

1. LETTER TO G.E. CHATFIELD

ASHRAM,
September 29 [1919]

DEAR MR. CHATFIELD,

Anasuyabehn has just shown me the order regarding the levy to be made from the inhabitants of Ahmedabad including the millhands on account of the April disturbances. I observe that the levy from the mill-hands is to be collected today by the mill-owners paying to the Hazur Deputy Collector one week's wages out of the amount held by them as caution money on their account. I venture to think that this levy will come upon the mill-hands as a perfect surprise. Will it not be better to give them some time to realize the situation and to make individual or collective payments themselves. The proposed summary procedure may be suitable from the Government standpoint, nay, even be agreeable to the mill-owners. But the principle of leaving totally out of consideration the party that is to pay seems to me to be dangerous and demoralizing. I should imagine that the Government are interested in the mill-hands realizing and recognizing their own dignity and becoming conscious of their own responsibility.

Moreover, I do not know whether you are aware that the coming days are auspicious days for both Mohammedans and Hindus. The Moharram festival is always, all over India, a time of anxiety for the Government. I have no doubt that this matter has been overlooked by you as well as others who are responsible for fixing the time of levy. But you will agree with me that the mill-hands who are even ordinarily suspicious will jump to the conclusion that the time chosen for collecting the levy has been specially selected in order to wound their feelings and cause them embarrassment. I therefore venture to suggest that the collection from the mill-hands may be deferred till after the Diwali holidays. Meanwhile I need hardly assure you that you will depend upon those who are at all connected with the mill-hands doing their best to facilitate collection. I know that you will treat this matter

as very urgent and, if you at all agree with my argument, issue the necessary orders.¹

Yours sincerely,

From a photostat of the handwritten draft : S. N. 6904

2. LETTER TO P.S. TO VICEROY

SABARMATI,
September 30, 1919

TO
THE HON'BLE MR. S.R. HIGNELL, C.I.E., I.C.S.
PRIVATE SECRETARY TO
HIS EXCELLENCY THE VICEROY

DEAR MR. HIGNELL,

As His Excellency is aware, there are orders against me which, among others, prohibit me from entering the Punjab and from leaving the Bombay Presidency. Hitherto, I have not been keen about the orders being withdrawn, if only because, so long as the Government persists in retaining on the Statute Book the Rowlatt Act, so long must my civil resistance continue *in esse* or *in posse*. But the situation has altered somewhat now. In my humble opinion, it is necessary for me to be in the Punjab when and some time before the forthcoming Committees begin their sittings. I claim that my presence can only help to elucidate truth. There is an urgent demand from the Punjab that I should be in that province before and at the time of the inquiry. I see that so many things are alleged to have happened in my name that I am naturally interested in the proceedings. I hope, therefore, that the orders against me, so far as the Punjab is concerned, will be removed.²

N.A.I. : Home Department : Political A : October 1919 : File Nos. 426-440;
also from a photostat of the draft : S. N. 6911

¹ In his reply, G.E. Chatfield wrote the same day : "I am afraid I cannot accept the principle of recovering the amount from the mill-hands by individual and collective contributions or agree that it is unreasonable to levy a fine from them without consulting them first. I quite understand your point of view and I am sure you will understand mine and how they must inevitably differ." The Collector agreed that the timing of the levy was awkward, but believed that delay involved even more danger, observed that he was making arrangements to avoid disturbances and appealed to Gandhiji to use his influence with the mill-hands to keep the peace.

² Gandhiji followed this up with a telegram on October 2; the prohibitory order was withdrawn on October 15.

3. LETTER TO SHUAIB QURESHI

[September 1919]¹

DEAR FRIEND,

You will not consider me discourteous for not having replied to the letter signed by you and other friends regarding the Ali Brothers and addressed to the Editor, *Young India*. The fact is I have been overwhelmed with the care of having to edit two important newspapers.² I must confess that I do not like your letter at all. It is a lawyer's letter containing quibbles. But even that would not matter. Do you sincerely take up the position that a Mussulman may never kill a Mussulman no matter what crimes the latter may commit? I would not be surprised if you took up that attitude, for then the rule of the Brahmin law-givers will descend upon you. They have made the life of the Brahmin, as they think, absolutely sacred, and, as the others consider possible, by providing that no matter what his crime is, a Brahmin may not be killed. It is true that the rule has been observed more in the breach than in the performance. For, in war, we have not hesitated to kill Brahmins. My quarrel is, therefore, not with a mental attitude, but with your impressing a Koranic text into service for defending the position of our friends. I would like, then, to have a letter that would appeal to reason. Before your letter was received, I wrote to Bari Saheb³ saying that, in my opinion, no agitation for the release of the Brothers was likely to be successful before the Turkish Peace terms were declared. I do not know whether your letter, which I see is addressed to the Press in general, has been published elsewhere.

QURESHI, SHUAIB

C/O DR. [M.A.] ANSARI

DELHI

From the original pencilled draft : S. N. 6864

¹ The exact date of this letter is not known. It is, however, likely that it was written some time towards the end of September 1919.

² The reference is to the weeklies *Navajivan* and *Young India*. Though the journals appeared under his full-fledged editorship only on October 7 and October 8, 1919, respectively, Gandhiji did a considerable amount of editorial writing for them even before they passed under his full control.

³ *Vide* "Exact from Letter to Abdul Bari", 27-8-1919.

4. LETTER TO JETHALAL SAMPAT

ASHRAM,
SABHARMATI,

Wednesday, [September, 1919]¹

DEAR JETHALAL,

The doubt you raise has been answered in my reply. So I do not reproduce it in *Navajivan*. We have got to stick to swadeshi in all things. So I cling to the trunk of the tree. I can have no interest in electricity, etc. Others can take that up. What I am doing harms no one. And the handloom and the spinning-wheel can never harm anyone. Even today handlooms are working side by side with the mills. I am developing them. We should create conditions where, 21 crores, sitting at home, can carry on their occupation. For further clarification of your doubt, you must regularly see the *Navajivan*. Everyone certainly cannot do everything. Activities should be distributed.

MOHANDAS

From a copy of the Gujarati in Devanagari script: C. W. 9843. Courtesy: Narayan Jethalal Sampat

5. THE PUNJAB STUDENTS

The letter from "One who feels" published in the *Leader* of the 22nd instant is an important communication confirming the many letters I have received from the Punjab, some of which have already appeared in *Young India*. The action of the college authorities reflects but little credit on them. "One who feels" is, as the *Leader* tells the public, "one of the most respected and foremost men in the educational world in the Punjab". At the worst the action of the students consisted in absenting themselves from their respective colleges. It amounts to nothing but a boyish method of demonstrating their opinion over the action of the Government and their affection for those whom they loved. In any place but India, such action would

¹ The period has been inferred from the reference to *Navajivan*, the first issue of which appeared in September 1919 under the editorship of Gandhiji, who wrote widely on the subject of handloom and spinning-wheel during the year 1919; vide also "Swadeshi V. Machinery", 14-9-1919.

have passed unnoticed or college professors would have made common cause with the students and warned the authorities of the unpopularity of their action. But the action of the authorities shows in a forcible manner what part terrorism has played in the public life of the Punjab. The college authorities have given an object lesson to the students in unmanliness. They have not hesitated to obtain by threat of punishment the names of the ring-leaders in the strike. It is evident that the strike was popular and spontaneous and all were practically ring-leaders. The prudent course in such an event is not to tempt weak students to buy exemption from penalty by blaming their fellows, but to regulate and direct their enthusiasm in the right channel. The authorities could not have adopted a more effective course than they did if they intended to rouse the bad blood of the students and make them seek crooked ways.

His Honour the Lieut.-Governor has now appointed a committee of inquiry which, according to the *Leader's* correspondent, is not quite satisfactory. The Lahore Medical College, however, will have nothing to do with the committee. The authorities will not have their action reviewed. This unrestrained lust for power and punishment is intolerable. I hope that His Honour will intervene, that the whole of India will insist on an inquiry into these cases. But if the authorities prove unbending, it would, in my opinion, be necessary to find out a remedy. If education is to be bought at the price of manliness and self-respect, the price is too heavy. "Man does not live by bread alone." Self-respect and character are above means of livelihood or a career. I am sorry that so many students have taken their expulsion so much to heart. The parents as well as students must revise their ideas about education. Education is treated merely as a means of earning a livelihood and acquiring a status in society. These are not unworthy ambitions. But they are not everything in life. There are many other honourable means of acquiring wealth and status. There are many independent activities in life which one may undertake without having to contemplate loss of self-respect. And there is no better or cleaner passport to status in society than honesty and selfless service of fellow-beings. If, therefore, after due effort, the college door remains banged in the students' faces, they should not lose heart but seek other means of livelihood. And if the other students will empty the recalcitrant colleges as a matter of respectful protest, they and India will not be losers, but both will be considerable gainers.

Young India, 1-10-1919

6. NATIVE STATES' SUBJECTS

Mr. M.T. Doshi has furnished me with detailed notes of an interview he had with the District Magistrate of Karachi on the 13th August last.

Mr. Doshi is a native of Vankaner in Kathiawar. He is an accountant and commercial instructor and has been manager of a firm in Karachi. The interview took place in virtue of a memorandum issued by the District Magistrate requesting Mr. Doshi to call on him. I cannot help remarking that there is too much of this kind of gratuitous calling of people by means of Memoranda. It is demoralizing alike for the officials and the public. It is an improper way of conducting public affairs. District Magistrates have no legal right to summon people in this manner. If Mr. Doshi had committed anything wrong, he should have been judicially dealt with. But to issue a non-judicial, political warning causes unnecessary fright and no man can regard himself safe under a system of what may be called political espionage.

After a few preliminary questions, Mr. Doshi was asked whether he had taken the satyagraha vow and whether he had been writing letters to the newspapers. He was told that he wanted "to stir up political agitation and satyagraha in spite of the troubles caused thereby in April last". The following conversation, being interesting, I give verbatim as supplied to me in Mr. Doshi's notes.

DOSHI : I do want political and all other kinds of national activities to go on here as elsewhere. I have no intention to cause troubles nor do I advocate any measures that might bring about troubles. I have done nothing to endanger the position of anybody.

D[ISTRICT] M[AGISTRATE] : Mr. Gandhi, when he started the satyagraha, never wanted to endanger anybody, but you know what happened in the Punjab and elsewhere; you want the same thing again here.

D : Troubles in the Punjab were not, in my opinion, due to any acts of Mahatma Gandhi, but to the peculiar attitude of the officials there. However, I do nothing that might cause trouble. And you know there never was any trouble here though here also we had the Saytagraha Day.

D. M. : You must be knowing that some time back I have called some of your Kathiawari people and warned them not to take any part in any movement against the Government or the laws of the place which afford them

protection here, for if they did not obey the laws, they shall have to be expelled to their own States. And you are doing just the same thing. Your case is just analogous to those of the other Kathiawaris already deported. They were asked to leave the country not only because they agitated themselves but they also tried to make others agitate, as you do now. . . . You have not yet given up the satyagraha vow. Have you?

D : I have not as I cannot. . . .

D.M. : Well, I tell you that I give you this warning personally. I am not moved by the authorities...the Commissioner. I just read your letters in the paper, two of which bear your signature and the third only initials and I thought it better to advise you as a good man.

D : Oh, I thank you for that.

D.M. : (while taking note on the paper) You say that "you are not prepared to cease taking part in political activities".

D : I would rather word it differently. I would say, "I am not prepared to cease taking part in any activities connected with the Indian national welfare."

D.M. : Why do you work here and not within the bounds of your State?

D : My State is only a part of India and it is only a narrow field whereas this is a vast one. If we make any progress here, sure enough that goes for progress in my own State which is well-up.

D.M. : Besides trying to stir up agitation, you try to help those that have been externed and want to take up their cause, but you must be careful, lest you meet with a similar fate.

D : I must try to help my friends as much as I can. I don't mind the rest.

D.M. : When the whole city is quiet you try to stir up troubles. I will make you responsible if anything occurs.

D : I am not attempting to stir up troubles. There have been never any troubles in Karachi and none likely to be. I don't understand why I shall be responsible.

D.M. : You are a subject of another State, and His Majesty's Government and its laws afford you protection here, so you must obey its laws, otherwise you must depart.

D : How do you call us subjects of another State and treat us as foreigners? Is not our State within India?

D.M. : I do not wish to argue with you on the matter; such is the law and law is law. I am not here to explain that, I only want you to stop partaking in such works.

D : May I know what works you mean? Do you include satyagraha and ordinary national political work in what you say?

D.M. : You should not take part in the political movements, surely you should not partake in the satyagraha or the disobedience of the law and such other matters.

D : I do not think satyagraha is criminal or illegal. It is not harmful.

D.M. : I do not want to discuss and argue over the case. I only want to warn you to stop writing to the Press and such other works as trying to help the externees and so on. I warn you that, if you persist in attempting to stir up *violent* political agitation and movements for breaking the laws in British India where you enjoy the protection of its laws and Government, I shall have to recommend action against you.

D : I have never tried to stir up nor will stir up *violent* political agitation, but I cannot in any case give up working for the activities connected with the Indian national welfare. For I consider that my own good and the good of my State lie in the good of my country-India.

The above extracts from Mr. Doshi's notes make painful reading and show the difficulty of carrying on political agitation. Any day the District Magistrate may prove as good as his word and expel Mr. Doshi from British India and thus ruin his career, as has been done in the case of Mr. Manilal Vyas and others.

Apart from the general question of the propriety of such notices and conversations, the question of the status of the subjects of native States is of very great importance. A law that makes it possible to coop up people without any trial in small areas must surely be altered. It is obvious that imprisonment is better than internment without provision for maintenance. On the one hand, the Government appoint subjects of native States to high office and on the other subordinate officials are permitted to treat them as foreigners. Sir Prabhasker Pattani can become an honoured colleague of Mr. Montagu. The Hon'ble Mr. Lallubhai Samaldas is a trusted councillor. The Government welcome the financial and other assistance of subjects of native States and shower titles on them. They are dubbed 'loyal'. What can be the meaning of the loyalty of foreigners? Can foreigners be or be expected to be 'loyal' to a State to which they do not belong? Must the *suzerain* power take everything from the people of the States in alliance and give nothing? It is a suicidal policy that has been laid down in Sindh. Let one hope that His Excellency's Government will nip the evil in the bud.

Young India, 1-10-1919

7. TELEGRAM TO P.S. TO GOVERNOR, BOMBAY

LABURNUM ROAD,
[BOMBAY,
October 1, 1919]¹

PRIVATE SECRETARY
HIS EXCELLENCY
POONA

EIGHT LACS RUPEES ORDERED TO BE COLLECTED FROM AHMEDABAD REGARDING APRIL DISTURBANCES OF WHICH ONE LAC SEVENTY-FIVE THOUSAND TO BE COLLECTED FROM MILL-HANDS. THIS SUM ORDERED TO BE COLLECTED THROUGH MILL-OWNERS WHO WERE REQUIRED TO PAY ON 29TH ULTIMO TO DISTRICT MAGISTRATE ENOUGH TO COVER LEVY OUT OF CAUTION MONEY. MILL-OWNERS IT IS UNDERSTOOD WILL RECOUP THEMSELVES BY DEDUCTING FROM WAGES ON PAY DAY. THIS MONTH IS AUSPICIOUS BOTH HINDUS MOHAMMEDANS. ALTHOUGH TIME SELECTED UNINTENTIONAL LABOURERS WILL CONSIDER THAT PRESENT OCCASION SELECTED SPECIALLY WOUND FEELINGS. MOREOVER THIS SUDDEN LEVY WITHOUT NOTICE TO LABOURERS IN MY HUMBLE OPINION DEMORALIZES. DIRECT COLLECTION SHOULD BE TRIED BEFORE RESORT TO FORCIBLE LEVY. SUGGESTED THESE CONSIDERATIONS COLLECTOR BUT HE HAS REFUSED CONSIDER. RESPECTFULLY REQUEST HIS EXCELLENCY AT LEAST POSTPONE COLLECTION TILL AFTER HINDU NEW YEAR'S DAY. I PROPOSE SUBMITTING ARGUMENT BY LETTER AGAINST COLLECTION FROM LABOURERS ESPECIALLY THE SUM AND MANNER SUGGESTED.

GANDHI

From a photostat of the draft in Gandhiji's hand: S. N. 6906

¹ In the "Letter to N.P. Cowie", 4-10-1919, Gandhiji refers to this telegram as sent on Wednesday, i.e., October 1.

8. *SPEECH AT ANNIE BESANT FELICITATION MEETING*¹

BOMBAY,
October 1, 1919

In opening the proceedings, Mr. Gandhi said that it gave him great pleasure to attending the meeting to celebrate the anniversary of the person who had devoted the greater part of her life for the public cause and they could feel justly proud in celebrating the event. He first knew her in England in 1889. He was introduced to her at the Blavatsky Lodge in England. He saw her answering the various queries and giving reasons for renouncing atheism and adopting Theosophy. After replying to all the allegations, she had then said that she would be satisfied if, after her death, it would be said that she lived for truth and died for the cause of truth. When he had been to South Africa, he came in contact with many Theosophists there and from them he came to know the work of Mrs. Besant, and they furnished him with more particulars of the work of Mrs. Besant, which information was not contained in the books published by Mrs. Besant. From all this, he was convinced that Mrs. Besant continued to work according to her own convictions, little caring whether she was praised or abused.

Coming to the satyagraha movement, Mr. Gandhi pointed out to the audience how Mrs. Besant stood by her own convictions, which made her believe that satyagraha had its shortcomings and the common people were not able to grasp the full significance of satyagraha. That furnished another instance that she cared for convictions of the inner soul more. She did not care whether these convictions were liked by the public or not.

He then referred to Mrs. Besant's work and said that he never in his life found Mrs. Besant at leisure, but found her always toiling for the public cause even when she was travelling in trains. Though he found her in her 73rd year, he was glad to see her working with such zeal and earnestness as none of them could equal. In his opinion, the services that Mrs. Besant had rendered to India were immense and invaluable. She had dedicated her whole life and all her own for the good of India.

Referring to the present political differences with Mrs. Besant, Mr. Gandhi was pleased to see that even those who differed from her were proud to testify to the great services that she was rendering in England for India. By espousing the cause of Indians, she had suffered much in body and mind. Her company was even shunned by

¹ Gandhiji presided over a public meeting held at the Excelsior Theatre to celebrate the 73rd birthday of Annie Besant. The report was reproduced in *New India*, 4-10-1919.

Europeans. But the greatest services, to the speaker's mind, which she rendered and which will ever remain a monument to her memorable career in India, was the introduction of Home Rule propaganda. It was only by her initiation that the movement was set afoot and now it had spread to every nook and corner of India, so that in whatever village he went, he found the villagers there awakened to the necessity of winning Home Rule for India.

Concluding, Mr. Gandhi said that Mrs. Besant had inculcated the *Mantra* of Home Rule into the minds of Indians and it was his fervent prayer to Almighty God that she might live long for India's sake and might be able to see India secure Home Rule in her lifetime, so that contentment might reign supreme everywhere in India and India would achieve her pristine glory once again.

After two other speakers had paid tributes to the work of Mrs. Besant, Gandhiji asked the audience to give him permission to send a suitable message to Mrs. Besant, which was agreed to.

The Bombay Chronicle, 2-10-1919

9. MESSAGE ON ANNIE BESANT'S BIRTHDAY

BOMBAY,
October 1, 1919

I gladly respond to the request to add my humble quota to the many appreciations that would be tendered to the Editor of *New India* on Mrs. Besant's birthday. It was in 1889 that I first paid my respects to Mrs. Besant when I was studying as a lad in London. I was privileged to do so by the courtesy of two English friends who were at the time ardent Theosophical students. She had only just joined the Theosophical Society there. Not much impression was created on my mind then. I really went not to have impressions but out of mere curiosity to see what this lady who was once an atheist looked like. My friends had told me that she was the best among the living women orators in the world, and that Madame Blavatsky was in great joy over this big "capture". But when, immediately after, I went to Queen's Hall, I went not to look at Mrs. Besant but to listen to her. And the words she uttered then as she rose to answer the charge of inconsistency have never faded from my memory. She said as she wound up her great speech which held her audience spell-bound that she would be quite satisfied to have the epitaph written on her tomb that she lived for

¹ *Vide* the preceding item.

truth and she died for truth. I had from my childhood an instinctive fascination for truth. The utter sincerity with which, I felt, she spoke these words captivated me and ever since I have followed her career with unabated interest and always with admiration for her boundless energy, her great organizing ability and her devotion to the work she might have made her own for the moment. I have sharp differences of opinion with her as to methods of work. I have also been hurt to feel at times that she has lost her robust independence of 1888 and her uncompromising search after and adherence to truth at all cost. But in the midst of all my doubts I have never wavered in my belief in her great devotion to India. It is no small gain for India to have her many gifts dedicated to her cause with a single-mindedness few of her natural-born sons and daughters can claim. I have no doubt that she has popularized Home Rule in a manner no other person has. May she be spared for many a long year to serve the country she has made her own.

From a photostat of the handwritten draft with corrections in Gandhiji's hand:
S. N. 6903

10. SPEECH AT FELICITATION MEETING, BOMBAY

October 2, 1919

In accepting it, Mr. Gandhi said that he was grateful to them for what they had done for him on his birthday, and we would utilize the sum for some object for the amelioration of the condition of Indian womanhood after careful consideration, and would ask for suggestions from them.

The Indian Review, October 1919

¹ A meeting to felicitate Gandhiji on his 51st birthday was organized by the Bhagini Samaj, at which a purse was presented to him.

11. TELEGRAM TO P.S. TO VICEROY

[October 2, 1919]

IN VIEW FORTHCOMING DISTURBANCES INQUIRY I
WROTE¹ FROM AHMEDABAD APPLYING FOR REVOCATION
OF ORDERS INTERNMENT AND EXTERNMENT
AGAINST ME. HAVE JUST LEARNT COMMITTEE BE-
GINNING ENQUIRY END THIS MONTH. I THEREFORE
REQUEST URGENT AND TELEGRAPHIC REPLY.²

GANDHI
AHMEDABAD

From a photostat of a copy : S. N. 6918; also Bombay Government Records

12. TELEGRAM TO SWAMI SHRADDHANAND³

October 2, 1919

SWAMI SHRADDHANANDJI
PRAKASH OFFICE
LAHORE

PLEASE WIRE AHMEDABAD WHAT BEING DONE LEAD
EVIDENCE BEFORE DISTURBANCES COMMITTEE. SUGGEST
CENTRAL BODY EXCLUSIVELY DEVOTED TO COLLECT-
ING SUBMITTING EVIDENCE PROPER COUNSEL SHOULD
BE RETAINED. AM TRYING SECURE PERMISSION
ENTER PUNJAB.

From a photostat of the handwritten draft : S. N. 6917

¹ *Vide* "Letter to P. S. to Viceroy", 30-9-1919.

² Maffey telegraphed back on October 3: "Orders to which you refer will be withdrawn on October fifteenth. Lord Hunter had not left London on October first but hoped to sail yesterday." Notice withdrawing the order was received by Gandhiji on October 16; *vide* "Letter to the Press", 17-10-1919.

³ A similar telegram was sent to C.F. Andrews at the *Tribune* Office, Lahore.

13. SPEECH AT BHAGINI SAMAJ¹

BOMBAY,
October 2, 1919

President, ladies and gentlemen, as I have said in the *Navajivan*, I cannot find words to express to you my gratitude.² Presentation of this purse places on me a great responsibility. On the occasion of my birthday, many men and women have done some work or other which I have liked. At every such function I have said that if we have respect and affection for somebody, the best way of expressing that respect and affection is to follow in his footsteps.

The best way to celebrate my birthday is to absorb whatever appears good in my life. If I go out to beg in India I can collect lakhs and crores of rupees. But that will not make for progress. This does not mean that money has no importance. It only means that everything has importance in its own place. If something made of gold goes to a wrong place, we have to discard it.

Many people have piles and piles of money, but if they cannot spend it for a good purpose, their having the money is of no consequence.

There is scarcity of food and clothing in our country. People have to satisfy themselves with one meal a day and many people go naked. You ladies do not know what cold means. But if you come with me to the fields, I will show you that some women use straw and cowdung to keep themselves warm. I want to be known as a farmer and a weaver. If some people, instead of spending a single paisa on milk for their children, squander money on gambling, how can they rise at all? With my head bared and my hand stretched I am begging from the rich in India. I tell them about my experiments and they help me. I intend to use this money for a good purpose and so I have agreed to accept this present. A large number of women have contributed towards it. Smt. Avantikabai and I can tell the story of Champaran. The women there told me that they went without bath and

¹ The Bhagini Samaj had collected a sum of Rs. 23,000 for the Golden Jubilee Fund in connection with Gandhiji's 51st birthday. The purse was presented to him on October 2. For a brief account of Gandhi's speech on the occasion, *vide* "Speech at Felicitation meeting, Bombay", 2-10-1919

² *Ibid*

remained dirty because they did not have any change of clothes. I felt sad that I had no extra clothes with me. The responsibilities I have to shoulder at present are beyond telling. I believe I shall be able to account for it to you and to God. I have solicited the views of many men and women as to the use of this money, and I hope to use it accordingly. What I am seeking is the resurgence of *Satya Yuga* in India. We had a Golden Age at one time. In that age men and women in India spontaneously and automatically spoke only the truth. Women in those days maintained their chastity. In those days even when men and women got together, they did not have lustful thoughts in their minds. That is how things were in the *Satya Yuga* or the Golden Age.

In this *Kali Yuga* it is difficult for women to remain chaste. When I went to the Harijan quarters at Dahod, I was told that in the past the women there had not worked for wages but that lately they had started working. Earlier the men had been weavers and their women assisted them. Hence they were able to preserve their chastity. Lately they have not been doing any spinning and have taken to working as labourers. The condition of women there is very sad. The overseers tyrannize over them.

Education of women is the paramount task in India. With education women can remain chaste. For such education we do not require great learning. All that is needed is character. It needs no money. Four hundred Muslim women are today helping themselves, and they are earning adequate wages from spinning.

Since you have shown me so much love today, I appeal to you to show me the love that will bring back *Satya Yuga*. India is in a position to take care of itself. If we use only the cloth produced in the country, we shall be able to make the country secure in a very short time. I have been campaigning for the spinning-wheel. The chastity of women can be protected with the help of the spinning-wheel. There is no other occupation in which our millions of women can engage themselves while staying at home. This does not call for much intelligence. India must learn to be self-reliant. When India produces brave men and women we shall become self-reliant. We have to show the gallantry of satyagraha. This needs more bravery than the bravery of arms. If that happens we shall be free right away. Protect your women and save those millions of rupees being drained out of India. You can work wonders even if you work only for an hour every day. You have shown me boundless affection. You call this money a small

amount but it is bountiful. This gift given willingly and with good intention is bound to bear fruit. To me it has the value of a billion rupees. Hence, do not think that this is inadequate. If you find my appeal for work appropriate, prepare to train yourselves for that work in the interest of your country.

[From Gujarati]

Bapujini Sheetal Chhayaman, pp. 91-5

14. TELEGRAM TO P.S. TO VICEROY

October 3, 1919

P.S.V.
SIMLA

"TIMES OF INDIA" REPORTS RUMOUR THAT JUSTICES CHINIS AND RAUF ARE TO REVISE JUDGMENTS SUMMARY TRIALS. SUBMIT THAT THESE APPOINTMENTS WILL CAUSE SERIOUS DIS-APPOINTMENT. ABSOLUTELY NECESSARY APPOINT EMINENT JUDGES OF PROVED INDEPENDENCE OR SUCH LAWYERS AND THEY SHOULD BE ASKED TO REVISE JUDGMENTS BOTH COM-MISSIONS AND SUMMARY COURTS AND NOT RESTRICT THEMSELVES TO SUMMARY TRIALS ONLY.

GANDHI

From a photostat of the draft in Gandhiji's hand : S.N. 6920

15. LETTER TO MATHURADAS TRIKUMJI

Friday, October 3, 1919

CHI. MATHURADAS,

The draft of a telegram was to be sent to Ahmed Haji Siddiq Khatri. It has been sent. I am also sending a copy to you. His address is: Hilal Manzil, 85 Abdur Rehman Street. Take the draft to him and find out whether or not he has received my letter.

Some important books have been left behind there. Mahadev will write about it.

The Press has been acquired. Mahadev has gone today to make the declaration. The Government's permission for *Navajivan* has also

been received. So, for the present at any rate, the cloud has lifted.

Blessings from

BAPU

[PS.]

The compositors should keep themselves ready to come here in a day or two. You discuss the matter with them.

From the Gujarati original: Pyarelal Papers. Nehru Memorial Museum and Library. Courtesy: Beladevi Nayyar and Dr. Sushila Nayyar

16. LETTER TO TEHMINA KHAMBATTA

BAZAR GATE STREET,

BOMBAY,

[October 2, 1919]¹

DEAR MRS. KHAMBATTA,

Your letter was redirected to me at Sabarmati. I am glad you are going to assist in the national undertaking². I am endeavouring to popularize [spinning]. I am arranging to send you 4 spinning-wheels. The price is Rs. 4 each. A lady teacher could attend from Saturday next for one hour between 2 and 3 p.m. Needless to say she is a volunteer. Will you please drop a line to Mr. Mathuradas Trikumji at the address given above as to the appointment and he will bring the teacher to you. I am leaving Bombay tomorrow evening.

Yours sincerely,

M. K. GANDHI

From a photostat : G. N. 75636; also C. W. 5038. Courtesy : Tehminabehn Khambatta

¹ From the contents; *vide* "Petition to Natal Legislative Assembly", Before 5-5-1895. Gandhiji left Bombay for Ahmedabad on this day.

² Swadeshi

17. LETTER TO MATHURADAS TRIKUMJI

ASHRAM,

Friday, October 3, 1919

CHI. MATHURADAS,

The Press has been acquired. It has all the facilities to bring out *Young India*. Hence, pack all the types that the owner of the Press has purchased under instructions from Shankerlal and the other types that the owner of the Press may insist on our buying and send them here. See that the types do not get mixed up. The bill for the types will be paid later making deductions for depreciation. If the owner of the Press demands any guarantee in this matter, give it. Money will be paid only after the amount has been settled. Send the compositors who have agreed to come on Saturday. The types will still be in 'chase'. If they have not been distributed, the best way would be to bring them packed as 'chase'. If any types belonging to the owner of the Press have got mixed up, we shall return those types. We do not need the 'chase' of advertisements. No new types will have been used in them. Take the necessary trouble and settle the matter by tomorrow. Tell the compositors that they will be paid the maximum salary possible in Ahmedabad. Carry out this job at all cost. Keshav (head compositor) should bring with him as many selected compositors as he thinks necessary for *Young India*. Let Yadvadkar also come immediately if he can make it. Inform me telegraphically.

Blessings from

BAPU

From the Gujarati original: Pyarelal Papers. Nehru Memorial Museum and Library. Courtesy: Beladevi Nayyar and Dr. Sushila Nayyar

18. FINING THE LABOURERS

Ahmedabad, the Government has decided, has to pay a fine of nearly nine lacs of rupees in connection with the April disturbances. This is under the same section of the British Police Act¹ as Nadiad has been dealt with. A law that allows a Government thus arbitrarily to impose a penalty is bad law. All laws that place a Government above

¹ The Bombay District Police Act IV of 1890 as amended by Act III of 1915.

law and enable them to impose their will upon people without consultation with them or without the authority of a properly constituted judicial tribunal are bad, and should not be tolerated where there is an enlightened and liberal Government or where the people are jealous of their freedom. But it is not my purpose to discuss the badness of the law. My object at the present moment is to bring to public notice an unwise and untimely and an almost despotic application of that bad law. The principle that the wanton damage done to life and property by crowds of people should be made good by them is beyond dispute. But acceptance of that principle cannot and does not involve acceptance of arbitrary powers. In the case of the Ahmedabad mill-hands a fine of 176 thousand rupees has been fixed. Recovery is to be made from all mill-hands employed during September 1919, within the Municipal limits. Now the disturbances took place in April last. It is a notorious fact that mill-hands have changed somewhat and new-comers constantly come in. Why should those who joined after the disturbances and have no connection with them be made to pay anything whatsoever? Why should women and children of whom there is a considerable number in the mills have to pay? There are probably sixty thousand labourers in the mills. Is it right to fine them nearly two lacs of rupees?

The manner of collection and the time chosen are still more unfortunate. The order is dated 26th September, 1919, and on the same day the following was served upon the mill-owners:

The Collector of Ahmedabad hereby calls upon the agents of the . . . mill to pay to the Huzur Deputy Collector, Ahmedabad, on Monday, September 29th, before 3 p.m., an amount equal to one week's wages of the manual labourers employed during September, 1919, in the . . . mill out of the amount held by him as caution money on their account.

The law contemplates the possibility of an appeal to the Government against such orders by the parties aggrieved. The order has not been served upon the mill-hands. They have not been given the chance of appeal nor have they been given the option of paying the fine themselves. The caution money, i.e., the money retained by the mill-owners out of the wages due to the mill-hands, has been summarily attached without notice to or consent of the labourers concerned. Such treatment of labourers debases them, needlessly irritates them and keeps them in a helpless condition. This manner of dealing

with the labourers shows that they are not considered responsible human beings.

It is almost like collecting fine from owners of cattle for trespass without reference to the latter, the difference being that the labourers are not dumb like cattle and, unlike cattle, the burden ultimately falls on their shoulders. It is surprising that the mill-owners have, as I understand they have, become willing parties to such a monstrous procedure.

Information in my possession goes to show that the mill-owners are to recoup themselves for the above payment out of the wages immediately to fall due. This means that the enormous sum of one hundred and seventy six thousand rupees is to be collected during a festival season common to both the Hindus and Mohammedans. The impropriety of such a step can hardly be questioned. The coincidence is no doubt unintended but the unsophisticated labourers will conclude that the festival season has been intentionally chosen to wound their feelings.

The Collector of Ahmedabad is a gentleman. He has given every satisfaction to the inhabitants of the district. At a time of intense excitement, he acted with remarkable coolness. He is a man full of broad humanity. It is a matter, therefore, of special regret to me to have to criticize his actions and I cannot help saying that, if he was not a slave to a system which makes arbitrary procedure possible at almost every step of national life, he could not have helped seeing the absurdity and the injustice of the action taken by him. The matter is now before His Excellency the Governor and I venture to express the hope that the wrong done to the labourers of Ahmedabad will be redressed. The sum apportioned for the labourers is too much for them. It should be reduced. Women and boys should be exempted and the payment received by easy stages. I admit the difficulty of collection by instalment from a large number of labourers but that difficulty is nothing compared to the infliction of a serious injustice upon a large number of human beings. Terrorizing punishment is hardly the best method of weaning offenders from wrongdoing and, in the present instance, the punishment will fall upon many innocent shoulders.

The authorities have recognized the delicacy of the situation in that they have drafted special police to Ahmedabad and taken

extraordinary precautions in order to avoid unruliness on the part of the labourers and to cow them down into submission.

Young India, 4-10-1919

19. PRAYER AND FASTING

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 Khilafat Day. Mr. Andrews' letter shows clearly what the Khilafat question is and how just is the case of the Mohammedans. 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 resignations, better than protests, are 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 to 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 Mohammedan brethren. It is the surest and simplest method of

bringing about the Hindu-Mohammedan 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 Mohammedans 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 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 manoeuvring. 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 Mohammedans, we have all got the religious spirit in us. Let it not be undermined by our playing at religion.

Young India, 4-10-1919

20. TELEGRAM TO P. S. TO GOVERNOR, MADRAS

[AHMEDABAD,
October 4, 1919]

HIS EXCELLENCY GOVERNOR
MADRAS

MR.	ANDREWS	WROTE	SAYING	HIS	EXCELLENCY
WOULD	EXPEDITE	MISS	FAERING'S	COMING	TO ME.
SHE	IS	NOW	WITHOUT	OCCUPATION	AND MOST
ANXIOUS	JOIN	ME.	WILL	HIS	EXCELLENCY PLEASE
PERMIT	MISS	FAERING	TO	JOIN	ME PENDING ANY
INVESTIGATIONS	HIS	EXCELLENCY	MIGHT	BE	MAKING. ¹

GANDHI

From a photostat of the handwritten draft : S. N. 6931

¹ The reply stated: " . . . if Miss Faering will apply in the usual way to Government for permission to travel to Bombay, there will be no difficulty in granting it." Gandhiji acknowledged this letter on October 22; *vide* "Letter to P. S. to Governor, Madras", 22-10-1919.

21. TELEGRAM TO ESTHER FAERING

[AHMEDABAD,
October 4, 1919]¹

PLEASE HAVE PATIENCE,² HAVE MYSELF TELEGRAPHED
GOVERNOR MADRAS EXPEDITE YOUR COMING.

From a photostat of the handwritten draft : S. N. 6932

22. LETTER TO G.E. CHATFIELD

SATYAGRAHA ASHRAM,
SABARMATI,
October 4, 1919

DEAR MR. CHATFIELD,

Messrs Banker and Desai have described to me the whole of the discussion they had with you over your proposal to demand security regarding *Navajivan* and *Young India*. I know that what ever decision you will give would be actuated by nothing but a strict sense of duty. Nor have I the slightest desire to seek any special exemption. I would however like to put just one thought before you. People and, I venture to think, the Government consider that my acts are not actuated by any enmity to the latter, and if I find myself in opposition to many measurers of the latter, it is because I want what I consider to be the wrong to be righted. Any security therefore taken in connection with newspapers whose policy I am permitted entirely to control will excite strong ill feeling amongst the people and therefore diminish to that extent the prestige of the Government. If you agree with me in the views submitted by me I would ask you not to impose any security. But if you do impose it, as I have already said, I shall not misunderstand your action. And if you do and if you could see your way, I would like you to give your grounds for imposing security. I may add

¹ The date is mentioned in the official acknowledgment, dated October 6, addressed to Gandhiji from the Madras Governor's camp.

² In her letters dated September 15 and 21, Esther Faering had expressed her longing to go to the Sabarmati Ashram early. On September 28, she had written of her impatience and asked Gandhiji to allow her to go to Bombay and intercede with the Governor.

that when security was imposed upon *Navajivan* only recently,¹ I wrote to His Excellency almost in the same strain as above and the matter is still engaging his attention.

Yours sincerely,

From a photostat of the handwritten draft : S. N. 6925

23. LETTER TO N.P. COWIE

SATYAGRAHA ASHRAM,

SABARMATI,

October 4, 1919

DEAR MR. COWIE,

I sent you a telegram on Wednesday last regarding the levy of rupees one hundred and seventy-six thousand from the mill-hands of Ahmedabad. I said in the telegram that I would submit for His Excellency's consideration the argument against the amount of the levy, as also the class of labourers from whom it is being or to be exacted. It seems to me that the labourers have been put on a par with the wealthiest citizens of Ahmedabad; and whilst the payment to be made by the latter will take some time before it is collected, the labourers are being required to pay the (to them) terrible sum of Rs. 1,76,000 at once. I hope it will not be replied that the Government's duty is finished as soon as they have paid themselves out of the caution-money retained by the mill-owners and that the mill-owners may collect as they choose.

It is a well-known fact that labourers are continuously changed. All, therefore, who were employed in April were not necessarily under employment in September. It is therefore difficult to understand the justice of levying from the labourers to be found on the books of the mill-owners in the month of September.

In my humble opinion, justice demands that any levy imposed should be recovered from the labourers on the books of the several mills on the 10th of April. I venture to think, too, that collection from women and boys employed in the mills is also an injustice. I submit therefore that the amount to be collected should be reduced; that all the labourers who were not employed on the 10th of April, women and boys under the age of eighteen, should be exempted from

¹ *Vide* "Notes", 5-10-1919.

payment; and as submitted in my telegram, the payment ought not to be recovered during the current festival month but the recovery should be spread over a long enough period to enable the labourers to pay without extreme inconvenience to them.

Yours sincerely,

From a photostat of a handwritten draft : S. N. 6926

24. LETTER TO MAGANLAL GANDHI

Wednesday [On or before October 5, 1919]¹

CHI. MAGANLAL,

We are to purchase some press and Chi. Chhotalal has been urgently dispatched there for the purpose. Go and inspect the press, with Shri Popatlal of the Diamond Press. Make an inventory. Have a careful look at the machinery, etc. Make sure that all the machines work. See that the types are not worn out. If you find everything all right, close the bargain. The transaction should be in the name of Shri Shankarlal Banker. They have offered to sell [the press] for six thousand rupees and it includes one double royal machine, two treadles, one hand-case and types. There are Gujarati and English types sufficient for running two papers, *Navajivan* and *Young India*, as we understand the telegram to say. I send the telegram² herewith.

Perhaps a man will go specially from here to inspect the machines. If he does, keep him with you. Go to the town the moment you get this letter.

Blessings from
BAPU

From the Gujarati original in Gandhiji's hand : C.W. 5772. Courtesy : Radhabehn Choudhri

25. FORTHCOMING SESSION OF GUJARAT POLITICAL CONFERENCE

On the election of the Hon'ble Gokuldas Kahandas Parekh as president of the forthcoming session of the Gujarat Political Confe-

¹ The first issue of *Young India*, as a weekly, was published from Ahmedabad on October 8; the Wednesday before it was October 5.

² This is not available.

rence to be held in Surat, we congratulate him as well as the Reception Committee. The Hon'ble Mr. Parekh has rendered no mean service to Gujarat. At a time when very few Gujaratis used to come forward for public service, being afraid of expressing their thoughts before the Government, the Hon'ble Mr. Parekh would fight the Government and apprise it of public opinion. These days we often find a tendency among us that, if the older people refuse to go along in every matter with the young, the growing generation, and declare their differences with them, they are treated as of no account and their earlier services are forgotten. It is our conviction that our customary practice of respecting elders is an invaluable one, that giving it up will harm the nation. Maybe we have a difference of opinion with someone on some matter; we can politely express it, but we should not feel any the less respect for him. Hence we welcome the choice of the Reception Committee as an instance worthy of emulation and congratulate the Hon'ble Mr. Parekh, too, on having been duly honoured by Gujarat and on his services having been appreciated.

ARRANGEMENTS FOR CONFERENCE

On this occasion, we shall take the liberty of making some suggestions to the Reception Committee. Our experience tells us that we incur some unnecessary expenses during these conferences. We have with us some very fine observations of Professor Patrick Geddes¹ which we hope to give some other time. On many matters, we always imitate the West blindly and harm our country. In fact, our knowledge of the West is very little. The West means England, America, France and Germany; these countries are very prosperous. We can never rival them in prosperity. The expense that they can afford is entirely beyond India's means. Hence, in making arrangements for conferences, we ought to give due consideration to India's climate, her economic condition and her manners and customs. Looking at the matter from this point of view, we cannot approve of the spending of thousands of rupees on pandals and countless flags and buntings. If cleanliness and comfort are ensured, beauty will follow as a matter of course. If we have a clean and open plot, with plenty of trees at the right spots, we cannot imagine a better pandal than this. We want lakhs of people to attend our conferences. If we do not, we ought to. Even in England pandals are not erected when lakhs attend. A wooden framework is erected in the middle for the president and some leading

¹ *Vide* "Letter to Patrick Geddes", 12-4-1918

figures and round this seating arrangements are made for the general public. The audience takes up very little space, a large number can hear the speeches made from the platform and the arrangements cost very little. Where thousands assemble, we cannot detain them for long. The main work of the Conference should be done in committee. The resolutions should be finalized there and the arguments should be presented [in the plenary session] in the fewest words possible, in simple language, free of all pomposity, such as the people can understand. In this way we can go through the work of the Conference, working only from 7 to 9 in the morning and from 5 to 7 in the evening, and save time for the committee. If we fear excessive heat even during these hours, we can have lights and finish the work of the Conference at a sitting from 6 p.m. to 9 p.m., or even later.

EXHIBITION AT CONFERENCE

We also take the liberty to make another suggestion. Mr. Wamanrao Mukadam¹ has suggested a swadeshi conference at the time of the [Political] Conference. We amend this and suggest a swadesi exhibition. We believe that we can easily arrange such an exhibition within the short time at our disposal. Only recently an exhibition was held at Amreli and we have been told that not only did everything go off very well but that it was visited by thousands of men and women with great interest. We hope that the Reception Committee and the enterprising citizens of Surat will do their best to carry out this suggestion.

[From Gujarati]

Navajivan, 5-10-1919

26. FATHER OF THE WORLD [-II]

In the last issue we briefly described the peasant's lot. We have now to consider ways and means of improving it.

Mr. Lionel Curtis², who came into limelight during the Lucknow Congress, has in one place drawn a realistic picture of the Indian villages. He says that the villages of India are situated on dunghills. The huts are in ruins and the inhabitants feeble. Temples are to be

¹ Public worker, Panch Mahals district, Gujarat

² Member, Transvaal Legislative Council; *vide* "Interview to the Star", 6-1-1908.

found at all sorts of places. Cleanliness is non-existent. The lanes are full of dust. The general appearance would suggest that no one was responsible for the management of the village.

There is little exaggeration in this account; in fact it could be extended. There ought to be some method in the lay-out of a well-ordered village. The streets should follow a definite pattern and not be laid out in the present arbitrary fashion. And in India, where crores of people walk bare-foot, the roads should be so clean that walking or even lying on them should not seem disagreeable. The streets should be metalled and have gutters to drain away the water. The temples and mosques should be clean and look ever fresh and should evoke in those who enter them a sense of peace and sanctity. In and around the village there should be useful trees and orchards. There should be a dharmashala, a school and a small hospital for the treatment of the sick. Arrangements should be made for the bodily needs of the inhabitants so that the air, the streets, etc., are not polluted. The inhabitants of every village should be able to raise their own food and produce their own cloth and should be capable of defending themselves from thieves, marauders or wild beasts. Most of these things were to be seen in the Indian village in olden days. Those which were wanting were probably unnecessary at that time. In any case, whether once they existed or not, no one can deny that villages should be planned on the lines I have indicated above. It is only such villages that can be regarded as self-sufficient. And, if all our villages could be so organized, there is little that can afflict the country.

Not only is it possible to bring about such conditions, but it is not even as difficult as we imagine. It is said that there are seven and a half lakhs of villages in India. In that case the average population of a village is 400. In many villages the population is less than 1,000. It is my firm conviction that to make proper arrangements in a village with such a small population is a very easy matter. It does not need long speeches or legislative assemblies or laws. All that is required is a few sincere and willing workers, both men and women, as many as may be counted on the fingers of one hand. These will be able, by their own exemplary conduct and spirit of service, to bring about the necessary transformation in every village. Nor does this mean that these men and women must confine themselves day and night exclusively to this task. Even while earning their livelihood they can, through their spirit of service, bring about important changes in the village.

It is not at all necessary that these workers be highly educated. Village uplift can be undertaken even by the illiterate. Neither the Government nor the princes can obstruct such efforts and there is little need for their help. If such volunteers come forward in each village, the work of the entire nation can be done without any fuss or big movement. Even a limited effort will produce results far beyond our expectations. The reader will easily realize that even money would not be necessary for such work. What is indispensable is character and religious zeal.

I know from experience that this is the easiest way of ameliorating the peasant's lot. In making such an effort, it is not necessary for any village or for any individual to wait for another to make a beginning. If in any village there is even one man or woman with the sincere desire to serve the people, he or she can immediately start such work. Such service will amount to the service of the entire nation. I hope that those village-dwellers into whose hands this issue of *Navajivan* falls will give a trial to the experiments suggested by me and, within a short time, demonstrate the results of their experiments to the rest of the country. In the next issue I plan to place before my readers some of my experiences which may suggest how to make a beginning with these experiments. But I also hope that any worker who has realized the importance of this task will start work on his own initiative without waiting even for a week.

[From Gujarati]

Navajivan, 5-10-1919

27. NOTES

LONG LIVE MRS. BESANT!

Mrs. Besant entered her 73rd year last Wednesday. On that day thousands of Indians must have prayed to God to grant this great lady many more years on this earth. Few among us can, at the age of 33, show the diligence and industry Mrs. Besant continues to do at the age of 73. It is indisputable that the service rendered to India by Mrs. Besant will ever remain memorable in the country's history. The enthusiasm with which the Indians seized the term "Home Rule" is due solely to this good lady and it was due to her courage that branches of the Home Rule League were established everywhere. She has had a great share in the political education of India. Even in England Mrs.

Besant is agitating for Home Rule for India. She is using all her resources for the cause of Home Rule. There may be differences of opinion about Mrs. Besant's ideas and her methods of work, but there can be none about her service to India. Not only is she considered the best woman speaker in the world, very few even among men could rival her eloquence. Her pen, too, has great force. For many years, this lady has been using all these great powers in the service of India, and for this the country will ever remain grateful to her. And so the prayer, "Long live Mrs. Besant!" is, really speaking, a prayer for our benefit.

CLOUD OVER "NAVAJIVAN"

As the *navajivan*¹ of India progresses extremely slowly and comes upon many a check on the way, so does *Navajivan*, the paper. It has to contend against both internal and external difficulties. The external difficulty consists in harassment by the government and, deterred by this harassment, people hesitate to help in printing the paper and in other ways. The reader is aware of some of the facts of the official harassment.

When the Government asked questions and pointed out that, *Navajivan* being a new paper, it was necessary under the regulations framed under the Defence of India Act to obtain the Bombay Government's permission for publishing it, Mr. Indulal Yagnik, believing that the Government's interpretation must be correct, admitted straightaway that a mistake had been made in publishing *Navajivan*. At that time I was in Dhoraji. On reaching the Ashram and reading the Act, I felt that Mr. Indulal was wrong. Being a satyagrahi, he frankly admitted what he believed to be true, so that his action in admitting the error does him nothing but credit. But I could see that this admission was the result of a mistake. *Navajivan* cannot be described as a new paper. Everyone recognizes and knows it as a fact that the monthly *Navajivan* has been changed into this weekly. The dropping of the words *Ane Satya*², as redundant, from the title of the monthly *Navajivan* does not make it a new journal. Accordingly, with his consent, I decided that *Navajivan* ought not to be withheld from the public till the Government had made up its mind.

¹ New life

² "And Truth"

After telegraphically¹ withdrawing Shri Indulal's letter, I waited for 36 hours for the Government's reply. The number is being placed before the public. But this does not relieve *Navajivan* of its worries. Really speaking, we have invited the worries, but on a battle-field that has to be done. However, in case *Navajivan* incurs the Government's displeasure, why should a poor printer take the risk of printing it? For this reason, *Navajivan* must have its own press and hence Mr. Shankerlal Banker, who is shouldering the financial responsibility, has purchased a new printing press. A declaration will now have to be made before a magistrate, after which another declaration will have to be made for publishing *Navajivan* in that press.

For these reasons and owing to some damage to the machinery because of the large number of copies to be printed, there has been delay [in publishing this number]; I hope the reader will excuse this and have patience.

(Since this was written, the Government's permission has been received; I thank the Government for it and congratulate the readers.)

SPINNING-WHEEL

The success of the swadeshi movement depends in a large measure on our producing simple but quick-working machines for ginning cotton, on our making the process of carding easy and effecting possible improvements in the spinning-wheel and the loom.

It seems a few people believe that, in Mr. Gandhi's movement, there is no scope for improvement in ancient or modern machines. This is a mistaken belief. His opinion is this. The machines or the improvements in the machines must be such as will suit our country and lend themselves to use in one's home. Keeping this in mind, Mr. Gandhi is ever on the watch for possible improvements. No farmer, and not all artisans, can work in big factories. The farmers cannot leave their fields; it is the duty of every well-wisher of India to discover some means and take steps for introducing an industry in their homes in addition to their work in the fields.

Hence we announce in this number and welcome the prize offered by Mr. Rewashankar Jagjivan Mehta.² Improvement in the

¹ This telegram is not available.

² The prize of Rs. 5,000 was offered to anyone inventing a portable spinning-wheel of indigenous components, as far as possible, which could take on ten spindles at a time. The model was to reach the Satyagraha Ashram before January 1, 1920.

spinning-wheel is our first need. Of course, even without improvement spinning will go on. Even so, it is evident that, if the spinning-wheel could be so improved as to make it do double the work it does now, the movement would gather more speed and the spinners' income would increase. There is absolutely no doubt that the type of spinning-wheel in use at present can be improved. Some patriotic artisans are already working to that end. An expert artisan from Gondal has made a delicate spinning-wheel of brass. His aim is not to increase the turn-out of yarn but to produce a wheel that will be easy to carry from place to place and be also durable. This artisan is still at work devising improvements in that model.

An artisan in Rajkot is developing a spinning-wheel which can take four spindles simultaneously, that is, one which will turn out four times the quantity of yarn during a given period. In Broach, a spinning-wheel with two spindles working simultaneously has already been invented. There should, therefore, be no difficulty in inventing a spinning-wheel which will win the prize. We hope our readers will carry the news of this prize to the artisan class. This means that the educated people need to take interest in the lives of the artisans and give them the benefit of the knowledge they have acquired, instead of remaining cut off from them. Our country is not devoid of craftsmanship or the inventive faculty but it is denied the benefit of these talents for lack of encouragement. We hope that a great many competent artisans will strive to win the prize offered by Mr. Rewashankar Mehta.

IMPROVEMENT IN METHOD OF CREMATION

We have had two or three letters from Shri Chhotalal Tejpal, and also some literature on the movement he is carrying on. There is so much of it and so thick-laid with secondary details that we are unable to publish it¹ Hence we intend merely to describe here his purpose, which has appeared useful to us.

Day by day the difficulties of disposing of dead bodies are increasing. Those of the poor are greater. Many lack even the facilities for carrying the bodies. The plague and such other epidemics break out frequently in the country and at such times the condition of the people is indeed pitiable. Moreover, time is wasted in waiting for

¹ *Vide* "Letter to Chhotalal Tejpal", 17-9-1919.

the body to be fully consumed. Sometimes the logs on the pyre are so arranged that the body is not even fully covered by them.

Hence Mr. Chhotalal has been trying for some time to reform the manner of carrying the dead body and of cremating it. We think the enterprise deserves encouragement. He suggests that the body should be removed in a vehicle and that the crematorium should be constructed scientifically so that the body will be put into a furnace and be quickly reduced to ashes by a strong fire. This will save money and time without hurting religious sentiment in any way. All the same, it would be better for the present not to make it compulsory for dead bodies to be carried in vehicles and scientifically cremated, but to leave them to people's choice. In such matters, it is necessary to educate the people. Customs, even when undesirable, can be reformed but slowly. Real reform lies in the people's willing acceptance of the change, in full knowledge of what it means, or on faith. Therefore, if there are a few venturesome persons in a place, money is readily available and some persons at any rate are ready to accept the new method of cremation, if at such a place vehicles for transport and facilities for [scientific] cremation are provided and these are good enough, this important change will soon become popular and, in times of epidemics, the poor in any case are bound to welcome it gratefully.

[From Gujarati]

Navajivan, 5-10-1919

28. TELEGRAM TO KISAN SABHA, KHAJAULI

[AHMEDABAD,
October 5, 1919]

DIFFICULT ADVICE ON STRENGTH WIRE. YOU SHOULD
HAVE PATIENCE. CONSULT BRIJKISHORE BABU.

From the pencilled draft in Gandhiji's hand: S. N. 6971 A

29. LETTER TO HAROLD MANN

SATYAGRAHA ASHRAM,
SABARMATI,
October 7, 1919

DEAR SIR HAROLD MANN¹,

You may be aware that I am editing a Gujarati weekly called *Navajivan*. It is only a five-weeks-old infant. But it has several thousand readers already. Farmers write to me inquiring where they can get good and cheap seed. Can you direct me?

Yours sincerely,

From a photostat of the handwritten draft: S. N. 6937

30. LETTER TO P.S. TO GOVERNOR, BOMBAY

[After October 7, 1919]

DEAR MR. COWIE,

I thank you for your letter of the 7th October.²

Regarding swadeshi, I am anxious to get a word of encouragement for publication for the work now being done to increase production by inducing chiefly women to devote their spare time to hand-spinning and ask chiefly men to [do] hand-weaving.

Yours sincerely,

From a photostat of a copy in Gandhiji's hand: S. N. 6936

¹ Director of Agriculture, Bombay Presidency

² *Vide* footnote 1 to "Letter to P. S. to Governor, Bombay", 25-8-1919.

31. LETTER TO MATHURADAS TRIKUMJI

ASHRAM,
SABARMATI,
[Before October 8, 1919]¹

CHI. MATHURADAS,

I have your letter. *Young India* will certainly appear from here. We are working hard. It will reach there every Thursday. I am not worried if the compositors do not come from there. It is best not to have them if it means having to flatter them.

Ask Nandlal in what way he can help us now.

Send all the old issues of *Young India* here. We must not allow even a single copy to go waste.

If Vasumati has gone to Poona, can Taramati not go to give tuition to Mrs. Khambatta? If she does not go, Anand can go. Ask Trivenibehn and Avantikabehn.

Find out if the charkhas have reached Godhra. Has Manibhai gone to Trivenibehn's?

You must try to write for *Navajivan*. It will be good if you can read about land revenue and write about it. Carry on the Swadeshi campaign there. Keep yourself informed about the different schools running there. You yourself should sit at the spinning-wheel. See what is being taught in the technical school. It is a wide and sacred field.

Blessings from

BAPU

From the Gujarati original: Pyarelal Papers. Nehru Memorial Museum and Library. Courtesy: Beladevi Nayyar and Dr. Sushila Nayyar

32. WE ARE APT TO MAKE MISTAKES

The Hon'ble Mr. Sinha, whilst he was speaking on the Indemnity Bill, was led into a confusion of terms. He was pulled up by Sir George Lowndes, and His Excellency the President defended Mr.

¹ From the contents. The first issue of *Young India* as a weekly was published from Ahmedabad on October 8, 1919 with Gandhiji as editor.

Sinha saying it was a slip of the tongue. Mr. Sinha then made these frank and dignified remarks:

It is hard for Your Excellency to realize what our difficulties are in speaking a foreign tongue in this Council. We are apt to make mistakes.

This is only too true. We are apt to make mistakes in our own mother tongue. But they are never so ludicrous as when we attempt to speak in a foreign tongue. Professor Jadunath Sarkar has remarked that our having to speak and think in English puts a strain upon us from which we never fully recover. The remedy for the evil is that we must begin self-government by introducing our own speech in our own assemblies provincial vernaculars in the provincial legislatures, and Hindustani a resultant of Hindi and Urdu in the Imperial Council. We cannot make a better beginning than by adopting the change in the Congress and the conferences. In adopting English as the medium at these gatherings we have done a positive disservice to the masses who have but a vague idea of the proceedings of these annual gatherings. By persisting to conduct them in English we have actually put obstacles in the way of the masses getting political education. I imagine what would have happened if we had, during the thirty-five years' existence of the National Congress, deliberated in Hindustani instead of English which is understood only by a microscopic minority of our countrymen.

Young India, 8-10-1919

33. TO THE SUBSCRIBERS AND THE READERS

Young India from this week enters upon a new stage. It became a bi-weekly when Mr. Horniman was deported and the *Chronicle* was strangled. Ever since the *Chronicle's* rebirth, the syndicate and I have been considering the advisability of reverting to the weekly issue. The conversion of *Navajivan* into a weekly and its coming under my charge has hastened the decision. The burden of conducting a bi-weekly and a weekly is too great a strain on me and a weekly *Young India* will now serve almost as well as a bi-weekly. An endeavour will be made to give as much matter as was given in the bi-weekly. The annual subscription will now be Rs. 4 instead of Rs. 8 and the price of single copy will be one anna instead of two without postage. Subscribers may either have the balance due to this change returned to them or the amount may be credited to the next year's account.

Those subscribers who may be dissatisfied with the change can have the proportionate payment refunded to them on application.

The headquarters of *Young India* have been transferred to Ahmedabad for better management, and in order to enable me to devote some time to the Satyagraha Ashram which, owing to my continued absence from it, was being somewhat neglected by me. Moreover, it was obviously uneconomical in every respect to edit two papers at two different places. This deprives me of the privilege of being with Bombay friends as much as I have lately been. But I hope they will forgive me, if the new arrangement results, as I hope it will, in greater service to the country.

Young India has hitherto been chiefly occupied in dealing with the Punjab affairs. But one may reasonably hope that the cloud will lift in the near future.

What will *Young India* then present to its readers? I frankly confess that to me, editing a newspaper in English is no pleasure. I feel that, in occupying myself with that work, I am not making the best use of my time. And but for the Madras Presidency, I should now leave the work of editing *Young India*. It is true that I should at times like to make my views in matters of general interest known to the Government. But I do not need to control a newspaper merely for that purpose.

The editing of *Navajivan* has been a perfect revelation to me. Whilst *Young India* has a little more than 1,200 subscribers, *Navajivan* has 12,000. The number would leap to 20,000 if we would but get printers to print that number. It shows that a vernacular newspaper is a felt want. I am proud to think that I have numerous readers among farmers and workers. They make India. Their poverty is India's curse and crime. Their prosperity alone can make India a country fit to live. They represent nearly 80 per cent of India's population. The English journals touch but the fringe of the ocean of India's population.

Whilst, therefore, I hold it to be the duty of every English-knowing Indian to translate the best of the English thought in the vernaculars for the benefit of the masses, I recognize that for a few years to come, i.e., until we have accepted Hindustani as the common medium among the cultured classes and until Hindustani becomes compulsory in our schools as a second language, educated India, especially in the Madras Presidency, must be addressed in English.

But I will not be party to editing a newspaper that does not pay its way. *Young India* cannot pay its way unless it has at least 2,500 paying subscriber. I must appeal to my Tamil friends to see to it that the requisite number of subscribers are found, if they wish to see *Young India* continued.

The more so now because the proprietors of *Young India* have decided to give up all advertisements. I know that they have not been entirely, if at all, converted to my view that a newspaper ought to be conducted without advertisements. But they are willing to let me make the experiment. I invited those who wish to see *Young India* free from the curse of advertisements to help me to make the venture a success. The Gujarati *Navajivan* has already demonstrated the possibility of conducting a newspaper without advertisements soiling its pages. What a financial gain it would be to the country if there was for each province only one advertising medium not a newspaper containing innocent unvarnished notices of things useful for the public. But for our criminal indifference, we would decline to pay the huge indirect taxation by way of mischievous advertisements. Some readers who are interested in the purity of journalism recently sent me a most indecent advertisement extracted from a well-known newspaper. I have refused to soil the pages of *Navajivan* by reproducing it. But anyone turning to the advertisement sheets of even leading journals can verify the aptness of my criticism.

A word as to the policy of *Young India*. Apart from its duty of drawing attention to injustices to individuals, it will devote its attention to constructive satyagraha as also sometimes cleansing satyagraha. Cleansing satyagraha is civil resistance where resistance becomes a duty to remove a persistent and degrading injustice such as the Rowlatt Act.

Young India, 8-10-1919

34. SPEECH AT BARODA

[October 9, 1919]

We have enthusiasm; we also have good ideals; but these will not ensure us our freedom. They will not bring us what we seek. Our deeds alone will go with us and decide the shape of the future. If we do not translate our enthusiasm into action and see that it yields excellent results, it will have been to no purpose. It is good to inspire

people with idealism. There are times when this too is necessary. But instead of occupying ourselves with rousing idealism in people, if we applied ourselves to work, the effect would be better and we would succeed in awakening a steadier idealism through the example of work.

Yesterday there was great disorder at the station. With orderliness, men can work quietly, however large their number. It is not enough that I came to no harm. So many friends worked hard trying to ensure my safety. What is necessary, however, is to maintain conditions in which no one would come to harm. However large the crowd, if there is good order peace will be preserved. Here conditions are favourable for this purpose. This place has a fine gymnasium. I have always said that drill is essential in any system of education. If lakhs of people went ahead calmly according to a fixed plan, if at a sign they knew what was to be done, they could do things. We ought to get such strength.

In the straits in which we find ourselves at present, we must learn how to finish the job on hand expeditiously. Yesterday, two hours were wasted in taking out the procession. I do not mean to say that such processions should be altogether dispensed with. But we should be alive to the times. India is in such a plight today that we cannot afford to waste our time in processions and such public demonstrations. We shall not serve the motherland by parading in processions, raising slogans of "Vande Mataram" and shouting "Glory to the Motherland!" Today our India is aflame with a triple fire. To rescue her from it, what is needed is not processions but physicians, not demonstrations but effective remedies. We need heroic men and heroic mothers. The time which belongs to the leaders of the people is the people's own and we should save it. I make a simple reckoning. Yesterday there must have been no less than four to five thousand people in the procession. At the rate of two hours each, some eight to ten thousand hours from people's time were wasted. If these many hours had been utilized at the spinning-wheel...this being on my mind at the present time, I can speak of nothing else...or on the loom, what an amount of work could have been turned out? Instead of wasting one's time thus, I think one would employ it to better purpose by sitting quietly in one's little cottage and thinking a few good thoughts. We shall be able to compete with America, Japan and Europe only if we learn the value of time.

Those among us who know about the triple fire blazing in our country should work to put it out. When a fire has broken out, we cannot afford to go looking for principles or formulating rules how to quench it; we fetch water and put it out and afterwards formulate rules for future guidance. Today, therefore, those zealous to serve, who have found the master-key to service, should apply themselves straight to work rather than go rousing idealism in the people. They ought to make work their first, second and last duty. Only after they have done their work, or while they are doing it, can they deliver their message convincingly.

I want to tell you do not repeat what you did last evening. The leaders of the people are their servants. If they have been attracted to service by the thought of processions, their service leaves something to be desired. One who is out to serve should expect no gifts and no burning of incense before him. Service rendered with an eye to such worship is no service at all and, if indeed the people must worship them, they should get properly trained for the purpose. They should know how to offer the worship. The leaders' feelings ought to be respected.

What is the triple fire I mentioned? First, starvation. The millionaires and multi-millionaires of Bombay are no true index of the conditions prevailing in India. We cannot adjudge India to be prosperous or otherwise on the basis of their condition. Assuredly, as long as the condition of the weavers and farmers in the seven and a half lakh villages in India is one of utter destitution, we cannot describe the country as prosperous. I see wide-spread starvation in it. Large numbers of people are obliged to live on no more than plain bread and salt and, perhaps, there are many to whom even that much is denied. The reason is the shortage of food in the country.

Another thing in short supply is cloth. My heart bleeds as I think of this shortage and I am sure I could make yours bleed, too, if I described it. So many men in India live with nothing on but a loin-cloth. It is no pain to those who live thus by choice. A great many, however, are obliged to live in that condition for want of clothes. Men can live in that way, but surely we would not wish that women should. But I have seen many of our sisters who are obliged to go about in such a state. I saw large numbers of men and women, in Champaran,

in the condition of Nala and Damayanti.¹ I have conversed with these people. They cannot even wash their clothes for want of another dress into which to change.² The Ganga flows near by. So there is no scarcity of water. But, having washed their garment, what should they put on [while it is drying]? If we go naked these days, it is for want of cloth.

The third kind of fire is a product of these two. India is plagued by countless diseases because of starvation and lack of clothes. But I have not come here to talk about this. If the first two were put out, the third would go out by itself. I, therefore, leave the subject aside. Even the first fire not everyone of us can work to put out. In order to work for overcoming the shortage of food, we must have in us the strength of the cultivator; we must have land and so many things besides. Everyone cannot have them. But, for quenching the second kind of fire, all of us have the necessary means. For that, all can work, even boys and girls. It is not as difficult to get that much cloth produced through women and children as it is to set up a mill. I have discussed the matter with so many mill-owners. They say it would take some fifty years to set up enough mills to produce cloth for the whole of India. But these very owners say that, if women started spinning and the weavers started weaving and did their best, within two or three years we would be in a position to produce our own cloth.

Even today there are places in India where women rich as well as poor spin with their own hands, get the yarn woven into cloth by weavers and wear it. In the Punjab, it is customary, on auspicious occasions like marriages, to wear dresses made out of yarn spun by oneself. Such cloth is supposed to be sacred. There are many such places in the country. Only, we do not know about them.

There is no difficulty at all in the way of our producing cloth sufficient to meet our needs. The only hurdle is our own sloth and inertia. The effort requires no money, only zeal and great love combined with knowledge.

As a weaver myself, I assert that, working on a handloom for eight hours daily, one can certainly earn a rupee. Does one get so much even after wearing oneself out in working for the matriculation

¹ The husband and the wife were obliged to share one single garment between them. The story is told in the *Mahabharata*.

² Gandhiji had this experience in a village near Bhitiharwa; *vide An Autobiography*, Part V, Ch. XVIII.

examination? I have seen graduates slaving for a salary of Rs. 30/- a month, and they rot thus even after their exhausting work for examinations. Surely, the weaver's lot is better than the graduate's.

It is not at all difficult to produce yarn if the countless women and lakhs of widows in India, feeling the presence of Rama and Krishna in their heart, make up their mind to work in their spare time.

I entreat India to follow this dharma at the present day.

[From Gujarati]

Navajivan, 26-10-1919

35. TELEGRAM TO P.S. TO VICEROY

AMRELI,

October 10, 1919

THE PRIVATE SECRETARY TO THE VICEROY

MOTHER ALI BROTHERS REPORTED SERIOUSLY ILL.
RESPECTFULLY TRUST BROTHERS WILL BE PERMITTED
VISIT MOTHER. I UNDERSTAND THEY HAVE ALREADY
APPROACHED HIS EXCELLENCY.¹

GANDHI

AHMEDABAD

N.A.I. Home : Political: January 1920: Nos. 493-502 B; also from a photostat : S. N. 19826

¹ Since the Ali Brothers, in detention at Rampur, had themselves not applied for parole, the Home Department considered no action was called for and no reply by Viceroy's Private Secretary to Gandhiji's telegram was necessary.

36. LETTER TO THE PRESS

THE ASHRAM,
SABARMATI,
October 10, 1919

TO
THE EDITOR
THE [BOMBAY] CHRONICLE

SIR,

The Khilafat Conference at Lucknow has decided to observe Friday next, the 17th instant, as a day of fasting and prayer. There can be no doubt about the intensity of Moslem feeling on this very important matter. There is no doubt also that the intentions of the league are distrusted. In one's darkest hour, God is the only refuge and it is to Him that millions of Moslems all over India are expected to turn for comfort, guidance and relief. Millions of mouths will, that day, ask the Almighty if it be His will to avert the impending doom. A true Moslem can no more contemplate with equanimity the dismemberment of Turkey than a Christian can so contemplate the desecration of what is dearest and nearest to him.

What are the Hindus to do? I feel that they could do no less than their Mohammedan brethren. Their fast and prayer will be the truest test of friendship and fellow-feeling. I hope that every Hindu, man and woman, will observe the 17th instant and thus put a sacred seal on the Hindu-Mohammedan bond.

There is also to be a hartal. It is intended to impress upon His Majesty's Ministers the seriousness of the position. But, in order to be impressive, it has to be absolutely peaceful and voluntary. Any exercise of force will make it thoroughly useless for the purpose for which it is intended. If the Mohammedans really feel, and if the Hindus are sincere in their professions of friendship, naturally they will both voluntarily stop work on the 17th. I have ventured tenderly to advise that, in view of past experience, there should be no processions, no meetings.¹ Everyone must remain indoors except

¹ *Vide* the following item.

volunteers and Mohammedans who will visit the Juma Masjid. Any breach of the peace will simply mar a most excellent cause. I have, therefore, further suggested that the mill-hands should in no way be encouraged to stop work, nor those who are engaged in the interests of the public health.

I venture to hope that the Government will rise to the occasion. Indeed, they could make common cause with the people and, thereby, tell His Majesty's Ministers that we consider the Khilafat question as a sacred trust which must not be betrayed. But whether the Government go so far or not, they can at least issue instructions to all the officials not to interfere either directly or indirectly with forthcoming peaceful demonstration.¹

I am

YOURS, ETC.
M. K. GANDHI

The Bombay Chronicle, 13-10-1919

¹ A statement released by the organizers of the Khilafat Day on the same day said: "Mahatma Gandhi advised that it is absolutely incumbent upon the Hindus to signify their sympathy with their Mohammedan brethren by joining with them in observing the 17th of October as a day of prayer and protest by closing their shops and suspending their business." According to the Bombay Secret Abstracts, 1919, 30,000 copies of the above text, issued as a manifesto, were prepared in the form of a handbill by the Satyagraha Sabha, but the period of fasting mentioned in it was 12 hours.

37. CIRCULAR LETTER¹

SABARMATI,
October 10, 1919

I hope you have seen my remarks in *Young India* of 4th October 1919 as also my public letter² regarding demonstration of the 17th. I think all non-Mohammedans should join the Mohammedans in fasting, prayer and hartal. Fasting and prayer I regard as a purely religious function and no part of demonstration. Hartal is intended to be purely a demonstration. It must be voluntary. Personally I do not care if only a few Hindus join, and I should be exceedingly sorry if any join out of fear be they ever so many. In order to avoid untoward consequences, I have suggested that there should be no processions, no meetings, people should keep indoors and that volunteers should parade business quarters in order to protect those who might wish to keep their shops open. Mill-hands should not be called out and those who may be required for sanitary and such other daily work should be specially advised not to stop work. I hope you will take what steps you may consider necessary to give effect to my proposal if you agree with me.

Yours sincerely,
M. K. GANDHI

From a photostat of the handwritten draft : S.N. 19827

¹ This was issued as "A Circular Letter of Instructions guiding public demonstration of 17th October", and was sent to the following persons: Rajagopalachari; Kasturi Ranga Ayengar; Natesan; Dr. Rajan, Trichinopoly; Joseph, Barrister, Madura; Harilal Gandhi, Calcutta; Satyanand Bose, Calcutta; Swami Shraddhanand; Pandit Motilal Nehru; Professor J.B. Kripalani, Allahabad; Rajendra Prasad; Brijkishore Babu; Jamshedji Mehta, Karachi; Durgadas Adwani, Karachi; Dr. Choithram Gidwani, Hyderabad (Sind); Krishnalal A. Desai, Delhi; Pandit Sundarlal, Allahabad; Jawaharlal Nehru, Barrister, Allahabad; Pandit Kunzru, Agra; Pandit B.D. Shukla, Jabalpur; C.F. Andrews, Lahore; V.A. Sundaram, Triplicane; Devdas Gandhi; G.S. Arundale; Gangadharrao Deshpande, Belgaum; Khadilkar, Kesari Office, Poona; S.V. Vaze, Servants of India Society, Poona; Gokaran Nath Mishra, Harkaran Nath Mishra, Lucknow. The letter was also released to the Press.

² *Vide* the preceding item.

38. TELEGRAM TO SADIQ ALI

[On or after *October 10, 1919*]

SADIQ ALI

RAMPORE

HAVE TELEGRAPHED SIMLA ABOUT PERMISSION BROTHERS.
PLEASE WIRE CONDITION.

GANDHI
AHMEDABAD

From a photostat of the handwritten draft : S.N. 19824

39. LETTER TO ABDUL BARI

[After *October 10, 1919*]

DEAR MAULANA SAHIB,

You will have seen my letters about the 17th instant.¹ I am hoping that all Hindus will join and that the demonstration will pass off in a most peaceful manner. In the peaceful passing off of the demonstration lies its possible success. I hope, therefore, that you will issue necessary public instructions, as also private, to the effect that those who take part in the demonstration will all remain indoors, and that those who go to the mosques will do so in a perfectly peaceful and prayerful manner.

Yours sincerely,

TIVANGI MAHAL

LUCKNOW

From a photostat of the handwritten draft : S.N. 19825

40. FASTING AND PRAYER

It is my conviction and my experience that, if fasting and prayer are done with a sincere heart and in a religious spirit, marvellous results could be obtained from them. There is nothing as purifying as a fast, but fasting without prayer is barren; it may result in a diseased person being restored to health or may only mean a healthy person

¹ *Vide* "Letter to the Press" and "Circular Letter", 10-10-1919.

suffering unnecessarily. A fast undertaken purely for ostentation or to inflict pain on others is an unmitigated sin. Hence, it is only a prayerful fast undertaken by way of penance to produce some effect on oneself which can be called a religious fast. Prayer does not mean begging God for worldly happiness or for the things which advance one's interests; it is the earnest cry of a soul in anguish. It cannot but influence the whole world and cannot but make itself heard in the divine court. When an individual or a nation suffers because of a great calamity, the true awareness of that suffering is prayer; in the presence of this purifying knowledge, physical functions like eating, etc., become less urgent. A mother suffers when her only son dies. She has no desire for eating. A nation is born when all feel the same sort of grief at the suffering of any one among them; such a nation deserves to be immortal. We are well aware that quite a large number of our brothers and sisters in India live in great suffering and so, truly speaking, we have occasion at every step for prayerful fasting. But our national life has not attained to this degree of intensity and purity. Even so, occasions arise when we suffer acutely.

Such an occasion has arisen for our Muslim brethren. Readers of *Navajivan* know what it is: if Turkey is partitioned, the Khilafat will disappear. If the Khilafat disappears, Islam will lose its vitality. This the Muslims can never tolerate. Supporting my view, the good Mr. Andrews said that, if the Muslims feel they have not received justice, then Mr. Montagu and His Excellency the Viceroy should resign. This remedy is essential, but external. A far, far more powerful remedy lies in the hands of our Muslim brethren themselves. It has been decided that on Friday, October 17, Muslims should observe a *roza*, that is, a fast of twenty-four hours; accordingly, beginning from the evening of the 16th, they should spend the whole of the 17th in prayers. This is a beautiful idea. The peace and the good that ensue from turning our thoughts to God in a time of sorrow are not to be had in any other way.

The duty of Hindus at such a time is obvious. If they regard the Muslims as their brethren, they should fully share their suffering. This is the best and the easiest method of promoting unity between Hindus and Muslims. Sharing another's sorrow is the only real sign of brotherly regard. I hope, therefore, that every man and woman in India will spend October 17 in prayer and fasting. The *Gita* is universally accepted among Hindus. They should read it through from the beginning to the end, along with a rendering of its meaning.

This way the whole day will be spent in a religious spirit, and that will be the prayer of the Hindus.

I think we may, without fear, observe a hartal on that day. Those who are independent should stop their work. People in service, the labourers and those who serve in hospitals, etc., need not stop work. If people remain within doors on the day and take out no processions, there will be no cause for fear. There can be no coercion in fasting and prayer; and this should also be true about stopping work. A hartal can be effective only if it is purely voluntary. Such a hartal alone can provide the true measure of the feelings of Hindus and Muslims. In order that the hartal may remain voluntary, those who are appointed volunteers may move about. It should be their duty to see that no one offers violence to, or exerts undue pressure on, those who open their shops or attend to their work.

If the Government is wise, it will encourage the people in this step. It is the duty of His Excellency the Viceroy, if he would demonstrate to the Muslims his sympathy for them, to instruct the officers not to come in the way of the people observing a hartal. If His Excellency can go further, he could stop work on that day and thereby assuage the people a great deal. Whether the Government does this or not, the duty of the people is clear. Hindus and Muslims should unite to observe October 17 in the manner suggested above.

[From Gujarati]

Navajivan, 12-10-1919

41. WIDOWS' OUTPOURING

Eleven sisters from Surat have written two letters, pouring out their suffering. They begin their letters with the words: "We are *Vaishnava*, *Vanik* widows, widowed in childhood." They have given their own names but concealed the names of their parents and their addresses. I am sorry that they have not given full particulars about themselves. The law governing newspapers requires that the editor should pay no attention to anonymous letters, and this law is necessary. It is the editor's duty, if a correspondent does not desire his name to be published, to respect it fully, but the writer must give his full name for the information of the editor. If this is not done, the editor, despite his keenness to help, cannot help as much as he otherwise could. In the case of these sisters themselves, I see that, if I

knew their names and addresses, I could inquire for more details and also find persons who would befriend them in their suffering. Notwithstanding the incompleteness of the letters in this and other respects, they mention some general things which all should know. Of these eleven sisters, three have had some education and eight are utterly illiterate. One of them can barely manage to read the *Navajivan* once in eight days. Members of the community shoo them away as ill-omened, and dub them "husband-devourers"; they have to live dependent on who knows that kind of men; by way of education, they have had nil, and they get little ghee and sugar in their food. There are forty-two *Vanik* communities in Surat, among which there must be not less than 700 widows. No one knows what dharma is.

We know our dharma, but are denied the means which may enable us to preserve it. If we are maintained in some Ashram and given some education, taught how to serve, we are ready to follow the widow's dharma. In the absence of this, we are exposed to so many temptations that we feel it necessary for us to have a husband's intimate company. . . . When the path of knowledge declined, Vallabh¹ propagated the path of *bhakti*. With the passing of time, customs have changed. This should happen in regard to widows too.

There is much more than this in their letters. They also describe how widows come to lose their virtue. I have tried to give, mostly in my own words, the gist of what I could from the two letters. The question of widows is no ordinary problem for the Hindu society. There will hardly be any Hindu family which does not have the responsibility of maintaining a widow. The reformers have recommended a one-side solution. Remarriage is the only solution, they say. To me, that idea appears terrible. I read profound meaning in widowhood; equally, I also see how it can be turned to good account. Would it not be better if men, too, refused to marry again on becoming widowers? Nowhere, though, do we see any agitation to this end. And yet, how can this idea, even if implemented, end the sufferings of child-widows? Even if thousands of widowers should refuse of their own free will to marry again, how does that help the young girl who has to live a life of enforced widowhood? Can there be dharma in forcibly preventing a widow from remarrying? Can

¹ Vaishnava teacher (1473-1531); principally responsible for spreading the *bhakti* cult in Gujarat

purity be expected of widows without placing them in conditions in which they could live a life of illustrious widowhood?

These complex problems are not easy to solve. There is an element of truth on either side. Without entering into argument I wish to place before the Hindu society the following conclusions:

1. The attempt to end the practice of widowhood is injurious to religion.

2. Marriage is a sacrament. Love can marry only once.

3. A widow deserves to be looked upon with reverence.

It is a sin to despise her. The sight of a pure widow is a good omen. It is a sin to count it as an ill omen.

4. If marriage is, or is considered to be, a sacrament, and if it is a symbol of pure love, then marrying children and ill-matched partners must be considered a sin. If it is not wrong for a man of fifty to marry a girl of nine, and if such a man is not excommunicated, then it is also a sin to excommunicate or otherwise punish that girl if, becoming a widow, she marries again.

There is no room for coercion in the matter of dharma. And therefore, my advice to the *Vaishnava* and other Hindu families regarding child-widows in Surat is that they should think out a plan to keep to minds and bodies of the widows occupied and save them from temptations, and put the plan into action. Even so, if it is important that a child-widow should not be induced to remarry, it is equally important that, should such a widow want to remarry, she should not be prevented from doing so. To live a widow's life is a holy thing, but it is not entirely sinful for a widow to remarry. If the various communities would live so as to bring credit to *varnashrama*, if they do not want it to disappear, they will have to eliminate the innumerable evils that have arisen in it and see that the problems which arise in practice are solved with due regard for dharma. To the widows, therefore, I would say: "Look upon your widowhood as sacred and live a life worthy of it. There are many instances of such widows in Hindu society." To people of the various communities I would say: "If any child-widows want to remarry, do not despise or outcast them."

[From Gujarati]

Navajivan, 12-10-1919

42. NOTES

EXEMPTION FROM SECURITY

The reader probably remembers that, when *Navajivan* was turned into a weekly, a security of five hundred rupees was ordered. We have also told him of the cloud that subsequently gathered over us and dispersed.¹ The management realized that a paper like *Navajivan*, in printing which one must be prepared for risks and copies of which should be made available to the public regularly and in large numbers, could be printed unhindered only in its own printing-press; that is, only in this way can its external difficulties be reduced to a minimum. And so Mr. Shankerlal Ghelabhai Banker, who shoulders the financial responsibility, has purchased the Manahar Press and it will henceforth be known as "Navajivan Mudranalaya". Moreover, it was felt to be a difficult arrangement under which *Young India*, for which the editor of *Navajivan* is responsible, was published in Bombay while the latter was published in Ahmedabad. It was, therefore, decided to publish *Young India*, too, in Ahmedabad. This made it necessary to make declarations in respect of *Young India*, *Navajivan* and the Navajivan Press. These declarations were made before the Magistrate in Ahmedabad. He decided not to ask for security from either of the papers or from the Press. We congratulate the District Magistrate on this decision of his. So long as the sword of the unjust provisions in the Press Act continues to flash over Indian newspapers, we can feel or express no joy at *Young India* and *Navajivan* having been exempted from security. A security cannot place any kind of check on our pen. Exemption from it does not increase by one jot our freedom from inhibition; it increases our responsibility a little, lest we express, knowingly or unknowingly, views which may once again make them think that we deserved being called upon to furnish a security. No matter whether our responsibility has increased or decreased, we will strive hard to place before the public our views with politeness and restraint, but without fear.

¹ Vide "Notes", 5-10-1919.

"YOU CANNOT UNDERSTAND OUR DIFFICULTIES"

The Hon'ble Mr. Sachchidanada Sinha, the well-known journalist¹ of Bihar and member of the Imperial Legislative Council, while speaking on the Indemnity Bill made some mistake. Sir George Lowndes tried to correct him. His Excellency the Viceroy observed that it was a slip. But the Hon'ble Mr. Sinha replied: "You can have no idea of the difficulty we experience in speaking in a foreign tongue. We commit mistakes again and again." These words are worthy of Mr. Sinha. Obligated to speak in a foreign tongue, even the ablest members find themselves in difficulties and time and again we are worsted when it comes to returning a quick retort. This happens not because our case is weak or our knowledge is less but because we have to speak in a foreign language. Every Indian who has been to England knows how even those among them who are proficient in English fumble when speaking it in English families of even ordinary education and often become the butt of ridicule. Prof. Jadunath Sircar has shown that having to think and speak in English imposes a heavy burden on the educated class, so heavy, indeed, that it has lost its vigour and is ailing. Justice Ranade, likewise, pointed out several years ago that many of them came to an untimely end and they possessed little inventive power. Sooner or later we shall have to find a remedy for this painful situation, and the sooner the better. The business of provincial legislatures should be conducted in their respective languages and that of the Imperial Legislative Council in the national language, namely, Hindustani. The movement should start with the sessions of the Congress and various conferences. If the former would take its message to the millions, it can never do so through English but only through Hindustani.

FINE ON BAREJADI

We give elsewhere the petition presented by the people of Barejadi against the order of the Government for the collection of Rs. 7,200 on account of the additional police stationed there. The petition, it is evident, was not drafted by a lawyer. The petitioners have not advanced any logical arguments but have expressed their feelings in such language as they knew. We congratulate the people of Barejadi on what they have done. We think it is a valuable petition; and this is the way men and women who suffer can always make their protests

¹ He was editor of the *Hindustan Review*, a monthly magazine of Patna.

heard by the Government and the public. Such work does not require the services of lawyers of experienced draftsmen. No one can put the suffering of a man pricked by a thorn in stronger language than the man himself. Only, we must take care to give facts as they are and not to exaggerate. Where is the need to embellish truth?

Barejadi's case is straight. The issues raised are brief and to the point.

We are not guilty; we have suffered from two famines; we are hardly in a position to pay the Government's assessment. The posting of additional police at our place is unnecessary and hence we should not be burdened with [the fine of] Rs. 7,200. The Government is welcome to inquire into our conduct.

This is simple justice. While discussing the position at Nadiad, we wrote about Barejadi too.¹ Nothing more is necessary. We hope that the Government will pay full attention to the petitioners' representation and that non-official members of the Legislative Council from Gujarat and other areas will take up the matter and secure justice for the innocent landowners.

PETITION AGAINST ROWLATT ACT

We draw the readers' attention to the petition published by the All-India Home Rule League. It states the chief objections against the Rowlatt Act, the most important being that it is unanimously condemned by the people. To retain that Act after all the popular agitation against it and the suffering of the people in the course of that agitation will be a blow to the self-respect of the people and make the Government's autocratic attitude almost intolerable. Every Indian living in British India can sign it and we hope every adult man and woman will do so and forward the petition to the Home rule League, Bombay.

[From Gujarati]

Navajivan, 12-10-1919

¹ He was editor of the *Hindustan Review*, a monthly magazine of Patna.

43. TELEGRAM TO C.F. ANDREWS

AHMEDABAD,
October 13, 1919

C.F. ANDREWS
FEROZEPORE ROAD
LAHORE

JUST RETURNED FROM KATHIAWAR. WON'T BE TOO LATE
IF YOU START MIDDLE NOVEMBER EVEN LATER.¹

Bombay Government Records

GANDHI

44. SPEECH AT GUJARAT COLLEGE, AHMEDABAD²

[October 13, 1919]

MR. CHAIRMAN, SISTERS AND BROTHERS,

The English ladies and gentlemen present here will excuse me for speaking to you in your own language. It is difficult for me to say anything about Anandshankarbhair. I do not like to express my love for him, and he would not like my doing so either. I think it is my duty, all the same, to say something. In the address which the students presented to him they said: "Though you have been before us and with us all these years, we did not know you." These words state the truth. From the day that I settled in Gujarat, I have seen that we have failed to recognize him for what he is and to appreciate him at his true worth. Though, of course, he has lost nothing in consequence, Gujarat has lost a great deal. As for his learning, men who know more than I do can testify to it. To me his character, his bearing and his way of living are his true learning.

Anandshankarbhair is a priceless treasure of Gujarat. We have not availed ourselves of this treasure as well as we should have. Thanks

¹ Andrews proposed to visit East Africa to study the situation there. He replied from Gujranwala on October 17 : "Delighted come both immediately starting South Africa. Have wired Jehangir Petit."

² Gandhiji spoke at a farewell function in honour of Prof. Anandshankar Dhruva who was leaving the College on his appointment as Vice-Chancellor of Banaras Hindu University.

to his ability, informed with a liberal spirit, his intelligence and tact, he has succeeded in solving many a knotty problem. I have read, and still read, his writings and I feel that we have much to learn from him. How much Gujarat would have gone forward if it had profited fully by his writings, I cannot measure. Anandshankarbhai is Gujarat's gift to India. I would have envied Bombay if he had chosen to migrate there. It is better that he stayed in Ahmedabad than go away to Bombay. No doubt, Bombay would have learnt more from him, but Bombay is Gujarat and Gujarat is Bombay.

By sending Anandshankarbhai to Kashi, Gujarat is making an invaluable present to India. We cannot be proud enough of the profit India will derive from this gift. We cannot say, as we may of an Englishman, that he is in the prime of his life. His family has made great sacrifices.

Panditji¹ did not cast his eye on Anandshankarbhai merely because of his learning; he has selected him to manage the affairs there and to show whether or not Indians possess organizing capacity and administrative ability. If there is any person in India who can solve the all-too-delicate problems in the Banaras Hindu University, it is Anandshankarbhai. And it is my prayer, finally, that God may grant him a long life, that the University may attain the height it ought to and that India and Gujarat may duly profit from this.

From a handwritten Gujarati report : S.N. 6414

45. A PUNJAB VICTIM

Behari Lal Sachdeva is a young man of twenty-four with a young wife and an aged father of seventy-two years old. He belongs to the Gujranwala batch and was sentenced to transportation with forfeiture of property. He had "waged war against the King". So said the prosecution and so found the Court. His honour the Lieut-Governor has commuted the sentence to that of four years' imprisonment. Poor comfort to a prisoner who is innocent or to his father who is on the verge of death.

And so poor Behari Lal Sachdeva has sent another petition as "he believes that through some serious mistake his case has not been carefully gone into". The petition is convincing enough. It is so well

¹ Madan Mohan Malaviya

drawn that it will repay perusal. It is almost free from rhetoric or superfluous adjectives and is brief enough even for a busy reader.¹

A friend told me the other day that, after forty years of life devoted to the praising of British justice, the Punjab had undeceived him. He no longer believed in British Justice. He added with distinct energy:

I do not care straw for your reforms; what can they do for us if our lives and our honour be not safe and we stand in peril of being wrongly imprisoned?

Well, the case of Behari Lal Sachdeva seems to be one such. It is probably one of mistaken identity. The young man would appear to be perfectly innocent. The prisoner is not stated to have been connected with or present at the meeting on the 4th and the 5th April or on the 12th or the 13th April. The principal witness's evidence is merely hearsay. The other evidence is stated to be tainted, and even if true, the facts sworn to do not disclose any offence. The evidence given for the prisoner by respectable and impartial witnesses was discarded by the Court. The reader has by this time known sufficient of the Punjab judgments not to feel surprised at such attitude of the special courts. What is, however, surprising is the fact that even now when perfect quiet reigns in the Punjab these cases of injustice do not receive the attention they deserve at the hands of the Lieut.-Governor. No government deserves respect which holds cheap the liberty of the subjects as the Punjab Government seems to do.

Young India, 15-10-1919

46 LETTER TO THE PRESS²

[BOMBAY,]

Khilafat Day [October 17, 1919]

SIR,

The following order was served upon me yesterday:

Whereas under Rule 3 of the Defence of India (Consolidated) Rules, 1915 and with the previous sanction of the Governor-General-in-Council, the Lieut. Governor of the Punjab was pleased on the 9th April, 1919, to prohibit the entry of Mohandas Karamchand Gandhi into the Punjab and was further pleased to order him to return to and reside within the limits of the Bombay Presidency;

¹ The petition was reproduced in the same issue of *Young India*.

² This was published in several leading newspapers.

And whereas the necessity for this order has ceased to exist;

Now therefore the Lieut.-Governor is pleased with the sanction of the Governor-General hereby to cancel the said order with effect from this day, the 15th Oct. 1919.¹

I am naturally thankful for it in that it enables me to visit the Punjab and to render such service as I may be capable of rendering. At the same time, I cannot help saying that it was not with unmixed pleasure that I received the release order. The order of internment and externment was no discredit to me; my conscience was absolutely clear. When it was served upon me, it appeared to me to be an act of criminal folly on the part of the Government. And now, though the release order is creditable to Government, it cannot recall the precious lives for whose loss the prohibitory order must be held responsible. Moreover, so long as the Rowlatt Act remains on the statute-book, the release order can be no joy for me. In the internment order I had a ready-made weapon for offering civil resistance. I hear people saying that satyagraha is as dead as Queen Anne,² and that Mr. Montagu will never repeal the Rowlatt Act, although he is quite sure that the act will never be enforced. Those who make the first statement do not know what satyagraha is and how it works. Those who make the second do not know the power of satyagraha. He who make the second do not know the power of satyagraha. He who runs may see that satyagraha is slowly but surely pervading the land. So far as Mr. Montagu's

¹ The removal of restriction on Gandhiji was, in fact, being seriously considered as early as September. A confidential telegram (No. 1917, Home Department) of the Government of India, dated September 8, observed: "Conditions are now comparatively normal and there seems no immediate intention on his part of advocating civil disobedience. In view of His Excellency's opening speech in the Imperial Legislative Council, the Government of India think that a suitable opportunity now presents itself to relax the existing orders and that there is not sufficient ground for maintaining the restrictions on him and they propose that, when Lord Hunter lands in India, all restrictions should be relaxed."

² This reflected the official reading of the situation. The Bombay Government wrote on September 12, in a confidential note to the Chief Secretary, Madras Government: "His Excellency-in-Council considers that Gandhi's satyagraha movement may, for the present, be regarded as extinct. Even in Gujarat, which is Gandhi's headquarters and where the movement originated, the local organization have fallen to pieces. It is doubtful whether Gandhi, even if he so desired, could revive the movement with anything like its former vigour. Gandhi's own declared attitude is that the movement is, so far as civil disobedience is concerned, suspended *sine die*."

supposed declaration is concerned, the strongest man of South Africa had to yield to that matchless force. It was in 1909 that General Smuts, backed by Gen. Botha and the European opinion of South Africa, said that, although the Transvaal Asiatic Act would not be enforced, he would never formally repeal it, but in 1914 he proved his strength by repealing that Act and removing the legal racial bar from the Immigration Law. I have not the slightest doubt that Mr. Montagu and the Viceroy will yield to the same ancient force and repeal the Rowlatt Act long before the expiry of its time limit. But whether they do or not the lives of the satyagrahis are dedicated to securing among other things the repeal of that Act.

I am, etc.,

M. K. GANDHI

The Bombay Chronicle, 18-10-1919

47. LETTER TO H.S.L. AND MILLIE GRAHAM POLAK

M.K. GANDHI

*Khilafat Day, October 17 [1919]*¹

MY DEAR HENRY AND MILLIE,

You have both blessed me with your letters. I thank you. I know that Henry did what was the right thing about 'India'. We have only one taskmaster to please and that is conscience.

Henry may not agree with me on the Khilafat question.² I am content to differ. If I had the time, I would argue it out.

I was sorry to hear about Millie's health. She must take rest. She has too vivid an imagination to take complete rest anywhere. Merely bodily rest is not enough. However, that at least must be given to her.

I am glad you are there to look after Jamnadas and his wife. The orders against me have been repealed³ and I am presently going to the Punjab.

With love,

Yours,

BHAI

From the original : Gandhi-Polak Correspondence. Courtesy : National Archives of India

¹ From the contents

² Vide "Father of the World [—IV]", 2-11-1919 and "Notes", 2-11-1919

³ Vide "Letter to the Press", 17-10-1919

48. LETTER TO RABINDRANATH TAGORE

THE ASHRAM,
SABARMATI,
October 18, 1919

DEAR GURUDEV,

There is to be a literary conference in Ahmedabad in December.¹ The dates are 13th, 14th and 15th Dec. The organizers are most anxious that you should grace the occasion by your presence that I hope that if you could at all manage it, you will not disappoint Gujarat.

It was good of you to have permitted Andrews to go to South Africa. I have just received a telegram from him saying he is free to go. This relieves me considerably and I am sure that his going there will do the utmost good.

I hope that you are keeping good health.

Your sincerely,
M. K. GANDHI

From a photostat of the handwritten original : G.N. 4625

49. LETTER TO U. K. TRIVEDI²

[After October 18, 1919]

DEAR SIR,

I have your letter³.

I suggest the enclosed cable⁴ to Johannesburg. I suggest further that you should address the Commerce and Industry Department drawing attention to the fact that the whole question of disabilities regarding ownership of land and right to trade shall be sifted. The matter is rather delicate. It would be useless to press for opening the whole question, political and commercial, throughout South Africa.

¹ This was later postponed to suit Tagore's convenience.

² Assistant Secretary, Imperial Citizenship Association

³ This was dated October 18. Enclosed with it was Aswat's cable from South Africa seeking Gandhiji's advice.

⁴ This is not available.

As Mr. Shastriar is almost certain to be appointed there is no anxiety regarding commission.

Yours faithfully,

From the pencilled draft in Gandhiji's hand : S. N. 6484

50. FATHER OF THE WORLD [-III]

I have promised to give some of my experiences in connection with village uplift. Dr. Hariprasad, describing how Sister Nivedita improved a lane in Calcutta, has illustrated by this example what one man or woman can do if he or she so wills. To do this sort of work in villages is even easier than improving lanes in a city. When it was decided to open self-sufficient schools in Champaran,¹ I appealed for volunteers. Among those who arrived were the late Dr. Dev and Mr. Soman, a lawyer from Belgaum. These volunteers had to perform only three tasks...teach any boys and girls who came, show the villagers how to maintain cleanliness in the streets, in the village and their homes, etc., and give medicine to any patients who might come for it. Mr. Soman was sent to a village called Bhitiharva and Dr. Dev was to organize medical aid in villages having schools. He happened to stay for a longer period at the school in Bhitiharva. It was very difficult to induce the people there to effect any improvements. Dr. Dev showed them that improvements were necessary. But the villagers paid no attention to him. His proposal was about cleaning the streets and constructing a sloping platform round the well and removing the mud from around it. Dr. Dev and Mr. Soman then took pickaxes in their hands and began to make a sloping platform round the well and to clean the streets. The news spread like wildfire through the tiny village and the villagers understood Dr. Dev's advice. His action were more potent than his words. The villagers then sallied forth themselves to do the cleaning and very soon the well and streets of Bhitiharva took on an attractive appearance. Rubbish heaps disappeared. Meanwhile, the thatched school-house which had been erected was burnt down by some miscreants. This posed a serious problem. Should a similar construction be put up and a fire risked again? Mr. Soman and Dr. Dev decided to put up a brick structure for the school. By now both of them had learnt the art of public speaking. They begged for the requisite materials. When necessary they supplied

¹ Vide "Letter to J.I. Merriman", 22-11-1917.

money themselves and both began to work as labourers. By the time they had completed the foundation for a durable school building, the villagers joined them. Artisans gave all possible assistance, and even today the Bhitiharva school stands there as an example of what can be achieved if one or two individuals make up their mind to do a thing. This sort of work was done not only in one village but to a greater or less extent in every place where a school was established and everywhere the villagers' response was in proportion to the teacher's capacity to inspire co-operation. The service did not demand any great intelligence. What was needed was ardour and perseverance. Intelligence and skill were available from others.

In the Kheda district, the crop had to be valued. This could not be done unless all the villagers co-operated. Volunteers were detailed, one for each village, to collect the information; they not only succeeded in doing so but also won the affection of the villagers. I can multiply such examples from many other places.

Now we can see how a start may be made by one who wants to organize a village properly. He should select the place where he himself lives. He should get acquainted with all the other residents and share in their tribulations without making a show of any kind. He would then appeal for their help in cleaning the lanes. The worker would bear the neighbour's ridicule and insults and continue, in spite of them, to share in their suffering and would clean the streets single-handed. His wife, mother and sister should, by and by, join in this work. Whether the neighbours join or not, the road would be cleaned and experience would show that this does not require much time. At last the neighbours would start working themselves and the fragrance of one lane would sweeten the entire village.

If this volunteer has further enthusiasm and is himself an educated man, he would teach boys and unlettered adults in his street to read and write. If anyone in the street falls ill and is unable to take medical treatment, the worker would find a good *vaid* for him. If there is no one to look after the patient, he would do so himself. While doing these things he would get an intimate knowledge of the economic and moral condition of his neighbours. Having obtained this knowledge, he would plan how to bring about the desired improvement in them. Working on in this manner he would gradually get an insight into the political inclination of his neighbours and through them of the entire village. If, along with this insight, he also

develops the capacity to evoke co-operation in the people, he could improve their political condition as well. I have seen in Africa, Champaran, Kheda and elsewhere that those whom we regard as uneducated have, by dint of sheer perseverance and sympathy, been able to do great service and also make a fine impact on the public. In every village where I found even one zealous man or woman, I have also discovered that he or she was doing excellent work in that village.

We shall examine next certain rules of cleanliness and of physical, moral, and economic health. I hope that those who approve of them will start work on those lines in their respective villages. If this happens, we shall be able to produce a powerful effect on the condition of some villages in a very short time.

[From Gujarati]

Navajivan, 19-10-1919

51. GUJARAT'S GIFT

The friends of Prof. Anandshankar Bapubhai Dhruva knew for some time that this jewel from Gujarat was joining the Banaras University, ending his 27 years' connection with the Gujarat College. The thing became public at two functions held during this week, one under the auspices of the Sahitya Sabha and the other organized by the students of Gujarat College. At the second function, the Principal of the College was in the chair. Addresses were presented to Prof. Dhruva at both these functions. By honouring him in this way, Gujaratis have honoured themselves.

We come across very few Indians who combine learning and dharma in the measure in which Prof. Dhruva does. He has not taken to the profession of teaching with a mercenary motive. I believe he became a professor because he thought that thereby he would be able to serve the country better. As an author, he has maintained his integrity with the utmost conscientiousness. It is no ordinary responsibility which rests on an author, and that of one who would dive into the sea of ancient literature to bring up pearls is all the greater. Sanskrit literature is like a sea, difficult to fathom. Very few possess even a cursory knowledge of this literature. It offers much scope for laziness and dishonesty. We see at every step instances of this in our modern literature. How many translations of the *Bhagavad Gita* do we have! It is difficult to be pleased with any of them. The translations of Manusmṛiti at the disposal of the people of Gujarat are

not entirely reliable. Thanks to laziness, ignorance and sometimes deliberate mischief, people get faulty and incomplete translations of Sanskrit works. At a time like this, everything which Anandshankarbhai has given stands like a beacon. With regard to his interpretations, it is impossible to suspect dishonesty, ignorance, haste or laziness. He has written whatever he has in a liberal and objective spirit believing in all good faith that it is true. And, therefore, people need have no fear in accepting it.

Moreover, those who have come into contact with him have observed in his personal life the same qualities of character which he has shown in his public actions and in public life. By the force of his character, he has been able to maintain his influence both on the old and the new generations. Though duly respecting old ideas, the ancient way of life and ancient traditions, he has never sought to check the waves of modern life and its enthusiasms. Rather, he has tried to correct the excesses of both. Gujarat has not till now made full use of Prof. Dhruva's services, as was stated in the address presented by the students. We have not freely availed ourselves of the treasure he possesses. We have not recognized his full worth.

He is now entering a larger field. The Banaras University is but an infant. Its father is the celebrated Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya, known all over India, who looks like the patriarch of Hinduism and is endowed with qualities of character signified by his name. By the tireless efforts of one person, an amount of one crore has been collected. The University owes its existence to the labours of this one man. His child has however not learnt to walk. It can only move about on its knees. It needs someone to look after it. Panditji was on the look-out for such a person. There are all kinds of difficulties in running a university; besides, a university which seeks to give its due place to religion is bound to be in the utmost need of men of religion. Gujarat can be proud that Panditji found such a man here. The university will provide full scope to Anandshankarbhai's intelligence, his earnestness, his integrity, his straightforwardness, his large-heartedness and his imperturbable temper. We congratulate Gujarat on making this incomparable gift and the university on receiving it, and we are confident that Anandshankarbhai will render excellent services to India in this wider field. We pray to God to grant him a long life and all the strength which he will need in this difficult task.

[From Gujarati]

Navajivan, 19-10-1919

52. NOTES

FOOLISH EXPENDITURE

We draw our readers' attention to Shri Gopalji's letter. The custom of sending a card for the New Year's Day has no meaning whatever and involves an unnecessary expenditure besides. Shri Gopalji's point is that, instead of wasting money in this way, we should donate the amount to the Punjab Relief Fund. If all of us do what he and his friends have done, we shall have shared the sufferings of the Punjab at no cost to ourselves.

Is it an old custom to get New Year cards printed and send them? We do not know if it is. We do not say either that we should not introduce new customs or that everything old is good. We should think before giving up anything old. It is wise not to be hasty in introducing a new custom. The practice of sending cards has come from Europe. Had we not been blinded by Europe, we would not have adopted this practice of sending cards and friends would have taken no pleasure in receiving them. The practice is something like the prayer-circles in Tibet. Some people there want to repeat a prayer or *jai* lakhs of times over but, unable to spare so much time, keep wheels and count the number of its rotations as so many repetitions of the prayer.

In the same manner, we offer our greetings to friends through cards, at no trouble to ourselves. To us this seems to be a barbarous custom. It is understandable that we write letters specially to people whom we would remember. Sending a card has become so common a practice that it can have no value. Maybe sending the same type of card to one's father, brothers, sisters, wife, friend is treated as a sign of equal regard for all; to us it appears an insult to them all. Hence we altogether disapprove of the practice of sending cards. Be that as it may, the alternative to sending cards, suggested on the present occasion, deserves to be welcomed.

[From Gujarati]

Navajivan, 19-10-1919

53. TELEGRAM TO MATHURADAS TRIKUMJI

AHMEDABAD,
October 21, 1919

MATHURADAS
247 BAZAR GATE STREET
BOMBAY

START PUNJAB MAIL TOMORROW. WILL JOIN YOU
NAVSARI. BOOK AS FROM NAVSARI.

GANDHI

From the original: Pyarelal Papers. Nehru Memorial Museum and Library.
Courtesy: Beladevi Nayyar and Dr. Sushila Nayyar

54. TELEGRAM TO MATHURADAS TRIKUMJI

AHMEDABAD,
October 21, 1919

MATHURADAS TRIKUMJI
247 BAZAR GATE ST.
BOMBAY

NOT GOING NAVSARI. TAKING PUNJAB MAIL TO-
MORROW BARODA. ENGAGE AS FROM BARODA. BUYING
TICKET HERE. YOU MAY JOIN LATER.

BAPU

From the original: Pyarelal Papers. Nehru Memorial museum and Library.
Courtesy: Beladevi Nayyar and Dr. Sushila Nayyar

55. LETTER TO WATTAL

[AHMEDABAD,
Before *October 22, 1919*]¹

DEAR MR. WATTAL,

You will pardon me for some delay in replying to your letter, which was received in Bombay. I wanted on my return from Bombay to search my papers, to see what I could find. You have asked me for papers regarding an event that happened nearly 18 years ago. I have searched my old files and I have not succeeded in getting all you want. You will, however, have some idea of the impression created in S. Africa by the action of the Indian Community at the time of the Boer War. Mr. Escombe, who addressed us, was sometime Premier of Natal and commander of the Natal militia, and so was the late Sir John Robinson, Premier at another time. I give you these references, because you will find these names in the papers² I am sending you. We were present at the battle of Colenso, Spion Kop and the action at Vaalkranz. We had to carry the wounded on our stretchers a distance of about 20 miles, feed and nurse them on the way. I was mentioned in Gen. Buller's Despatch, on the relief of Ladysmith. The leaders of the Corps were recipients of the South African War Medal. In Ladysmith itself, an indentured Indian named Ganga Singh³ sat perched up in a tree facing the hill from which the Boers were shelling Ladysmith with their pom-pom. He watched the flash of the gun each time it was fired, and rang a gong, informing the besieged of the coming shell, and warning them to seek shelter. He performed his dangerous and onerous task with unfailing regularity, and for this brave and faithful service Lord Curzon sent him a toga, which was publicly presented to him, on Lord Curzon's behalf, by the Mayor of Durban at the Durban Town Hall.

I am sorry I have not been able to trace the verses referred to in your letter. I am asking my friends in Durban to send them. At the

¹ The letter appears to have been written from Ahmedabad. The exact date is not known. It is, however, likely that this and the following item were written some time before October 22, 1919, after which Gandhiji was away in the Punjab for the rest of the year.

² These are not available.

³ This should be Prabhu Singh; *vide* "Letter to Dadabhai Naoroji", 8-10-1900

time of the Boer War, we were over 1,000 strong. So much for the Boer War.

In 1906, there was the Zulu rebellion. At that time also we offered our services. They required only a small number. We were about 20 strong, a compact body of the Nurse, Orderly and Stretcher-bearers. We had to carry the wounded many miles at a time and march behind the cavalry sometimes at the rate of 40 miles per day. At this time there was no restriction as to the zone of fire. This little party took all the risks of war. A personal letter eulogizing the services of the Corps was addressed by the then Governor of Natal, Sir Henry MacCullum.

And then there was the European War. Indians formed a corps. I forget the number that served in East Africa directly under General Smuts, and I hear from one of the friends in S.A., who was a member of the Corps, that they gave entire satisfaction to their officer. If any further information is required, please let me know. After perusal, will you kindly return the papers punctually?

Yours sincerely,

WATTAL

PRIVATE SECRETARY

BIKANER

From a photostat of the handwritten draft : S. N. 6853

56. LETTER TO A FRIEND

[Before *October 22, 1919*]

DEAR FRIEND,

I have your letter. There was no occasion for apology. If I understand you correctly, you wish that I had brought the Viceroy under the pillory. If you do, I assure you that if you read my articles you will see that I have done so. Indeed I have suggested that the under-officials should be left severely alone¹. Our business is to impale the V[iceroy] and the G[overnor]. I cannot subscribe to the charge that I hide the truth, either out of consideration or goodwill or goodwill or desire for co-operation. All these three in my case are conditioned by truthfulness. And if I have appeared to friends to have

¹ *Vide* "The Indemnity Bill", 20-9-1919.

failed, it has never been a conscious lapse. I have not joined the cry for recall of the V[iceroy], because I never direct my shafts aimlessly. I am not so much concerned with the recall of a V[iceroy] as with securing justice. I know the exquisite story of the Prophet related by you and in my very humble manner I have indeed endeavoured to imitate his staunchness be it ever so imperfectly. You do yourself and me a wrong by thinking that I have yielded to any threat in suspending C[ivil] D[isobedience]. I suspended it in obedience to the canons of satyagraha as I know it. And you have, I feel, blundered because I think you have not yet assimilated the principles of satyagraha. A satyagrahi is the strongest when he appears to the outsider to have weakened. I suspended [it] because I have thereby accelerated the repeal of the R[owlatt] A[ct], that Act has to be removed from the S[tatute] B[ook]. Its mere suspension will not satisfy me. I shall pay for its removal with my life if need be, for, I repeat, satyagraha is the very breath of my nostrils. And you may be assured that no matter what activities I might be indulging in for the moment, the question of repeal of the R[owlatt] A[ct] is ever present with me. I am glad you are interesting yourself in swadeshi. I am sorry to gather that you have rather an unhappy time at a B[omba]y stores. You can have all the cloth you need at the S[wadeshi] Bhandar at the cheapest rate. The address is. . . .

If there is any difficulty, you will write to me. Do please send me the two Urdu papers in exchange for Y[oung] I[ndia].

Imam Saheb Bawazeer who is living with me will read them occasionally to me. I am opposed to advertisements because they are so untrue. Every decent paper should, free of charge, advertise books which it considers the public should read. It is, in my opinion, one of the necessary functions of a N[ews] p[aper]. I feel too that we should have a general advertising agency which for a payment will advertise all useful things. But I abhor the idea of a newspaper making money out of advertisements. It is a fraud on the public. I hope to leave for the Punjab next week. If I am not required in the P[unja]b during the whole of Nov[ember], you will certainly find me either at Bombay or at Ah[me]d[abad]. I shall be delighted to meet you again and exchange views. I need hardly assure you that I value your frankness and independent spirit. I think this answers your letter in full.

Yours sincerely,

From a photostat of the handwritten draft : S. N. 11706

57. *THE SATYAGRAHI LAWYERS*¹

The judgment² of the High Court in the case of the Satyagrahi lawyers is, to say the least, highly unsatisfactory. It has shirked the issue. The logical outcome of the judgment should have been punishment and not a postponement of it. The lawyers in question had shown no repentance. So far as the public know, they will be ready to offer civil disobedience should the occasion arise. The issue having been raised, the lawyers did not ask for mercy but a clear decision. As it is, they do not know where they are.

The learned Judges have laid down principles of legal conduct which, in our humble opinion, are open to question. For instance, what is the meaning of "those who live by the law must keep the law"? If it means that no lawyer may ever commit a civil breach without incurring the displeasure of the Court, it means utter stagnation. Lawyers are the persons most able to appreciate the dangers of bad legislation and it must be with them a sacred duty by committing civil breach to prevent a criminal breach. Lawyers should be guardians of law and liberty and as such are interested in keeping the statute-book of the country 'pure and undefiled'. But the Judges of the Bombay High Court have presented to them a mercenary view of their profession and have even confounded the functions of judges and lawyers. The only escape from the intolerable situation created by the

¹ This appeared among the "Notes".

² This was reproduced in the same issue, and read as follows: "Separate but concurring judgments were delivered by the Chief Justice and Justices Heaton and Kajiji of the Bombay High Court in the case of the satyagrahi lawyers of Ahmedabad on 15th October, 1919. In summing up, the Chief Justice in his judgment said: 'I wish to make it perfectly clear that, apart from any other considerations, those who are enrolled as advocates or pleaders of this High Court or of the District Courts cannot serve two masters. It may be that after due consideration of this expression of our opinion, the respondents may see the force of it. We have no desire to deal harshly with them and for the present we shall content ourselves with giving them the warning. We do so because we are told that the Satyagraha Sabha since the riots of April has been quiescent. Whether we shall take any further action depends entirely on the development, if any, of the satyagraha movement, so that these notices will be adjourned with leave to the Advocate-General and the respondents to move for their restoration to the Board should occasion arise.' "

judgment is for the respondents to have the case restored to the Board, reargued, and to ask for a final decision. Fortunately, the Judges have left the course open to the satyagrahi lawyers.

Young India, 22-10-1919

58. LETTER TO P.S. TO GOVERNOR, MADRAS

AHMEDABAD,
October 22, 1919

DEAR MR. DROFF,

Will you please convey to His Excellency my thanks for the consideration shown about Miss Esther Faering who has now arrived at the Satyagraha Ashram?¹

Yours sincerely,

From a photostat of the draft in Gandhiji's hand : S. N. 6933

¹ On October 4, Gandhiji had wired the Private Secretary to the Governor of Madras to facilitate Esther Faering's early departure for Ahmedabad.

59. LETTER TO REGISTRAR, HIGH COURT, BOMBAY¹

SABARMATI,
October 22, 1919

TO
THE REGISTRAR
HIGH COURT
BOMBAY

DEAR SIR,

I am in receipt of your letter of the 20th instant regarding the "publication in *Young India* on the 6th August of a private letter addressed by Mr. Kennedy, Dt. Judge of Ahmedabad" and comments thereon in *Young India*.

I am grateful to the Hon'ble the Chief Justice for not interrupting my preparations for going to the Punjab. The letter in question was in no way understood by me to be private, nor did the contents lead me to think so. It came into my possession in the ordinary course, and I decided to publish it only after I understood that it was received by the giver in a proper, regular and open manner. In my humble opinion I was within the rights of a journalist in publishing the letter in question and making comments thereon. I believed the letter to be of great public importance and one that called for public criticism.

¹ On October 18, Gandhiji received a letter from the Registrar of the Bombay High Court as follows: "I am directed by the Hon'ble the Chief Justice to request you to attend His Lordship's Chamber on Monday the 20th instant at 11 a.m. so that you may have opportunity of giving an explanation regarding the publication in *Young India* on the 6th August of a private letter addressed by Mr. Kennedy, District Judge of Ahmedabad, to the Registrar, Bombay High Court, together with certain comments thereon." Gandhiji appears to have sent a telegraphic reply saying in substance that "he was unable to attend as he was going to the Punjab and asked whether an explanation in writing would do." The actual text of the telegram is not available. The Registrar wrote in reply: "With reference to your telegram of the 20th instant, I am directed by the Hon'ble the Chief Justice to say that His Lordship does not want to interfere with your preparations for going to the Punjab. His Lordship is therefore willing, for the present, to receive a written explanation. The point I am directed to state is that the letter and the comments thereon were published without the permission of this Court at a time when proceedings were pending in the court in connection with the said letter." To this communication the above was Gandhiji's rejoinder.

I trust that His Lordship will be satisfied with the explanation submitted by me.

My address in Lahore will be Care Mrs. Sarladevi Choudhrani.¹

Yours, etc.,

M. K. GANDHI

From a photostat of the handwritten original : S. N. 6956

60. LETTER TO ESTHER FAERING

ON THE TRAIN,

Thursday [October 23, 1919]²

MY DEAR CHILD,

I do want you to feel at home at the Ashram. I do not want you to feel or think you are in the midst of strangers. Pick up a few words in Hindustani daily and the linguistic barrier will vanish.

If the Ashram is your home, you must reproduce the necessary home comfort. Pray demand them. Send me a line daily.

Remember that love is never afraid, it has *no secrets*. You will therefore open your heart to all and you will, I doubt not, find a response in every heart. Love will not be denied for it is ever patient and ever suffering. And love is service, therefore, it ever rejoices in service.

Do keep your health.

Yours sincerely,

M. K. GANDHI

From a photostat of the original in N.A.I.; also *My Dear Child*, p. 41

¹ The Registrar replied on October 31 informing Gandhiji that the Chief Justice did not consider his explanation satisfactory, and forwarding the text of an apology to be submitted by Gandhiji; *vide* "Telegram to Registrar, High Court, Bombay," 7-11-1919.

² The letter appears to have been written after Gandhiji left Ahmedabad on his tour of the Punjab, soon after Esther Faering had arrived at the Ashram.

61. LETTER TO MAGANLAL GANDHI

[October 23, 1919]

CHI. MAGANLAL,

After reading the accompanying letter¹, make what arrangements you think best for Miss Faering. I think Narahari's last sentence is perfectly correct. I had thought of sending him a telegram about her while on my way here, but gave up the idea. If you take her out for a walk every morning, as I used to take you out, this flower will bloom the better and will give sweet fragrance.

You are looking after Mahadev, I am sure.

Blessing from

BAPU

From the Gujarati original in Gandhiji's hand : C.W. 5778. Courtesy : Radhabehn Choudhri

62. LETTER TO MATHURADAS TRIKUMJI

Diwali, [October 23, 1919]²

CHI. MATHURADAS,

May the New Year be propitious to you. May you be healthy and have good character.

Now you go to Lahore only after the Surat Conference, for I shall try to go there at that time. My address will be c/o *The Tribune*.

Blessings from

BAPU

From the Gujarati original: Pyarelal Papers. Nehru Memorial Museum and Library. Courtesy: Beladevi Nayyar and Dr. Sushila Nayyar

¹ Presumably, this was the preceding item.

² The year has been inferred from the contents. In 1919 *Diwali* fell on October

63. LETTER TO ESTHER FAERING

C/O SARLA DEVI CHOUDHRANI,

LAHORE,

October 24, 1919

MY DEAR CHILD,

This is just to tell you you are with me in thought. I had a most wonderful experience here.¹

With love,

Yours,

BAPU

From a photostat of the original in N.A.I.; also *My Dear Child*, p. 44

64. TELEGRAM TO MATHURADAS TRIKUMJI

LAHORE,

October 25, 1919

MATHURADAS

247 BAZAR GATE ST.

BOMBAY

DO NOT COME JUST NOW.

GANDHI

From the original: Pyarelal Papers. Nehru Memorial Museum and Library.
Courtesy: Beladevi Nayyar and Dr. Sushila Nayyar

65. TO THE PEOPLE OF KATHIAWAR

A gentleman from Kathiawar has given Rs. 25,000 as a gift. His original aim was that I should use the sum in propagating swadeshi in one definite place only. I felt that such a large sum could not be spent in that way. Then he suggested my utilizing the amount [for promoting swadeshi] among the people in the particular State. Under this restriction, too, I felt I could not use it to good purpose. He has,

¹ The reference apparently is to the reception accorded to Gandhiji on arrival at Lahore.

therefore, given me the freedom to spend the sum for the whole of Kathiawar and I have agreed.

Even so I visualize difficulties in using the amount in a way which would be worthy of this gentleman's liberality. If the people of Kathiawar do not help me to the utmost, I would not be able to utilize the sum satisfactorily.

It is to be used only for promoting swadeshi. He has accepted my definition of swadeshi, which is, to increase the production of cloth in the country mainly by promoting hand-spinning and hand-weaving, and thereby saving the crores of rupees going out every year on account of cloth.

Promoting hand-spinning and hand-weaving is the easiest thing if spinners and weavers are available. If the Indian States take up the matter, the work can be done easily enough. The following are my humble suggestions to the States and their Diwans:

1. Remove the levy in your State, if any, on hand-made cloth produced in Kathiawar.

2. Do not tax hand-spun yarn produced elsewhere or yarn from Indian mills.

3. Do not encourage the peasants to sell cotton; encourage them rather to store it.

4. Improve the cotton. This can easily be done.

5. Encourage the use of cloth woven in your own State from yarn spun there. You, too, should wear only such cloth.

6. Have Indian-style spinning-wheels and looms manufactured in your State and offer them to your subjects at cost price.

7. Introduce the spinning-wheel and the loom in your primary schools and let the boys and girls be taught this craft as a compulsory subject.

If the Rajas, Maharajas and the Diwans take up this work, I can keep the foregoing donation unspent; I may then have to request the donor to permit me to use it for another purpose.

However, it cannot be expected that all the States will accept so very readily the importance of the swadeshi dharma.

It is likely, therefore, that the amount will have to be used among the people.

Men can do a lot if they will. They may find out the weavers in various places and give them encouragement.

They may advise the peasants to store their cotton.

They may advise the women among their relations to take to spinning.

For this purpose, it is necessary to make arrangements

1. to supply spinning-wheels;
2. to supply slivers; and
3. to collect yarn in exchange for the slivers and pay for it.

Then, for weaving, it is necessary to make arrangements

1. to supply yarn; and
2. to collect an equal quantity of cloth and pay for it.

Finally, it is necessary to promote its use, that is, to run a shop for its sale.

For all this work, diligent and honest workers are required. Since people cannot afford to work without payment, the donation can be used to pay a living wage to honest workers, if available. The associations of voluntary workers in Kathiawar can give the fullest help in this matter. If a large committee consisting of respectable men and women, who would be prepared to work, can be formed for this purpose and if a sub-committee is appointed under it, the work can be done promptly. It is hoped that people willing to join in this work, with or without payment, will immediately write to us at the Ashram address.

However, until the women take a leading part in this movement it will not gather momentum. It is women mostly who do spinning. They are in possession of an inexhaustible treasure of the nation, having plenty of time on their hands. By utilizing it, they will be serving the nation, even if they ask to be paid.

Whenever I go to Kathiawar, I receive much love. As a token of their love, I want all of them...the old and the young, the high and the low, the Rajas and their subjects...to observe strict swadeshi dharma and this they can easily do.

From Kathiawar, I expect cloth worth one crore of rupees annually; that is, I am endeavouring to put one crore of rupees into circulation among the people there. I wish to spend the foregoing Rs. 25,000 for this purpose. There are many intelligent women and weavers in Kathiawar; what is needed is men who will bring them together and set them working.

I feel pained to see large numbers of men and women from Kathiawar crowding every train going to Bombay in a mad rush to get their. Unable to earn their livelihood in Kathiawar, they go running about. So many of them, at any rate, who may set a crore of rupees in circulation during a year, have no need at all to leave Kathiawar for a living.

There are indeed few places in India which people may leave as affording no means of making a living. I know fully well that the number of our railway passengers is no index of the country's prosperity. The giving up of swadeshi is a potent cause of our miserable condition. Our prosperity lies in its revival.

[From Gujarati]

Navajivan, 26-10-1919

66. NOTES

WOMEN LABOURERS

In writing about women labourers, Mrs. Vidyagouri¹ has not touched upon a new subject. However, when our attention is drawn to any matter of which we knew but had taken no notice, it should be treated as a new subject. The solution offered by Mrs. Vidyagouri is as difficult, it seems to us, as the two remedies which she found to be almost impracticable. It is too much to expect that employers will be kind to women labourers. We think it possible for masons, etc., to be civilized without making themselves angels. Women labourers can learn to protect their honour. All three need education; they all need to be enlightened as to their condition. The group which we approach first will be the first to have decency and self-respect introduced among them. We must necessarily approach all three; those who have patriotism in them and have occasion for contact with all three classes may entreat members of each class. If Mrs. Vidyagouri were to start an association of thoughtful women like herself and go among women labourers, what seems impossible to her will become possible.

DIFFICULTIES OF CLERKS

Shri Popatlal Nanji sends us for our readers a letter on the hardships of clerks in which he says that a good many shopowners are rude, say all manner of harsh things to clerks and exact excessive

¹ Vidyagouri Nilkanth, a social worker

work from them. Shop-owners should look kindly upon their employees, whether clerks or gate-keepers, and be polite to them. But can it be that the masters alone are to blame? In keeping up slavery, slaves too play no less important a part any day. A servant's loyalty consists in his honesty and industry; he is not bound to tolerate unseemly behaviour. Servants show themselves to be so completely broken in spirit that they look upon service as their all in all. They ought to shake off this helplessness. We believe that a man who is sincerely ready to work, has sound health and is not ashamed to work with his body will never find it difficult to earn enough for his livelihood. The many movements in our country make no progress for want of sincere and diligent workers. These movements can absorb men who live by service. We, therefore, advise such men not to be submissive but to stand up. There is no need for them at all to continue in service where they are insulted, where they have to drudge and where their health is undermined. Before national life can make progress, it is necessary that a great many men and women acquire self-respect.

RELIEF TO THOSE IN DISTRESS

It is our moral duty to think, as the new years begins, of the people who suffer. That is in our interest. We can be happy only by making happy the people who suffer. To have this happiness, we should look around and send relief wherever we find suffering.

At present it is the Punjab which suffers especially, and Bengal, where, borne away by floods, many people have become homeless and go naked. It is our particular duty, at the beginning of the new year, to send them what help we can. We spend a great deal, giving dinners to friends and sending costly gifts and sweets to them. People are welcome to do so if they can afford it. But, in everything we do, it is our duty to remember that those who suffer have the first claim on us.

[From Gujarati]

Navajivan, 26-10-1919

67. "RING OUT THE OLD, RING IN THE NEW"¹

[October 26, 1919]

(THE YEAR WHICH HAS ENDED)

It is difficult to strike the last year's balance. The War has ended but with little result. The hopes it nourished have remained unfulfilled. The Peace, which was expected to be a permanent one, has turned out to be one in name. The War which was greater than the *Mahabharat* war has been proved to be but a prelude to a still greater war. Widespread discontent all over France, America and England after the War \approx enough to bewilder one. All that has followed seems to be a huge enigma. Here in India we are faced with despair everywhere. It was confidently hoped that, at the close of the War, India would get something substantial, but the hope turned out to be false. For aught we know the reforms may not come. Even if they do, they will be worthless. The Congress-League Scheme, then the Delhi Congress Scheme and subsequent schemes are now airy nothings. We have to wait and see. The Punjab has been a scene of most revolting episodes. Innocent lives have been lost. There reigned a reign of terror. The gulf between the rulers and the ruled has been widened. In these matters it is impossible to strike a correct balance. What is the sum total on the credit side? Or is there something to be debited, and if so, what? Or is it that there is no credit side at all and we have simply to sum up the debit figures?

Was there any silver lining to such a thick, dark cloud of despair? The sun of satyagraha dawned all over India on the 6th of April. The clouds were scattered and the rays could be distinctly seen. But the sun underwent an eclipse in the Punjab and Ahmedabad and its shadows are still haunting us. And yet satyagraha is again seen dawning on most minds, though slowly. There was hartal in many parts of India on the 17th of October amid perfect peace and quiet. Those who believe in God passed that day in fasting and prayer. The Hindus participated in the Moslems' mourning, strengthened the latter's hopes and the bonds of union with them. It may now be very difficult to break the bonds.

¹ The original of this article appeared in two parts in *Navajivan*, 26-10-1919. The occasion was the new year's day according to the Vikram Era.

If someone were to ask: "What was the greatest event of the last year?", we would unhesitatingly say, "It was the acceptance of satyagraha, however slightly and consciously or unconsciously, both by the rulers and the ruled." And in proof of the statement we would cite *October the 17th*.

(THE YEAR WHICH HAS COMMENCED)

The hope of India lies in satyagraha. And what is satyagraha? It has often been described. But just as the sun cannot be fully described even by the myriad-tongued *sheshnaga*, so also the sun of satyagraha cannot be adequately described. And though we always see the sun but know really very little of it, even so we do ever seem to see the sun of satyagraha but we know precious little about it.

The spheres of satyagraha are swadeshi, social reforms and political reform. And in so far as these are based on satyagraha, so far only, and no further, is their permanence assured. The way of satyagraha is distinct from the beaten track and it is not always easy to discover it. Few have ventured along that path and the footprints on it are few and far between and indistinct, and hence the people's dread of it. And still we clearly find people taking that course, be it ever so slowly.

He to whom satyagraha means nothing more than civil disobedience has never understood satyagraha. No doubt the rigid interpretation of satyagraha does include within its meaning civil disobedience. But only he who has mastered the art of obedience to law knows the art of disobedience to law. Only he who thoroughly knows how to construct may destroy. The poet has sung,

The path of Truth is the path of the brave,
It is beyond the power of the cowards.

Swadeshi is satyagraha. It is beyond the power of cowardly spirits to observe or to propagate swadeshi. It is impossible for a coward to foster Hindu-Moslem unity. It takes anyone but a cowardly Mussulman to receive a wound from a Hindu's dagger and *vice versa* and to preserve his mental balance. If both could muster this much forbearance, swarajya would be instantaneously obtained. There is none to forbid us the path of satyagraha, and both swadeshi and Hindu-Moslem unity being in their essence religious, India would incidentally perform an act of religion. This, then, is our prayer for the new year:

"Lord, lead India towards the path of Truth, this doing teach her the religion of swadeshi, and knit the Hindus, Mussulmans, Parsis, Christians and Jews living in India closer together."

Young India, 5-11-1919

68. MESSAGE TO PEOPLE OF AMRITSAR¹

[LAHORE,

October 27, 1919]

Please tell the public that I have been simply unable to go, because the mission on which I have come requires my presence in Lahore. I hope to see the friends in Amritsar shortly.

The Leader, 2-11-1919

69. PUNJAB LETTER

[October 27, 1919]²

When I tried to go to the Punjab last April, I had imagined that my going to Delhi and Lahore would result in restoring peace. In Delhi Swami Shraddhanand had sought permission to go to the Punjab as had Dr. Satyapal from Amritsar. Both had hoped to pacify the people. Meanwhile Dr. Satyapal and Dr. Kichlew received orders restraining them from speaking in public and they obeyed, too. Before I could reach Delhi, I was stopped and taken into custody. Finally, I was ordered to remain in Bombay Presidency and not go to the Punjab. We know the result. If I had not been arrested, the subsequent disturbances would not have occurred.

The restriction on my movements was later removed and I was at last able to go to the Punjab. I reached Lahore on the 24th of October. There was a vast concourse at the station. The Hon'ble Pandit Malaviyaji was there. It took us 40 minutes to go from the station to the car. It was extremely difficult to make one's way through the crowd. Twice or thrice I was convinced that someone would be crushed. But where men are overwhelmed with love, accidents are few.

¹ Gandhiji was expected to visit Amritsar on the afternoon of October 27. This teleprinter message was sent at 8 p.m.

² Gandhiji's interview with the Lt.-Governor mentioned in the last paragraph took place on this date. It was Monday, and some of the subsequent instalments in the series were also written on Mondays.

This was the case here. Yet there is no doubt that it is very necessary that we learn to make proper arrangements where such crowds gather. As awakening grows day by day, the people will take greater interest in national activities and there will be ever larger crowds. If people learn one extremely simple rule, there need be no accident. When we gather in order to meet someone, those who are behind him and on either side of him should remain at a distance and those in front of him should press forward. Today we do exactly the opposite. Those at the back rush upon the front lines so that the people in between are squeezed between the two. People are pushed about and there is risk of accidents. Consequently, it becomes necessary to protect the person in the centre by holding him right in one's embrace. Everyone will agree that this should not happen. All that is necessary is to give the people some training. And it is imperative that such training be given to the people through volunteers as soon as possible.

In Lahore, I am staying at the house of Sarladevi Choudhrani, the wife of Pandit Rambhuj Dutt. Readers will recollect that Pandit Rambhuj is in jail.

As the Punjab Committee will start meeting from the 29th October¹, I have had very regretfully to cancel my proposed visit to Surat. Discussions are afoot regarding three requests to be made to the Government, viz., that the leaders be released during the Committee's investigations; that among the judges to be appointed to review the cases, one at least should be from outside the Punjab; and that, if the judges feel it necessary to take fresh evidence, they should have the power to do so. These matters are under discussion and Pandit Malaviya is giving them serious thought. It is also rumoured that our lawyers will not be allowed to appear before the Committee.² It is expected that some settlement will be arrived at on this point also. If this does not happen, I at any rate am of the opinion that we should refuse to lead evidence before the Committee.

If it is decided to lead evidence, it is likely that Mr. C.R. Das and Pandit Motilal Nehru will be our counsel. Apart from these, a British lawyer also has been invited. His name is Mr. Neville. It is learnt that it will take 15 or 20 days for him to arrive from England.

It is universally acknowledged that Pandit Malaviya and Pandit Motilal Nehru have rendered unique services to the Punjab. At a time

¹ The Committee held its first sitting, however, on October 31 at Delhi.

² C.R. Das and Madan Mohan Malaviya were, however, later permitted.

when the people were panic-stricken, these two leaders brought them solace and strength. Pandit Motilal has even neglected his legal practice. Swami Shraddhanandji belongs to the Punjab and nothing need be said about his services. Several less known leaders of the Punjab are also labouring for the cause to the best of their ability. The services rendered by Mr. Andrews it is impossible to measure. His ceaseless work continues unobtrusively. It may be truly said that his left hand does not know what his right hand is doing. I see that his service is the purest charity given in secret. Mr. Andrews can reach places which would be difficult of access to others.

We meet hundreds of men and women here every day. We experience the wonderful faith of India. Among the officers, I have already had interviews with the Dy. Commissioner, Mr. Butler, and the Lt.-Governor. I am making efforts to meet the leaders who are in jail and I hope to succeed fairly soon.

[From Gujarati]

Navajivan, 2-11-1919

70. LETTER TO ESTHER FAERING

LAHORE,

Monday [October 27] 1919

MY DEAR CHILD,

I have your letter.

I am having a precious time here. I may not be able to come in the early part of November after all.

Mr. Andrews is here and we often talk of you.

Keep good health please.

With love,

Yours,

BAPU

From a photostat of the original in N.A.I.; also My Dear Child, p. 43.

71. LETTER TO ANASUYABEHN SARABHAI

LAHORE,

*Monday [October 27, 1919]*¹

REVERED ANASUYABEHN,

I did not get the time to read and correct the statement you have sent me, but the matter is not out of my mind. I will certainly send it in time.

I am keeping well. Organizing the boycott was very difficult but it appears to have passed off successfully.

I intend to come there to tender my evidence². I hope the statements by Vallabhbhai and others have all been filed.

Saraladevi's³ company is very endearing. She looks after me very well.

Do you ever go to the Ashram? Please do go if you have not been there .

Does Bhai Shankerlal look after himself? Tell him that the paper used in *Young India* and *Navajivan* should be of better quality.

Vandemataram from

MOHANDAS

From the Gujarati original S.N. 32817

¹ From the contents of the letter. Monday, during Gandhiji's five-day stay at Lahore in October, 1919 was the 27th.

² Before the Punjab Disorders Inquiry Committee which was to start meeting from October 29

³ Saraladevi Chowdharani

72. LETTER TO SHANKERLAL BANKER

LAHORE,
*Monday, [October 27, 1919]*¹

DEAR SHANKERLAL,

I have received your letter. Of course, you have my blessings. I think your straightforwardness will take you far. I wish all your great aspirations are fulfilled. Take care of your health.

It seems I will not be able to come there for the present. There is a lot of work to do. I have met the Governor. But right now there is no time to write in detail. I shall leave for Delhi tomorrow. See the letter regarding the application that has been sent to Chandulal. Make the necessary changes in it.

I wish you would carry on all the work to be done there. Relieve me from the anxiety about things there.

Vandema

MOHANDAS

From a copy of the Gujarati : S. N. 32710

73. LETTER TO ESTHER FAERING

LAHORE,
[October 28, 1919]

MY DEAR CHILD,

I have your two letters. I have [for] Delhi today with Mr. Andrews.

I am glad you are feeling at home there. I am most anxious that you should retain your health and get stronger than you are. The best thing of course is not to worry about anything. Be careful for nothing and to take or prepare the diet that suits you.

Ba wrote to me you were looking after her.

I may some time describe the work here. It is difficult work but it is useful and people gain by it.

¹ From the reference to the meeting with the Governor, which took place on October 27, 1919. Gandhiji left Lahore for Delhi on October 28, a Tuesday.

Please do not write for *Young India* at present. I do not want to disturb the Government though there is nothing wrong about your writing on the educational system. For the time being let your life speak to your surroundings.

With love,

BAPU

From a photostat of the original in N.A.I.; also *My Dear Child*, pp. 42-3

74. LETTER TO RABINDRANATH TAGORE

AS AT DELHI,
C/O PRINCIPAL RUDRA,
October 28 [1919]

DEAR GURUDEV,

I have just arrived in the Punjab and I feel happy that I have been able at last to visit this unhappy land. I am today in Lahore. Tonight both Andrews and I are going to Delhi in connection with the Committee.

I write this to tell you how great have been Andrews' services to the people of this Province. He has done work which no other person could have done. And with him it is a matter of the right hand not knowing what the left hand doeth. It was good of you to have spared him for the Punjab. I am now pleading with him to go to South Africa as soon as he has *finished* the Punjab work. His own intention is not to stir out of Shantiniketan. I tell him the South African work is his speciality and he may not neglect it, when the call has come. Of course he has told me that you have left him free to do as he pleases. And I am hoping that he will go to South Africa. He won't have to be there for any length of time. Two months' stay would suffice.

I have an appeal for funds for the distress in East Bengal. Could you please let me have a pen picture?¹ It will enable me to approach the people more effectively.

Hoping you are keeping well,

Yours sincerely,
M. K. GANDHI

From a microfilm of the original in Gandhiji's hand in N.A.I.

¹ It is not known if Tagore sent this.

75. LETTER TO MATHURADAS TRIKUMJI

LAHORE,

*Kartik Sud 4 [October 28, 1919]*¹

CHI. MATHURADAS,

A great deal is going on here. I have no time to go into details. I have demanded that of the two revision judges² one be appointed from outside the Punjab. Most probably this will be conceded. I have suggested three names: Faiz Tyabji, Sir Narayan Chandavarkar and Dr. Sapru. Please see Faiz Tyabji and tell him that if he gets the invitation he should not decline it. I think Bhai Umar should be informed. You give him this information. Meet Sir Narayan if you think it is necessary. This matter should not be discussed very widely.

I expect that things will take a good turn. My interview³ with the Governor passed off well.

Blessings form

BAPU

[PS.]

If it is necessary to go to cyclone-affected Bengal I wish you would go there. It is necessary to find out the extent of the damage and what remedial measures might be needed. We must arrange for this. I have wired to Bhai Umar.

From the Gujarati original: Pyarelal Papers. Nehru Memorial Museum and Library. Courtesy: Beladevi Nayyar and Dr. Sushila Nayyar

¹ The year has been inferred from Gandhiji's meeting the Governor in Lahore.

² For Gandhiji's earlier telegram in this connection, *vide* "Telegram to P.S. to Viceroy", 3-10-1919.

³ On October 27

76. LETTER TO MATHURADAS TRIKUMJI

LAHORE,

Tuesday, October 28, 1919

CHI. MATHURADAS,

I got your letters. My movements have become very uncertain. That is why I have been putting off calling you here. I shall not be able to go to Surat. But I do expect to be free earlier than I had supposed. Look after all the Swadeshi work there properly. I am off to Delhi today. My address there is c/o Principal Rudra, Stephen's College.

Blessings from

BAPU

From the Gujarati original: Pyarelal Papers. Nehru Memorial Museum and Library. Courtesy: Beladevi Nayyar and Dr. Sushila Nayyar

77. SPEECH TO LAHORE STUDENTS

[October 28, 1919]

On 28th October at 3.30 p.m. Mahatma Gandhi addressed a large number of students of Lahore at Pandit Rambhuj Dutt Chaudhri's house. Preluding his remarks with a few questions as to which of the colleges they belonged to, what was the numerical strength of the latter and how many students were still under the ban of expulsion...to all of which he received answers..., the speaker proceeded further. To get degrees, he said, was not the be-all and end-all of education; moreover, it spoiled their health as well as their pecuniary prospects. Lest he might be misunderstood he explained himself by saying that education, as at present imparted, was too theoretical. Now they ought to supplement it by practical instruction in arts and crafts so that they might be sure of an independent livelihood. They should curtail their needs to a minimum. Ninety-five per cent of India's population was agriculturists, who could not improve their agriculture as long as they remained uneducated.

Mahatma Gandhi continuing said he was sorry to see students living under a cloud of fear. He admonished them to practise *nirbhaya* (fearlessness) which was, according to him, an essential adjunct of education. Let them study the problem of their poverty. They should refuse "to become blotting sheets of civilization", but instead be trustful and self-reliant. He appealed to them first to know what the duty of

each of them was and then to perform it. He concluded with the advice that they should observe the five *yamas* and *niyamas*, i.e., ahimsa, *Satya*, etc. He laid great stress on the practice of *brahmacharya* which was sure to remove all their difficulties.

The Tribune, 30-10-1919

78. ANOTHER MARTIAL LAW CASE FROM THE PUNJAB

Mr. Parshotam Singh, son of Mr. Jamiat Singh Bagga of Wazirabad, has sent me a statement of his father's case, and what is miscalled record of his case and judgment. Mr. Jamiat Singh Bagga is a merchant and banker of Wazirabad. He is 62 years old and suffering from a bad cataract in the eye. He was sentenced to 18 months' rigorous imprisonment and a fine of Rs. 1,000 or in default to undergo further rigorous imprisonment for six months. I have no hesitation in saying that the judgment is utterly unworthy of anybody calling himself a judge. It is devoid of reasoning and full of imputations and bad logic and if the facts set forth in the son's statement are true, the convicting Magistrate is utterly unfit to sit as a judge. Mr. Jamiat Singh's crime seems to have been that he was present at the mosque meeting and advocated hartal, and that he was a rich man, for the Magistrate disbelieves the testimony of impartial witnesses because "Jamiat Singh is a rich man". It is sufficient for the Magistrate that the accused was with the mob that stoned the troopers, that "if he prevented boys from breaking fencing, there may have been some other reason, but he certainly was in the mob." Thus, everything in favour of the accused is deliberately disregarded by the Magistrate. The reader must go through the judgment to feel the force of my remarks regarding its incoherence. But the son's statement makes what seems apparently to be an injustice appear blacker still. Is it true that the Magistrate confiscated the accused's property without a moment's notice, that the inmates were subjected to the treatment described in the statement, and if it is true, was it not a lawless act? Is it true that the witnesses cited for the defence were not called, that the defence counsel was not allowed to appear, when the charge was framed against the accused? So much for the precious judgment.

The treatment received by the accused before and after judgment seems to have been in keeping with the proceedings of the court. It was an inhuman act to make him walk handcuffed with his bedding under his armpit. It reminds one of General Hudson's speech about the hand and knee order, which, by the way, should be,

according to the correction made by Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, described as the crawling order. It is evident that the proceedings taken by the authorities were intended, like the crawling order, to produce an impression on the people. It is difficult on any other ground to understand the insulting and cruel treatment to which the accused was subjected. Even the help he rendered the Government during the war period by subscribing the largest amount in Wazirabad to the war loan, and by recruiting, was of no avail. The *sanad* granted to him for his loyal services was of no service to him when he was put in the dock, and treated as a common felon.

I cannot congratulate the Punjab Government on the reduction of the sentence to six months, when the accused seems clearly to be entitled to a full discharge. The case, as appears from the statement, is now to be investigated by the Revision Judges. I have already ventured to express my misgivings about this Revision Tribunal. Its composition cannot inspire any confidence or hope. If the Government fail to repair the irreparable mistakes, create tribunals merely in order to cover themselves, they will forfeit all title to respect and intelligent co-operation. The dead are buried and gone, but it is intolerable that the living, who are now suffering undeserved punishment, are not given an opportunity of showing their innocence before a tribunal in which they and the public can have full confidence.

Young India, 29-10-1919

79. SPEECH AT DELHI MEETING¹

[October 29, 1919]

Mr. Gandhi said he was quite sick of making and hearing speeches. There was need for action and truth and not for speeches. His only message to the people was that they should insist on truth, for untruth had introduced cowardice among Indians. They seemed to be afraid of telling the truth before authorities. That was a grave defect of character in India. Only truth and action were needed.

Amrita Bazar Patrika, 31-10-1919

80. TELEGRAM TO SABARMATI ASHRAM

[DELHI,

October 31, 1919]

NO PEACE CELEBRATIONS UNTIL KHILAFAT QUESTION
SATISFACTORILY SETTLED.

Bombay Government Records

81. LETTER TO SIR GEORGE BARNES²

DELHI,

October 31, 1919

Your kind letter of the 21st instant has been redirected to me at Delhi.

Though I can't yet take the view you take of the changed position, I am prepared to consider it the second best and I shall do what I can to prevent agitation for realizing Mr. Montagu's original declaration. Could you announce the name of the Indian member? I

¹ A public meeting under Swami Shraddhanand's chairmanship passed resolutions urging the Hunter Committee to allow representation of various interests before it through Counsel. It urged the release of principal leaders, undergoing imprisonment in the Punjab, for the duration of the Committee's sittings, and the revision of sentences passed by the Punjab courts by two judges with power to admit fresh evidence where records were insufficient. Due to indisposition, the report stated, Gandhiji addressed the gathering seated.

² Member of the Viceroy's Executive Council

have heard it is to be Mr. Shastriar. I venture to say that no other better choice could be made. Could you also say when Sir Benjamin Robertson is likely to sail for South Africa?

India Office : Judicial & Public Records : 6140/19

82. LETTER TO ESTHER FAERING

DELHI,

Friday [October 31] 1919

MY DEAR CHILD,

You will teach the children¹ not so much reading and writing as what is character and what it means. It therefore gives me much joy to know that you will soon be coming in close touch with the children.

Please tell Sundaram to write to me as also Krishna and Manidatta.

I am not likely to return yet for a fortnight.

Mr. Andrews is with me and we are both trying to bring about peace.

I wonder if the coming of the children causes some overcrowding and inconvenience.

Yours,

BAPU

From a photostat of the original in N.A.I.; also *My Dear Child*, pp. 41-2

¹ In the Ashram

83. LETTER TO A FRIEND

[DELHI,]

Kartik Sud 7 [October 31, 1919]

DEAR FRIEND,

Chi. Chhaganlal writes to me to say that you have been waiting to receive 50 spinning-wheels from me. I don't recollect anything about this. All the same, if you want any in addition to the ten I sent, I shall certainly be in a position to supply them. You should, however, get them made there. I am at present in the Punjab.

Vandemataram from

MOHANDAS GANDHI

From a photostat of the Gujarati original in Gandhiji's hand : G.N. 5714

84. LETTER TO ANASUYABEHN SARABHAI

DELHI,

October 31, 1919

REVERED SISTER,

I received two of your letters together and then I sent a telegram. I shall revise your statement when received. I find it difficult to draft one and send it on to you.

My health is tolerably good. There is no cause for worry at all. The boil has quite healed.

I saw Lord Hunter today. We had a long talk. He intends to leave for Lahore in a day or two. I don't think I shall be able to get away from here for time being. For there is no one here. Panditji is in Banaras. Nehru¹ is indisposed and is in Allahabad. Das² hasn't arrived.

Blessings from

BAPU

From the Gujarati original: S. N. 32799

¹ Motilal Nehru

² C. R. Das who was one of the counsel to review the cases before the Punjab Committee

85. LETTER TO MATHURADAS TRIKUMJI

DELHI,

Friday [On or after October 31, 1919]¹

CHI. MATHURADAS,

My visit to Surat is stalled. It seems I shall not be able to stir out of here. Still, I have not the courage to call you here. I shall not be able to use you much and there is also the difficulty of accommodation. Food will be a real difficulty. I shall be in Delhi only for two or three days. Otherwise mostly I shall be in Lahore and other parts of the Punjab. Things will be very difficult in Lahore. That is why I am not sending for you. The food will put you off. Besides, it is very cold there.

I am trying for the release of some leaders. I am also trying for the appointment of one judge from outside the Punjab. I am hoping both will be achieved. I hope the Swadeshi work is proceeding well.

Blessings from

BAPU

From the Gujarati original: Pyarelal Papers. Nehru Memorial Museum and Library. Courtesy: Beladevi Nayyar and Dr. Sushila Nayyar

86. LETTER TO HIRST

October 1919²

DEAR MR. HIRST,

I thank you for your letter. I quite agree with you that there should be no unrestrained or violent language at the meeting today. And you may entirely depend upon my using my best endeavour to prevent the use of such language.

Yours sincerely,

From a photostat of the handwritten draft: S. N. 19828

¹ From the contents. Gandhiji had reached Delhi on Oct. 29. The Friday following was October 31.

² It is not clear which the meetings referred to in the letter are, the date cannot therefore be fixed

87. LETTER TO THE PRESS¹

DELHI,

November 1, 1919

Several friends have inquired what should be the position regarding the forthcoming peace celebrations. On the Khilafat Day, I know that resolutions were passed at some meetings to the effect that Mohammedans could not participate in the celebrations if the Khilafat question was not satisfactorily settled. There can be no peace in Indian estimation so long as the great question remains unsolved and the Mohammedan sentiment is in danger of being lacerated, and millions of Mohammedans remaining in suspense or grief, it is hardly possible for the Hindus, Parsis, Christians, Jews and others for whom India is the land of their adoption or birth to take part in the forthcoming rejoicing. I venture to think that His Excellency the Viceroy can, if he will, tell His Majesty's ministers that Indians cannot participate in the celebration, so long as the Khilafat question remains unsettled. And I do hope that His Majesty's ministers will recognize the necessity of securing and publishing an honourable settlement of the question before asking us to take part in peace celebrations.

The Leader, 3-11-1919

88. INTERVIEW TO ASSOCIATED PRESS OF INDIA²

[DELHI,

November 1, 1919]

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 Commission³ of Indian representative 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

¹ This was published in several leading newspapers and also in *Young India*, 5-11-1919.

² This was published in several leading newspapers.

³ The reference is to the Commission appointed by the Union Government to go into the question of Asiatics trading and holding lands in South Africa.

case, it would be the next best thing. In my opinion, our effort should be concentrated upon securing a proper reference to the Commission in the place of the very narrow one, which 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 the 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.

New India, 2-11-1919

89. LETTER TO MATHURADAS TRIKUMJI

DELHI,

*Kartik Sud 8 [November 1, 1919]*¹

CHI. MATHURADAS,

I have your letter. How old was your uncle? Had I met him? Is your aunt alive? I proceed on the assumption that you are not frightened of death. The young and the old, all die only when their time comes. All do their part during their physical existence and then depart. The souls residing in the body of a child may be enlightened and that in the body of an old man may be wrapped in ignorance. In such a situation, whose death should we mourn?

I am abandoning altogether the idea of asking you here. There are many difficulties. But I should like you to take up the responsibility for the Swadeshi work. I also wish to arrange that the

¹ The year has been inferred from the contents. Gandhiji left Delhi for Lahore on November 1.

letter coming for me at Ahmedabad should be sent on to you. I cannot attend to them while I am on tour. And duties at the Ashram have been distributed among the inmates. I wish you to see to the smallest details. You should only consult me. In other words, you should shoulder the chief burden for Swadeshi. Consider this matter and send me your reply at Lahore. I am going to Lahore *via* Amritsar today. If you agree to take up this work I shall send instructions that a few letters lying at the Ashram should be sent on to you.

I am keeping very busy here. You will find some reports in the *Navajivan*.¹ Let me know how the work of spinning-classes, etc., is progressing there.

Has the poet Shyam arrived there? How is the work at Nara-Narayana going on?

I have sent a telegram to Bhai Umar concerning the damage at Dacca. I have already written to you about it.² What has he done about it?

Blessings from

BAPU

From the Gujarati original: Pyarelal Papers. Nehru Memorial Museum and Library. Courtesy: Beladevi Nayyar and Dr. Sushila Nayyar

90. FATHER OF THE WORLD [-IV]

We have, so far, given some thought to the peasant's condition. We have also seen that the rules of cleanliness are not followed in villages. The saying that good health is the first condition of happiness has much truth in it. Men and women who have reached a high position can look after themselves even when they fall ill. But we who have yet to rise to the top, will fall by the way if we do not keep fit.

There is a saying in English: "One cannot reach heaven with cold feet." In a cold country like England, if the feet remain cold one can suffer agonies. One cannot remember God in such a state. It is said that "cleanliness is next to godliness". There is no reason why

¹ For the series of reports about Punjab, *vide* "Punjab Letter", 27-10-1919, "Punjab Letter", 3-11-1919, ; 17-11-1919, ; 25-11-1919, ; About 1-12-1919, ; 7-12-1919, ; About 15-12-1919, ; 27-1-1920

² *Vide* "Telegram to P.S. to Viceroy", 3-10-1919

we should be dirty or live in dirty surroundings. There is no sanctity in dirt! Filth is a sign of ignorance and sloth. How, then, are peasants to be rescued from it? Let us examine the rules of cleanliness.

1. Many of our diseases originate from our latrines or from our custom of going to the fields for evacuation. Every house must have a latrine. Only able-bodied adults can go out. If there is no latrine available, the rest turn their courtyard, lanes or houses into latrines, dirtying the place and poisoning the air. We can, therefore, lay down two rules. If anyone wants to evacuate in the open, it must be a distance of a mile from the village. There must be no habitation in its vicinity, nor any human traffic near by. The person must dig a hole and after using it must cover the faeces with earth. If all the earth that has been dug out is put back, the faeces will be properly covered. By taking this little trouble, we can observe an important rule of cleanliness. Sensible peasants may evacuate in their fields and obtain free manure. This is one rule.

Even if the open space is thus availed of, every house should necessarily have a latrine. This should have a bucket. Here also every person should, after use, cover the faeces with earth in order to obviate offensive odours, prevent buzzing of flies and the breeding of vermin. This bucket must be regularly cleaned. A pit sunk to serve as a latrine is useless. The earth's crust, to the depth of one foot, is swarming with germs. The refuse buried in this portion is immediately transformed into manure. Earth very deep down does not contain enough germs to turn filth into manure. Consequently, filth which has been buried very deep produces foul gases and pollutes the air. The bucket may be of iron or earth coated with paint. This also requires not money but industry. Urine too should not be passed in any and every place. It should be regarded a sin to pass urine in the street. There should be ditches for the purpose and, if there is plenty of earth in them, no bad smell will be produced, there will be no splashing and the earth will turn into manure. This, then, is the second rule. If every peasant follows it, not only will his health improve but he will also profit materially thereby as, without labour, he will obtain valuable manure.

2. No one should spit or clean his nose on the streets. In some cases the sputum is so harmful that germs are carried from it and they infect others with tuberculosis. In some places spitting on the road is a criminal offence. Those who spit after chewing betel leaves and

tobacco have no consideration for the feelings of others. Spittle, mucus from the nose, etc., should also be covered with earth.

3. Peasants are very careless about water. The well or pond from which drinking and cooking water is taken must be kept clean. It should contain no leaves. No one may bathe there, nor should cattle or clothes be washed in it. Here also all that is needed is a little effort in the beginning. It is easy enough to keep a well clean. It is slightly more difficult to keep a pond clean, but this also will be easy if people are properly educated. If drinking filthy or polluted water caused disgust, it would be easy to follow the rules of hygiene with regard to water. Water must always be strained through a thick, clean cloth.

An old woman was once dusting a table. She washed it with soap and wiped it with a rag; and yet it refused to be clean, try how hard she might. She would change the soap and the rag but the table remained the same. Someone said, "Old lady, if you take a clean cloth in place of that rag, the table will be clean in no time." The old woman understood. Similarly, rather than use a dirty cloth to filter water it is better not to filter it at all.

4. It is scarcely necessary to enlarge upon the rule that dirt must not be thrown on the street. Disposal of refuse is also a science. Glass, iron, etc., should be buried deep. Twigs and sticks used for cleaning teeth should be washed, dried and used for fuel. Rags may be sold. Left-over food, peelings, etc., should be buried and turned into manure. I have seen many a heap of manure prepared in this way. Paper can be made from rags. It should not be necessary to employ anyone to remove refuse in a village, because there is very little of it and most of it can be converted into manure.

5. Near the village or dwellings, there should be no ditches in which water can collect. Mosquitoes do not breed where water does not stagnate. Where there are no mosquitoes, the incidence of malaria is low. At one time, water used to collect around Delhi. After the hollows were filled, mosquitoes were greatly reduced and so also was malaria.

6. I hope no one will ask why I filled this article with rules of cleanliness. It is on the observance of these rules that the health of 21 crores of peasants depends.

7. The worker who teaches the peasants of his village these rules will increase the life-span of the residents and will have taken a great step towards prevention of diseases. This is the most difficult task of

all because there are few who take interest in it. Even so, it will have to be attended to some day. One cannot go wrong in the performance of this solemn duty. However little the effort, the fruit will be in proportion. He who wishes may start the work and he will find that he is able to improve the health of the village within a year.

[From Gujarati]

Navajivan, 2-11-1919

91. NOTES

ROWLATT PETITION

We publish the Rowlatt petition¹ as a supplement to this issue. It has to be despatched with all possible haste. It would have a good many signatures on it. All men and women living in British India can sign it. Readers of *Navajivan* can help a great deal in getting this done. The petition must contain particulars of the signatory's occupation, name and address in full. It would be better if the name of the volunteer was also entered but those who sign the petition without being approached by a volunteer need not give such a name. After signing the petition, the signatory should send it to the *Navajivan* office; we shall forward it to the proper quarters. We hope that readers of *Navajivan* will give us all help in this matter, and that immediately.

Let it not be thought that the petition will serve no purpose. A petition, by itself, is a kind of education. It can help to focus the attention of the people on its subject. A petition not backed by strength or action, which itself comes to be looked upon as strength or action, comes to nothing, but a petition backed by strength and action serves a most useful purpose. This Rowlatt petition is of the latter type. Behind it is the incomparable power of satyagraha; those who have taken the lead in this matter do not intend to go to sleep after having taken the signatures on it. We hope, therefore, that thousands will work to obtain signatures on it, realizing how valuable it is.

HELP TO THE PUNJAB

We publish elsewhere in this issue an account of the work done in Madras for the relief of the families, now left without support, of those who have been sentenced by the different courts or killed or wounded in the disturbances in the Punjab in April. There being more

¹ Vide Appendix "Rowlatt Petition", 13-11-1919.

rich people in Calcutta and Bombay, a larger fund has been collected in these places. But the credit for the best collection drive among the average middle class goes, more or less, to Madras. The figures for contributions to the fund received from this city up to date are also published in this issue. We are sure that, on reading them, the true Ahmedabadis will feel ashamed of themselves. The contributions received during the last week or two merely prove that we have still to make a real effort about this. On every side we see people discussing the Punjab incidents with a good deal of interest. But we fear there is very little realization of the need to give practical shape to the abundant sympathy for the thousands of helpless people, especially women and children, of this unhappy province. A Committee has been appointed to inquire into the administration of Martial Law in the Punjab, and, when eminent men like the revered Pandit Malaviya, Pandit Motilal Nehru, Swami Shraddhanand and Mr. Andrews are working hard to present before it the case of the people of the Punjab, there is little need for resolutions on the subject or discussions about it. Rather, the poor and the rich, men and women, all may offer what little they can for the relief of the destitute families in the Punjab. No one need hold back at the thought that this would be helping the families of those who had taken part in the disturbances or had received sentences. Even the enemy troops wounded in fighting are nursed carefully. We hope, then, that everyone will embrace the duty, dictated by love, of succouring the innocent families of the guilty.

CENTRE OF PILGRIMAGE

We know from our own experience that there is no exaggeration in the picture of Dakorji given by Dr. Lakshmiprasad. Its condition is such that no person who wants to observe the rules of cleanliness can stay there for 24 hours. No one bothers about people dirtying the banks of the lake. The pilgrims spend their time somehow. As we take no pride in Dakorji, even the station there looks like a building in ruins. In a place visited by hundreds of thousands of people every year, the comforts are of the fewest!

If we look at the inside of the temple, even there we find filth. The priests look dull and inert. A receiver has been appointed for Dakorji's jewellery. How can *Vaishnavas*¹ bear the affairs of a holy place of pilgrimage being taken to a court of law? A religious

¹ Worshippers of Vishnu, the Preserver in the Hindu Trinity

tradition which promotes morality and which has been graced by persons like Narasinha Mehta and Mirabai seems, at present, to have become the enemy of morality.

Who are the people visiting Dakorji? There is no doubt that some of them are simple-hearted and unsuspecting pilgrims, but it is certain that impostors also visit the place to further their own hypocritical designs.

How can this darkness of immorality and filthiness be got rid of? What is the duty of *Vaishnavas*? It is not that Dakorji is the only centre of pilgrimage which is being desecrated. We observe the same condition in Kashi Vishvanath. Were the *Vaishnava* trustees to behave like true heirs of Prahlad, they could kick out the numerous Hiranyakashipus in Dakor. If they would bring lustre to the *Vaishnava* way of life, there are many reforms they could introduce. The real power is with the pilgrims, if they became enlightened enough. That they should be enlightened means, however, that crores of Hindus should understand the profound wisdom of their religion and its essential principles. That hour is far away.

The *Bhatia*¹ battalion has started going there. These, too, could do something, were Ranchhodji² to dwell in their hearts. Their duty is not only to keep order...they should not be content merely with that...but to suppress immorality wherever they find it. For this they can get suitable literature distributed among the people.

Maharajas³ can do much indeed, but we doubt if a copy of *Navajivan* ever finds its way into their hands. *Vaishnava* readers can draw their attention to this state of rot. And *Vaishnava bhaktas*⁴ can explain to them their duty.

The question which should especially exercise swarajists is this: "If we can bring about no improvements in our centres of pilgrimage, what shall we be able to do when we get swaraj?" Surely, no one believes that these places will improve automatically on our getting swaraj. Dr. Lakshmiprasad has suggested that the Dakor Municipality can do something about it. A municipality means the people. Institutions like these have no soul in them. They are like so many

¹ Name of a community in Cutch. Its members used to attend the temple as volunteers to keep order.

² The deity in the Dakorji temple.

³ Heads of *Vaishnava* temples, here used in a special sense

⁴ Devotees

carts. They go the way the driver takes them. The municipality will bring about cleanliness only when people are roused and ask for it. Again, even where there is no municipality elected by the people themselves, unexpectedly some improvement comes about. Improvements do not take place because of a municipality but because of the intelligence and interest of some individuals.

INDIGENOUS SPINNING-WHEEL

We publish under this head an article by Shri Biharilal Kantawala and we draw the attention of every patriotic reader to it. If others exercise their minds and give their views as Shri Biharilal has done, the needed improvements will be made the sooner.

We believe it possible that a spinning-wheel may remain what it is and yet be improved in some ways so that it will spin increased quantities of yarn. We are entirely in agreement with the writer's view that the element of intelligence which the old-style spinning-wheel requires on the part of the spinner should remain in the improved model. We think it worth while to offer the prize donated by Shri Revashankar Mehta.¹ The efforts of those who are trying to increase the quantities of yarn spun will not go entirely in vain. These people should avail themselves of Shri Biharilal's experience. If they bear the suggestion in mind, they will get the results the sooner or abandon unavailing efforts.

We do not agree with the view that cotton cannot be carded by hand. Even today it is so carded in many places and, if the essential features of the present movement come to stay, it will be increasingly carded by hand, for the assumption in this movement is that, by and large, cotton will be used locally where it is produced. For the mills, it may be carded in ginning factories, but to get it carded in such factories for hand-spinning will mean double labour and waste of cotton-seeds.

We welcome the idea of offering prizes for improving the tools so as to make carding easier and discovering simpler means of starching, and we shall certainly secure donations to award prizes to persons doing this. We hope, as well, to be able to announce a definite amount for the prize after obtaining suggestions for a practicable scheme for the purpose. We should say to our readers, however, that they need to interest skilled workers in these matters. People who

¹ *Vide* "Notes", 5-10-1919.

come into contact with them will find it easy to engage their interest in such inventions.

SPINNING-WHEEL MOVEMENT

We invite reader' attention to the report, published in this issue, of the spinning-wheel movement started by the Ahmedabad Swadeshi Sabha. Some important conclusions may easily be drawn from it. First of all, as in Bombay, there is a class of women in Ahmedabad who find it worth their while to spin and earn two or three annas a day. Secondly, a large number of spinning-wheels are being plied in Lunsawad¹; in fact, so far the number has been increasing every month. In Khadia², on the other hand, the number seems to have decreased a little during the third month. Drawing up a list, community-wise, of the women who have bought spinning-wheels will throw some light on this rise and fall in numbers. On a superficial view, it may seem that the residents of Lunsawad, being poorer, have resorted to the spinning-wheel in greater number and on a larger scale. It cannot be denied that there is an element of truth in this conclusion. But it is also worth considering to what extent these figures provide an example of the tendency of the higher-castes, proud of their superior status, to shrink from work generally regarded as mean even when they feel the pinch of poverty, and of the relatively lower communities to welcome suitable work, under the pressure of necessity. Another question, the answer to which will be more instructive, is this: As between the women, on the one hand, in cities like Bombay, Ahmedabad, Surat, etc., and in smaller places, who at present work on the spinning-wheel and, on the other, the thousands and hundreds of thousands of other women of the same class, what percentage earns how much in which work? We request everyone to start immediately collecting figures to find the reply to this instructive question and hope that, meanwhile, all the volunteers and [Swadeshi] Sabhas will oblige us by sending us detailed reports, on the lines of the Ahmedabad report, on the spinning-wheel movements at various places.

¹ Localities in Ahmedabad

² *ibid*

TANNERIES

Tanneries¹ means the shops and establishments of *Chamars*². A correspondent informs us that a good many such firms are coming up in the country these days. He adds that it is not desirable that India's trade should increase in this way because this involves the destruction of our cattle wealth.

In saying this, the correspondent has in his goodness raised the issue of compassion to animals. We do not think that tanneries will mean more destruction. There is no reason to believe that increase in the number of tanneries will mean destruction of cattle in greater numbers. In our view, the use of hide from cattle dying in the natural course is no sin. The *Chamar's* profession is an essential one. Man cannot do without shoes. In agriculture, hide is needed at every turn. The countless scoops for drawing water are made of hide. Earnings through this occupation amount to lakhs.

At present this occupation is in the hands of *Chamars* and *Mochis*³. We should see to it that it does not pass on to firms and leave these starving.

If we do not wake up betimes, the result will be as we have feared. We have never been careful of the interests of our artisans. Looking upon them as dependent on other classes, we have despised them and done the country harm. We treated skilled work as low and exalted clerical work, and thus invited slavery for ourselves. We looked upon masons, shoe-makers, carpenters, blacksmiths and barbers as inferior to us and kept them suppressed. From their trades and their homes we have taken away all courtesy, learning, decency and culture. In the result, their life has become dull and they themselves do not think highly of it. Hence, if they receive school education, they give up their profession; the tailor, likewise, will have nothing to do with the needle; the weaver swears at the loom; as for the scavenger, is it ever possible that, after being educated, he will clean latrines? If we had not despised professions which required one to use one's hands and feet, we would not have fallen into this unhappy state and graduates would have felt no shame in working even as scavengers.

¹ Gandhiji uses the English word.

² A community of tanners

³ A community of shoe-makers

About compassion to animals, too, we have strange notions. Compassion should begin with our own species, that is, with mankind; instead, we believe that it means no more than refusing to kill an animal with a knife. It is needful, of course, to have compassion towards animals, but it is equally needful to have it towards human beings; we should remember, moreover, not to be deceived by anything said under pretext of compassion towards animals. There is no justice or truth in speaking of the use of hide from dead animals as “skinning a live animal”.

[From Gujarati]

Navajivan, 2-11-1919

92. MESSAGE TO CHRISTIANS¹

DELHI,

[Before *November 3, 1919*]

- [1st.] All Christians, leaders and all, must begin to live more like Jesus.
- 2nd. You must practise your Christianity without adulterating it or toning it down.
- 3rd. You must lay greater emphasis upon your central principle Love.
- 4th. You must study more sympathetically non-Christian religions and try to discover the good in them.

From a photostat of the typewritten letter : S.N. 6974

¹ Rev. E. Stanley Jones, a Christian missionary, appears to have interviewed Gandhiji at Delhi *prior* to November 3, on which date he sent Gandhiji a copy of Moffatt's translation of some verses from the 13th Chapter of *1 Corinthians*. The text of Gandhiji's message is extracted from a letter dated November 7 in which Rev. Jones wrote to Gandhiji: "When I had a talk with you the other day and asked you what we might do to make Christianity naturalized and a part of the national life of India, you replied: [Here followed the message.] I would like to ask permission of you to use the above statements. I am sure they would be a means of blessing to us Christians to have this message from you, but I do not want to use it without your permission. . . ."

93. NOTE OF INTERVIEW ON SOUTH AFRICA¹

November 3, 1919

He [Gandhiji] said that he was very sorry that the Union Government were unwilling to allow representatives from India to sit upon the Commission. He said that he was going to do what I had asked him to do in my letter, namely, not to raise an agitation himself on the subject, and to do all he could to repress any agitation raised by others. He told me that he had been interviewed during the last day or two, and he had said that he regarded the arrangement made as second best.

I asked him whether he had any strong views on the point, whether the terms of reference to the Commission ought to be enlarged beyond trading rights, and pointed out to him that the recent effort of the Indians to get an enquiry had resulted in what might be regarded as a restriction of the existing rights. He said that he felt strongly that the enquiry ought to extend to the Law of 1885, and considered that an extension in this direction could not possibly result in a restriction of the existing rights.

I asked him his views on the subject of inter-provincial emigration. He said:

I would not ask for this, for I know that we shall not get it. Freedom of emigration between the Provinces would mean freedom to migrate from the Transvaal into the Orange Free State. The Orange Free State has always prohibited the entry of Indians, and there is hardly any Indian in the whole State.

I further asked him what he felt about movement from one Province to another with the intention of returning. A man might, for instance, want to attend the funeral of a relative living over the border. He said:

This is a very small matter, and I think we can rely upon General Smuts to deal with it by executive order.

No legislation, he said, would be required.

He said he was starting for Amritsar (November 3rd), but would consider the question of the enlargement of the terms of reference very carefully, and would let me have his considered views. He said:

I know the South African people, and I fully realize the difficulties which exist. I do not want to fall into the error of asking for what is unwise and what we know we shall not get.

¹ This is evidently Sir George Barnes' report of the interview Gandhiji had had with him in connection with the South African Commission; *vide* "Letter to Sir George Barnes", 7-11-1919.

He asked me who was to be the Indian representative before the Commission. I told him that the Union Government had not yet consented to any Indian, but that both the Viceroy and the Secretary of State were entirely at one in wishing for an Indian representative and had urged that one should be received. He asked me whether it was true that Mr. Sastri's name had been suggested by the Viceroy and the Secretary of State. I told him that this was true. He said:

I do not think a better selection could possibly have been made.

Mr. Gandhi said that he hoped that I would send for him at any time I thought he would be useful, and said that he was quite willing to leave Amritsar or Lahore, wherever he was, to give help over the S. African question.

India Office : Judicial & Public Records : 6140/19

94. LETTER TO JIVANLAL B. VYAS

[DELHI,]

November 3, 1919

One rupee as commission for a maund of cloth. If desired, a salary may also be paid. Yarn must be hand-spun only.

From the Gujarati original in Gandhiji's hand : S.N. 6803

95. PUNJAB LETTER

DELHI,

Monday, Kartak Sud 8² [November 3, 1919]

The affection that I am receiving from men and women here in Lahore puts me to shame, while at the same time the unique faith of India and the frankness and generosity of our people enchant me. Young and old continue to come all day to have *darshan*³ of me. It is impossible for me to go out anywhere alone. As soon as the people catch sight of me, they crowd round. I simply cannot check them. I know of nothing in me which may make me worthy of giving *darshan*. Man's instinctive urge to worship is admirable. But that people should crowd round to have *darshan* of a mere servant is

¹ The draft reply was scribbled on a letter dated October 29 from the addressee, in which he had said that if they were permitted to buy yarn packed in boxes and get it woven, they could get yarn of excellent quality on order.

² This should be 10

³ Sight of a person, place or thing considered holy

intolerable to me. If I keep on giving *darshan*, my work will suffer. I do not believe that people profit in any way by having *darshan*. The condition of him who gives it is even worse. On one occasion, a friend of mine asked me, "Are you sure that the people's adulation does not make you vain?" He asked the question in all sincerity. What could I reply? I said, "God forbid!" This friend was a prominent Muslim. However, it is no ordinary responsibility which rests on him who gives *darshan*. No man is great enough to give it. I can say truthfully that this only embarrasses me and, if I could put a stop to this practice without hurting people's feelings, I would do so immediately. I have not yet found it possible to do this. I have failed either because my courage is inadequate or my judgment is yet clouded or, perhaps, my principle of non-violence does not allow me to hurt people's feelings. My opinion is that I suffer from both the defects and also that I have a strong inclination to non-violence. I do indeed make every effort to extricate myself from this dilemma. At present, even when people come for *darshan*, I continue to write and do other work. Even as I write this, people come and go but I do not interrupt my work. I salute them and go on with my writing.

It is perfectly clear to me that this is the miracle wrought by even a small measure of devoting to truth and service. I cannot claim that I always conduct myself, in thought, word and deed, according to the truth as I know it. Nor can I say that I always follow the principle of service as I understand it. My only claim is that I am making a prodigious effort to live up to these two principles. And the incomparable love that I have received has made it clear to me that they in whom truth and the spirit of service are manifested in their fulness will assuredly sway the hearts of men and so accomplish their chosen task. I have also come to realize that, in these difficult times, the observance of the principles of truth, service and compassion gives infinite peace to men.

PREPARATIONS FOR COMMITTEE

Having met the Lt.-Governor and the Dy. Commissioner in Lahore, I proceeded to Delhi together with Mr. Andrews as a meeting of the Committee had been fixed for the 29th in Delhi. There Mr. Andrews and I met Lord Hunter and had interviews with local officers. All appeared to be keen that the real facts should come to light. The questionnaire which has been issued by the Committee is also so framed as to facilitate the disclosure of what-ever information the

various parties possess. Two things yet remain, viz., the release of the leaders and the appointment of a judge from outside the Punjab. Efforts are going on towards this end.

PANDIT MALAVIYA

Pandit Malaviya arrived from Kashi on Sunday. He has already sent a telegram to the Lt.-Governor about these two points. Mr. C.R. Das arrived on Monday and will stay with Panditji. The only cause for regret at this juncture is that Pandit Motilal Nehru is taken ill. He has worked hard for the Punjab affair. There must be few who have collected as much information as he. At the moment he is confined to bed, but it is hoped that he will recover in a week or so. He has had an attack of asthma.

DELHI MEETING

A large meeting was convened in Delhi on Saturday. The purpose of the meeting was to meet me and also to collect money to erect a hall in memory of those who were killed in the firing in April. The meeting was held in the open air but the crowd was so dense that people were constantly falling on one another. I was in the chair. There was loud noise. I felt that in these conditions the meeting could not be conducted at all. No speeches could be audible in this tumult. I, therefore, asked the people to disperse and suggested that volunteers should be employed, the people should be cautioned and instructed in advance in the rules for conducting meetings. On the following day, Sunday, the meeting was called again and the same crowds sat quietly for about two and a half hours. They listened attentively to all the speeches.¹ The collection was also good. Hundreds either gave small amounts in cash or promised contributions. I give all these details here because the further we penetrate into the common and poorer sections of society, the larger will be the crowds. We ought to develop the capacity so to conduct these meetings that quiet is maintained. If suitable arrangements are made in advance, if the volunteers are active and the people are properly instructed, it will be possible to maintain quiet without much effort.

FIRST OPEN SESSION

The first open session of the Committee is fixed for today (Monday)². As I am writing this, it has yet to take place. Today

¹ No separate report of the speeches is available.

² November 3

evidence is to be given by Mr. Barron, Chief Commissioner of Delhi Province. It is the general impression that if this alert and worthy Commissioner had not been present last April, the results would have been even more terrible. Witnesses from outside include Swami Shraddhanand, Hakim Ajmal Khan, Dr. Ansari, Dr. Abdur Rehman, Shri Krishnalal Ambalal Desai and others. Shri Krishnalal is the son of the late Diwan Bahadur Ambalalbai. He carries on business in these parts.

SPINNING-WHEEL

To the women who came to visit me in Lahore I spoke at great length about the spinning-wheel, and also begged yarn from them. Hundreds of women came to see me and there was rarely one among them who said she did not know spinning. As soon as I asked for yarn, they began to bring it to me and many of them promised to take up spinning again. There is not much difference between the Punjab spinning-wheel and the old spinning-wheel of Gujarat. The more I discover the similarity in the spinning-wheels and spinning processes all over the country, the more I am convinced that India was one nation in the past and that the people were conscious of their being one nation. So far I have met few men or women who see any harm in spinning.

TORNADO IN EAST BENGAL

Mr. C.R. Das informs us that there has been a violent tornado in Bengal which has caused serious damage in nearly three-quarters of the Province. Hundreds have been carried away in floods, thousands have been rendered homeless. Many have been reduced to a state of destitution. Committees have been working to render assistance to them. Mr. Das has collected Rs. 2 lakhs and Rs. 3 lakhs more are wanted. He and Sir Rabindranath Tagore have also issued an appeal and I hope that wealthy men from the Bombay Presidency will respond to it. I would suggest that we send a very reliable person on behalf of the Bombay Presidency and organize the relief measures through him. If one of the wealthy persons from there would undertake this work, he could both help the local committee and obtain first-hand information. At the time of the famine in 1956,¹ the people of America sent shiploads of grain to India and even sent their own representatives to see to its distribution.

¹ Year according to the Vikram era, corresponding to 1900 A.D.

PRESIDENT OF MUSLIM LEAGUE

We were afraid that the Muslim League may not meet in Amritsar this time. Not only has this apprehension been removed, but even the president has been elected. The well-known Hakim Ajmal Khan of Delhi has been unanimously elected by the Lucknow Committee. Hakimji's family has lived in Delhi for three generations. It is both an old and a distinguished family. Hakimji gives medicine gratis to the poor. He is known to be such an expert in his profession that even princes invite him for their treatment. He is greatly interested in both the Unani and Ayurvedic systems of medicine. During Lord Hardinge's regime, he invited Hakimji to lay the foundation stone of a college¹ which would impart instruction in both these systems. This college has been built on a seven-and-a-half acre plot of land. It is two miles from Delhi, and the building is nearly complete. It contains accommodation for 120 patients. The Western system of medicine also finds a place there. Hakimji plans to introduce a certain amount of instruction in Western surgery. He holds Hindus and Muslims in equal regard and the two communities pay him the same respect. His political views are similar to those of the Congress. His election should be welcomed by Hindus and Muslims alike.

[From Gujarati]

Navajivan, 9-11-1919

96. *SPEECH AT WOMEN'S MEETING, AMRITSAR*²

November 4, 1919

SISTERS,

Amritsar has become a place of pilgrimage not only for me but for every Indian. No penance will suffice for the evil that has been wrought by our hand in Amritsar. It is true that a large number of our people were killed in Jallianwala Bagh. But we ought to have maintained peace even if everyone present had been killed. It is not right, in my opinion, to take blood for blood. Our religion teaches us not to inflict pain on anyone. I regard Amritsar as a place of pilgrimage because our brethren here have recently suffered much. The Government had detained me at Bombay, and I had been

¹ The Tibbia College

² The meeting was held at the house of Lala Girdhari Lal, a Congress leader of Amritsar.

wondering when I would have my freedom and be able to visit Amritsar. Now, having been freed, I have had the good fortune of meeting you. I will have peace only when I have done the work that I ought to do. You mothers, who must have had either a son, a brother or other relative killed or imprisoned and for whom you sorrow, should not regard it as an infliction. For we shall not become free of pain so long as we have not accustomed ourselves to putting up with hardships. We will have to endure much for the good of the country. In the late War in Europe millions had to sacrifice their lives for the sake of their country's freedom. India cannot become free if we are not ready to endure hardships so long as we live. The joy of freedom is only for those who are ready to face death. In 1896-97 hundreds of thousands died of plague in the Punjab. No one treated the Punjab as a place of pilgrimage then. Now Amritsar and various other places in the Punjab have become centres of pilgrimage because the people here have endured hardships for the good of the country. Being situated in the north, the Punjab is like the crown of India. The Punjabis, therefore, should not give up the use of swadeshi cloth, even if the other provinces do so. The Punjabi brethren I have been meeting in Bombay told me that the women in the Punjab ply the spinning-wheel. It is a matter of joy. But I shall be fully satisfied only when all the men in the Punjab use cloth made from Punjab's yarn. If you cannot find cloth made in your province, get some from another province, but do not wear foreign cloth even if you had to go about naked. Poverty in India is increasing because of our not using swadeshi goods. Tens of millions of our countrymen suffer from want of food and clothing. To relieve their suffering we must make the country prosperous by using swadeshi goods. It is my appeal to all mothers and sisters of the Punjab that they should all use cloth made in the Punjab. We look more graceful if we wear swadeshi instead of foreign cloth. I beg of my Punjabi brethren the boon that they take a vow to spin. I shall feel immensely grateful if you grant me this boon.

[From Hindi]

Mahatma Gandhi

97. LETTER TO ESTHER FAERING

LAHORE,

[After November 4, 1919]¹

MY DEAR CHILD,

I have your sweet letters. But you will not expect regular replies from me for the time being. I am having rich experiences of life. When you render yourself a willing instrument of service, inexpressible joy is the reward. But more later or when we meet.

With love,

Yours,

BAPU

From a photostat of the original in N.A.I.; also *My Dear Child*, p. 43

98. LETTER TO SHANKERLAL BANKER

LAHORE,

[After November 5, 1919]²

DEAR SHANKERLAL,

I have your letter. Umar has left today. At the moment I am tied down here and cannot say when I shall be able to come. We shall attend to the question of Hindi only when I come. The struggle may be an intense one. Do you sometimes go to the Ashram? Chhotalal has written a long letter. I wish you to read it.

All that you write about the mill workers is correct. May you have the capacity to impart to them real training.

Vandemataram from

MOHANDAS

From a copy of the Gujarati : S. N. 32706

¹ This letter appears to have been written after Gandhiji's visit to Amritsar in November, where the people greeted him with great affection.

² From the contents. Gandhiji was in Lahore from November 5 to November 16 and then again from December 12 to December 22, 1919.

99. TELEGRAM TO REGISTRAR, HIGH COURT, BOMBAY

[LAHORE,
November 7, 1919]

LETTER 31ST ULTIMO¹ JUST RECEIVED LAHORE. REGRET
UNSATISFACTORY. AM REFERRING MATTER TO COUNSEL.²
HOPEADDRESS ON RECEIPT COUNSEL'S OPINION.

The Bombay Law Reporter, Vol. XXII, 1920, p. 371

100. LETTER TO SIR GEORGE BARNES

2, MOZANG ROAD,
LAHORE,
[November 7, 1919]

TO

THE HON'BLE SIR GEORGE BARNES, K.C.B.
MEMBER VICEROY'S EXECUTIVE COUNCIL
DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE AND INDUSTRY
[DELHI]

With reference to our conversation,³ I enclose herewith my note as to the minimum to be included in the reference to the forthcoming South African Commission.

¹The letter ran as follows: "I am directed to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 22nd instant, and to inform you that the Hon'ble the Chief Justice regrets that he cannot regard your explanation as satisfactory. However, His Lordship is willing to concede that you were unaware that you were exceeding the privilege of a journalist provided that you publish in the next issue of *Young India* an apology in the accompanying form."

The apology was worded thus: "Whereas on th 6th August 1919, we published in *Young India* a private letter written by Mr. Kennedy, District Judge of Ahmedabad, to the Registrar of the High Court of Justice at Bombay, and whereas on the same date we also published certain comments on the said letter and whereas it has been pointed out to us that pending certain proceedings in the said High Court in connection with the said letter, we were not justified in publishing the said letter or in commenting thereon. Now we do hereby express our regret and apologise to the Hon'ble the Chief Justice and Judges of the said High Court for the publication of the said letter and the comments thereon." For Gandhiji's reaction to the form of the apology, *vide* "Letter to Registrar, High Court, Bombay", 11-12-1919.

² Gandhiji sought Vallabhbhai Patel's advice. On November 16, Mahadev Desai wired to Gandhiji at Lahore: "Saw Vallabhbhai. He thinks publication letter within rights. However case being subjudice clearly contempt of court."

³ *Vide* "Note of Interview on South Africa", 3-11-1919.

It is assumed for the purpose of this note that General Smuts contemplates referring to the Commission the question of trading rights of Indians in the Transvaal only.

If so, it will not in any way settle the most urgent questions.

The new Act deals with and adversely affects the rights of owning land and trading. It is therefore suggested that the question of trading and owning land, i.e., the laws of 1885 and the Townships Act and the Gold Law in so far as the latter two affect the rights of Indians to own land and to trade within the townships or the Gold areas be referred to the Commission.

It should be clearly understood as between the Union Government and the Government of India that the new Act in so far as it diminishes existing rights should be revised and that the findings of the Commission should not in any way restrict existing rights. The Commission is likely to prove injurious to the existing rights, small as they are, if the above two conditions are not fulfilled. My proposal should be taken and treated as a whole or rejected altogether.

In making the proposal, I am going against the most moderate public opinion here and against the demands made by the South Africa Indians' Conference recently held at Johannesburg.

Public opinion here as expressed by *The Times of India* requires the restoration of trading rights and ownership of land throughout the Union and the inter-provincial migration. This means entry into the Orange Free State and the rights to trade and own land there. In the present state of public feeling this may be difficult for General Smuts to achieve even if he himself is willing.

The demand of the Conference is wider still and includes the restoration of the political status and the abolition of all legal disabilities. Though this and this alone must be the goal to be aimed at, I recognize that it is not practical politics to strive for it as an immediate aim.

But, if neither the Indian demand nor the lesser one expressed by *The Times of India* is to be urged, it must be clearly understood that there should be no diminution of the existing status.

The Union Government having already opened the question of trade and ownership of property in the Transvaal, through the Select Committee and then the recent legislation, the Commission can well be asked to entertain both these questions without ruffling the prejudices of the white population. It should be remembered that, at the time of

the passage of the recent Act, Indians in the Transvaal had the right to Europeans and could under the existing law become receive licenses to trade practically on the same footing as the virtual owners of land by taking mortgages or forming limited liability companies. I contemplate statutory recognition of the right to trade under general sanitary control and the direct ownership of land in the Transvaal. This is not claiming much or more than they have virtually enjoyed.

So far regarding the reference.

There is the unsatisfactory administration of the Immigrant's Restriction Act which can be improved by diplomatic action without troubling the Commission. The points requiring attention are:

(1) The movement of the Indian settler from one province to another not for residing but for ceremonial or business visits or for mere passage to the province of domicile. Full facilities without fee should be granted.

(2) The entry of fresh Indians for supplying the needs of the resident population should be placed on a better and more liberal basis.

(3) There should be greater liberality in permitting plural wives to visit their husbands without creating any legal rights for them or their issue.

(4) Restrictions on passports from India or from the Union require complete overhauling whether regarding identification or otherwise.

(5) Men and women of status and students should have freedom to travel to South Africa.

These matters, if they cannot be dealt with diplomatically, should be included in the reference to the forthcoming Commission.

M. K. GANDHI

India Office : Judicial and Public Records : 6140/19

101. LETTER TO MATHURADAS TRIKUMJI

LAHORE,

Friday [On or after November 7, 1919]¹

CHI. MATHURADAS,

I had received your letter. About Khilafat you will know my views fully from *Navajivan*.

What are you doing about Swadeshi? Arrange to repair all the available charkhas. What about the [spinning-] classes there? What is happening at Nara-Narayana? I have not yet sent you the letters regarding Swadeshi because the solution of some of the problems lies there. If the arrangement has to be made at the Ashram, I think it can be done only through the Ashram. Still, I am considering what to do.

In the meantime, I want you to do the work of the Swadeshi Sabha. I think good works can be done if you devote yourself to it. It will be good if you and Umar together can carry forward the activities of the Sabha.

Blessings from

BAPU

[PS.]

Are you planning to come at the time of the Congress session²?

From the Gujarati original: Pyarelal Papers. Nehru Memorial Museum Library. Courtesy: Beladevi Nayyar and Dr. Sushila Nayyar

102. SOUTH AFRICA

The news about South Africa appearing in the papers is both startling and distressing. We were led by Mr. Montagu's words to believe that the Commission on the rights of Indians, which is to be appointed in South Africa, would have some members to represent us. Mr. Montagu now informs us that his words were misunderstood and

¹ The year has been inferred from the contents. The letter appears to have been written about the same time as the letter to the addressee dated November 1, 1919. The Friday following fell on November 7. Gandhiji's notes on Khilafat appeared in *Navajivan*, 9-11-1919 and 7-12-1919; vide "Notes", Before 12-11-1919 and "Punjab Letter", About 1-12-1919.

² Scheduled to be held from December 29, 1919 to January 1, 1920

that no one will be appointed on the Commission to represent India. However, Sir Benjamin Robertson will be accompanied by a non-official and the two will present our case. This is disappointing news for us. We think General Smuts did not have his way and it did not become possible to include anyone from India. So we have had to telegraph¹ Mr. Montagu to set the matter right. But we shall not succeed, through agitation, in getting our men appointed on the Commission. Mr. Montagu can insist on justice being done to us, but it is the South African Government alone which can decide the manner of doing it. Hence, we cannot compel it to appoint anybody from here on its Commission. Even then, if an able man like Mr. Shastriar is appointed by the Government, he and Sir Benjamin Robertson together will be able to secure justice.

The more startling news which we have received is that the Commission will investigate only the issue of trading licences. Such a limited inquiry will not serve the purpose. We shall have to carry on a strong agitation about this. The Commission should be given more powers. The Indians in South Africa have demanded that the inquiry should cover all their rights. We think it will be difficult to bring this about. But we can certainly demand that the inquiry should cover rights of trading and ownership of land; these are our minimum rights. What we have to be more vigilant about is lest the Commission should be empowered to recommend deprivation of the existing rights. It should have no power to recommend abrogation of any of the rights which existed at the time of the passing of the new law. Indians have now almost stopped emigrating to South Africa. The system of indentured labour having been discontinued, the resulting increase in the Indian population there has also stopped. Hence the only question that remains is that of the rights of Indians settled there. They must be allowed to trade honestly and to acquire and dispose of land. There is no room for difference of opinion on this point. The whites of South Africa cannot keep the Indians there merely as slaves or coolies.

Fortunately, the good Mr. Andrews has come forward to help our brethren and is proceeding there. The service he has rendered it is impossible to estimate. Wherever he hears the cry of Indians in distress, he runs to their help. Fiji,, Ceylon and the Punjab bear witness

¹ The telegram is not available.

to this. In South Africa, he is well known both to the whites and the Indians. And so his going there will inspire courage in our brethren and give us hope that justice will be done.

[From Gujarati]

Navajivan, 9-11-1919

103. FIJI

Only a few days ago it was feared that our indentured brothers and sisters in Fiji would not be released, even at the end of the current years, from their slavery. The Fiji legislature has passed a resolution to the effect that the indenture of the Indian labourers will be terminated in August. We cannot tolerate for a single moment a practice that does not safeguard the modesty of our women. Had the good Mr. Andrews not visited Fiji and brought this evil to our notice, we should still be in the dark about it. Fortunately, fresh news has arrived removing our fear of the prolongation of this slavery and the Indian government has been informed that those firms which are unable to introduce the reforms suggested by Mr. Andrews will terminate the indentures by the 1st January. On the other hand, those firms which are prepared to introduce these reforms will not terminate the indentures without compensation.

The reader will probably fail to follow this complicated point. Under a Fiji law, many whites hold indentured Indian labourers. These labourers are under contract to serve for a period of five years. Emigration of fresh indentured labourers stopped in 1917, but, after Mr. Andrews report, we demanded that even those serving terms of indenture should be released before the expiry of the five-year term. A contract which is based on immorality or which leads to immorality must be terminated and there can be no question of paying compensation for terminating it. But the Fiji planters are not prepared to forgo any part of their legal rights. Hence the question of compensation which I have referred to above. It is our bounden duty to secure the release of the Indian labourers even by paying this compensation. The question is merely that of paying £20,000 at the most. I hope that the Government of India will pay this amount and get them released soon. Congratulations on this are due to Sir George Barnes, the Secretary of the Department. Had he not taken a firm stand, the happy results we can expect now would not have been

possible. What shall I say about Mr. Andrews? In what way may I congratulate him? He has dedicated his whole life to us. He finds his happiness in the service of India. The Fiji Indians will bless him from the depths of their being.

[From Gujarati]

Navajivan, 9-11-1919

104. NOTES

KHILAFAT AND PEACE CELEBRATIONS

Friends have asked me what we should do during the forthcoming Peace Celebrations. I know that, in some of the meetings held on Khilafat Day, a resolution was passed to the effect that, if the Khilafat problem was not solved to their satisfaction, Muslims would not be able to take part in these celebrations since Indians would, in those circumstances, have no peace of mind. So long as this important problem remains unsolved and there is a fear that Muslim sentiment would be hurt, and so long as our Muslim brethren suffer in suspense and are worried, so long Hindus, Parsis, Christians, Jews and all others for whom India is their land of birth or adoption, can hardly take part in the forthcoming Peace Celebrations. I am bold enough even to imagine. His Excellency the Viceroy informing the Ministers of the King-emperor that, while the Khilafat problem remains unsolved, Indians would not be able to take part in the Peace Celebrations, and I am confident that before inviting us to join the celebrations the Ministers would accept the need for finding an honourable solution and announcing it.

[From Gujarati]

Navajivan, 9-11-1919

105. GIST OF LETTER TO LT. GOVERNOR, PUNJAB¹

[LAHORE,
Before November 12, 1919]

Firstly the right of public body or bodies to lead evidence should be definitely recognized and such bodies as well as the parties themselves should be allowed to be represented by counsel who should be permitted to help in the elucidation of facts by cross-examination. Secondly, some at any rate of the more prominent leaders, now in jail, should be released, if necessary on adequate security alike with a view to giving their own evidence from a position of comparative freedom and to their leading evidence on the non-official side and inspiring confidence in the people by their presence.

Thirdly, the tribunal already appointed to revise sentences of summary courts should be so reconstituted and should follow such a procedure as to command public confidence.²

The Leader, 14-11-1919

106. LETTER TO H.S.L. POLAK

LAHORE,
November 12, 1919

MY DEAR HENRY,

I have your letters. Owing to my wanderings in the Punjab, I have not been able to write to you.

In my opinion, your attitude regarding the S.A. affairs and the committee is quite correct. I shall speak to Dr. Mehta about it when he returns. You may have my name if it is of my use to your committee. I am asking Chhotalal to send you copies of my letters to Sir George

¹ The report stated *inter alia*: "Some time ago the Congress Sub-committee requested the Government to concede three things in connection with the enquiry." That Gandhiji wrote a letter on the above lines is indicated in the "Punjab Letter", 17-11-1919.

² The report stated *inter alia*: "Some time ago the Congress Sub-committee requested the Government to concede three things in connection with the enquiry." That Gandhiji wrote a letter on the above lines is indicated in the "Punjab Letter", 17-11-1919.

Barnes. I had a long interview with him yesterday. I met also Sir Benjamin Robertson.

Regarding Mrs. Sorabji, she has been hasty and I have been continuously writing to her. Both Palanji and Rustomji have asked me not to raise any subscriptions.¹ If Palanji does not assist, she can easily be assisted. However, I shall ask Jehangir to pay what you have sent. Why did you not send the money directly to me in July? Having sent it to Jehangir, why did you not even advise me?

The High Court has issued a rule nisi to show cause why I should not be committed for contempt for the publication of the Ahmedabad judge's letter to the Registrar regarding the satyagrahi lawyers. They asked me to apologize. I cannot see my way to do [ing] so. You need not therefore be surprised if you find me imprisoned.

With love to you all,

Yours,

BHAI

From the original : Gandhi-Polak Correspondence. Courtesy : National Archives of India

107. TELEGRAM TO RAOJIBHAI MEHTA

RADHANPUR,

November 13, 1919

RAOJIBHAI JAGJIVANDAS

24, OLD MODIKHANA

BOMBAY

TERMS SETTLED. HIS HIGHNESS DESIRES SEEING YOU 13TH AND 15TH DECEMBER. CAN YOU COME POSTING?

Bombay Secret Abstracts, 1919

¹ *Vide* also "Letter to Narahari Parikh", After 25-1-1920

108. LETTER TO P.S. TO LT.-GOVERNOR, PUNJAB

LAHORE,

November 15, 1919

Will you please tell His Honour that I informed the members of the Congress Sub-committee yesterday that he had kindly consented to consider the principle advanced by the Sub-committee to the extent that six leaders could be released on parole for the day or days they might actually be giving evidence before the Disorders Inquiry Committee. Members admitted that the concession satisfied the principle just barely, but was of no practical value if, no other days, they were not permitted, as prisoners in custody, to attend the Committee meetings in order to instruct counsel in matters specially within their knowledge. This would mean the attendance of say, Drs. Kitchlew and Satyapal in custody during the Amritsar hearing generally and their release on parole on the day or days they might be examined. I felt that the point raised was clear and covered by Lord Hunter's letter¹ to Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya, but Mr. Andrews offered to have it definitely cleared. Deep, therefore, was the disappointment when he returned to say that His Honour would not allow leaders to attend even in the manner suggested. The Congress Sub-committee had, therefore, no course left open to it but to adhere to its decision not to appear before Lord Hunter's Committee.²

I cannot help expressing my great regret that His Honour should have declined to grant what an ordinary criminal could claim as a matter of right.

The Leader, 19-11-1919

¹ For this letter, *vide* Appendix "Letter fro Secretary, Hunter Committee, to Malaviya", 19-11-1919.

² For the Congress Sub-committee's Statement in this regard, *vide* "Statement on the Punjab by Congress Enquiry Committee", 17-11-1919.

109. SPEECH AT FAREWELL TO ANDREWS¹

LAHORE,

November 15, 1919

He [Gandhiji] said that it was not possible for him to say much about Mr. Andrews who was like a brother to him. The sacred bond between them prevented him from giving expression to his feelings on that occasion. He would, however, like to say one thing: Mr. Andrews, a true Englishman that he was, had given his whole life to the cause of India and through his actions and his love for India seemed to say to us: "You may feel you are oppressed by my countrymen, but do not think ill of them; look at me." If the audience wanted to show their regard for Mr. Andrews, they should copy his love and he pleaded not for a blind love but for an enlightened love, the same that was shown by Bhakta Prahlad in his dealing with his own father. The lesson that Mr. Andrews' life taught them was that though we would and must resent and resist injustice and oppression wherever we found them, we were to bear no ill will towards the wrongdoer. They were placed by the Government in a most difficult position. They had made it impossible for them, by their refusal to release leaders, to co-operate with Lord Hunter's Committee, as they had hoped to do. In spite, however, of the imprudent action of the Government, whilst they would not yield to it, they would not be angry. Mr. Andrews had done more for India than many Indians. He had not spared his countrymen, but he did not on that account love them the less, and so could they, without harbouring ill will against Englishmen or the Government, go on fighting for the sake of justice and their honour.²

Young India, 26-11-1919

¹ *Young India* prefaced authorized versions of Gandhiji's and Andrews' speeches as follows: "A most impressive and touching function was the meeting held at Lahore in the Bradlaugh Hall on the 15th instant to bid farewell to Mr. Andrews who was leaving for South Africa . . . Mr. Gandhi, on being called upon to propose the resolution recording grateful appreciation of Mr. Andrews' very valuable services rendered to the Punjab in its hour of distress, addressed the meeting in Hindi." Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya presided. Among those who attended the meeting were Pandit Motilal Nehru and C.R. Das.

² Gandhiji then moved the following resolution: "This meeting of the citizens of Lahore hereby places on record its grateful appreciation of the very valuable services rendered to the Punjab in its hour of distress by Mr. C.F. Andrews and wishes him success in his humanitarian mission to South Africa." C.R. Das supported the resolution.

110. PUNJAB LETTER

LAHORE,

Monday, Kartak Vad 11¹ [November 17, 1919]

AMRITSAR'S LOVE

From Delhi, I went to Amritsar with Mr. Andrews. What I experienced there was truly unique. It was well-nigh impossible to make our way through the crowds. The entire area outside the station was packed with the citizens of Amritsar. Their cheers and shouts almost overwhelmed me. This huge procession proceeded towards the city. The people filled the car with flowers. I was taken to the mosque, which was thronged with Hindus and Muslims. With great difficulty I made my way from the mosque back to the car, and it was a long time before it reached the Golden Temple of the Sikhs. They call this temple the Durbar Sahib. Its dome and some other parts are gilt and there is a large lake by its side. The adjoining area is also fairly extensive. I found it an impossible feat to cross this open space and reach the main temple. Thousands stood on all sides. There was no dearth of women. I saw them boldly joining this thick crowd. Yet the men were conducting themselves with the utmost courtesy and restraint. This made me particularly happy. This should not, of course, be any special cause for joy. But I know only too well that this is not the usual state of affairs in India. It is my experience that in such crowds restraint is not always observed. We have read that it is disappearing even from the pilgrim bands which proceed to Dakor. Consequently, I was greatly pleased to see it at Durbar Sahib and I should very much like to see it at every place.

I took it upon myself, in this multitude, to teach discipline for a while. Just as the crowd surged forward I would stop, ask the men and women to be seated and remain so until I reached the Durbar Sahib. As long as I stood before them, they remained sitting, but the minute I began to walk, all would suddenly stand up and try to follow me. I made five or six such attempts. I even walked backwards, but the people could not control themselves. Finally, I decided to go ahead and, by the end of about an hour, I had covered the distance of a few

¹ This should be 10.

steps. This was obstinacy on the people's parts. They could not repress their affection. Those who had suffered much washed away their grief with the waters of love.

But what about me? How much of this did I deserve? Those who showered their love were of course blessed, but what about the one on whom it was showered? Many women whose relatives were in jail expected, perhaps, that they would be released through my efforts. But who was I to secure their release? All I can say is that I offer all this love at the feet of the Lord in whose name I serve.

When I had paid my respects at the shrine, I was presented with a scarf and turban; I tied the turban over my cap and put the scarf round my neck. It was no less difficult to go out of the temple than it had been to enter it. This going and coming in a procession took five hours. Yet the people were not satisfied. I was taken to Lala Girdhari Lal's. Thousands remained round the house till six in the evening and I had repeatedly to go out to meet them. Both men and women came. The people of Amritsar say that never before had women come out in such large numbers. They refused to disperse without *upadesh*¹ "Let us have *upadesh*" is a phrase in common use here. I tried to comfort the women in their sorrow and encouraged them to abandon fear. I requested them not to grieve for those who were in jail and told them that, as long as we did not have thousands of Indians courting the hardships of jail deliberately, we could not make progress. I then advised them to use only swadeshi and suggested that they should spin every day, for some time at least, as a religious duty.

FLOOD OF ENERGY

These were solemn scenes. Just as the Americans get energy from the Niagara Falls for their use, so can we also make use of the energy which exists at Amritsar and other places. Today this energy flows to waste like that of a waterfall. But it can be turned to valuable use. Patriotic pride has been awakened in the hearts of thousands of men and women. They realize, too, that this patriotism should be informed with the spirit of dharma. They have time, but no discipline, no knowledge, nor have they the zeal and diligence which will endure. Even more than reading and writing, they require the knowledge that touches the heart and the diligence that such knowledge brings. In real fact, however, there is a vast gap between the

¹ Spiritual counsel or advice

educated and the people generally regarded as illiterate. There were educated people, too, in this procession. They also were proud of their country. But their way of life differs from that of the illiterate and they believe that, until the latter are given education, the country can make no progress. But, for the uplift of the nation, nothing more is required than love for one's country and readiness to serve her or, in other words, a spiritual awakening. A spiritual awakening means devotion to duty. If each individual understands his present duty and performs it, the next duty will of itself become clear to him.

Today's duty is this:

- (1) to fear no man;
- (2) to follow the truth always;
- (3) to follow the swadeshi dharma for fighting starvation in the country;
- (4) that this dharma may be easily followed, to introduce the spinning-wheel into our homes, help in increasing the production of hand-made cloth and to wear garments made of it.

One who fears God will never fear man; hence he will not fear the Government or kings or officers. And who can frighten him who has no fear? None can rule over such a one by force. The Government and similar embodiments of authority will then realize their true functions and prove a beneficial power for subjects who are unafraid. The State's power of punishing is an instrument of fear. When the subjects have abandoned fear, this instrument loses its effectiveness. This fearlessness can be cultivated only through irreproachable conduct and such purity of conduct is impossible without truth. Thus, practice of truth is the only gateway to our freedom.

Every year we send 60 crores of rupees abroad for our cloth. That is why we need swadeshi. It can spread rapidly only through the spinning-wheel and the handloom. The wheel and the loom, therefore, hold the key to our developing a trade worth 60 crores.

There can be no fearlessness without truth and no wealth without swadeshi. Swaraj, therefore, lies in the practice of these two. If we have the right kind of workers, these two ideas can be taught to be people in no time. In the villages where such workers exist, a beginning should be made to teach these two principles. For this no large buildings or funds are required. What is necessary is zeal and sincerity of purpose.

These thoughts come repeatedly to me after my experiences at Lahore and Amritsar. I present them here to my readers.

IN LAHORE

We stayed for a day in Amritsar and then came to Lahore. There was much to be done here. Both the Pandits were still away Motilalji in Prayag and Malaviyaji in Delhi. I therefore busied myself in doing all I could about the evidence to be presented. I also wrote a letter to the Lt.-Governor reminding him that two of the three conditions were yet to be fulfilled.

TWO CONDITIONS

The first was that one of the judges who are to review the cases tried in the summary courts should be from outside the Punjab. The second was that the leaders who are in jail should be released during the time that the Committee sat. Explaining the reasons for this condition, I said that without them evidence could not be properly presented. Even their temporary release would give the people courage to give evidence and create faith in the Government's *bona fides*.

In the meanwhile, Pandit Malaviya and Mr. Das arrived from Delhi and Motilalji from Prayag. The members of the Committee also arrived. They inspected Jallianwala Bagh and other places in Amritsar where the people had suffered most. The Committee commenced its sittings on Thursday, the 13th, and the examination of witnesses about the Amritsar incidents started.

COMMITTEE BOYCOTTED

From our side, however, the Committee is being boycotted. On Monday, the 10th, a reply came from the Lt.-Governor that a judge from outside the Punjab had been appointed. He was Justice Mullik of the Bihar High Court. The Government had not however, agreed to the third condition. The Governor said that only prisoners required by the Committee would be brought before it to give evidence. This letter was addressed to Malaviyaji and I, too, received the same reply. The Congress Sub-committee met and Panditji explained the situation. I also made some observations. After much discussion, Panditji as Chairman wrote letters to the Lt.-Governor and Lord Hunter. These have now been released to the Press. They make it clear that, as long as the chief leaders were not released, the Hunter Committee would be boycotted by the people. The reasons for this were stated in the letter

to Lord Hunter and a request was made to him that the leaders should be released just as I and some others had been freed in South Africa. Lord Hunter has also replied in the negative. Meanwhile, Mr. Andrews called on the Governor and pressed him to accede to the request. Then I saw the Governor. As a result there was a further small concession.: It was agreed that, when the leaders were brought out to give evidence, they would be set free on condition that they returned to sleep in jail. In this the principle behind our demand was being conceded in part and so the Congress Committee met again to consider the issue. It was resolved that the Lt.-Governor's offer be accepted, provided the prisoners were left free on the other days as on parole and permitted to be present in the court to assist our lawyers. Mr. Andrews then went to finalize the matter, but the Governor refused to agree. Panditji has written again to Lord Hunter. The Government officials whose actions are under scrutiny, the Government Pleader among them, are permitted to attend the sittings of the Hunter Committee. Malaviyaji has pointed out that the Congress Committee cannot possibly agree to a partial arrangement whereby Government officers who are in the position of defendants are allowed to be present while our imprisoned leaders may not come to assist our lawyer. The result is that our boycott continues.

EVIDENCE BEFORE HUNTER COMMITTEE

Evidence is still being taken from the Amritsar officers. It seems they admit the main charges. All three Indian members are doing good work. Pandit Jagat Narain's cross-examination is extremely severe. I feel that at times it is harsher than it need be. Those who know him say that this is his usual manner. Having conducted criminal cases for a long time, he has got into this habit. Sir Chimanlal Setalvad also asks questions in great detail. Sahebzada Sultan Ahmed asks few questions, but these are very much to the point. The British members do not appear to be partial in their questions. The general feeling is that the members of the Committee are not such as would deliberately do an injustice. Whether or not this is so, it is admitted by all that the Indian members are no 'yes-men'.

OUR COMMITTEE

As we are boycotting the Committee, it is necessary that we do something else instead. The Congress Sub-committee has appointed five Commissioners. These are to study the evidence so far collected and any other that can be obtained, sift it and prepare a report. The

five Commissioners are Pandit Motilal Nehru, Mr. Chitta Ranjan Das, Mr. Abbas Tayabji, Mr. Fazl Hussain and myself. Mr. Tayabji will come from Baroda tomorrow and Mr. Fazl Hussain from Calcutta in a few days. These Commissioners have appointed Mr. Santanam of this place as their Secretary. Some local lawyers and others are also working as volunteers.

ANDREWS' DEPARTURE

A large meeting was held in Bradlaugh Hall yesterday to bid farewell to Mr. Andrews who is proceeding to South Africa. Tickets were sold and a sum of over Rs. 2,000 was collected and presented to Mr. Andrews. Pandit Malaviya was in the chair and a resolution was passed appreciating Mr. Andrews' services in the cause of the Punjab and wishing him success in his task in South Africa. Mr. Andrews made a wonderful speech in a voice choked with emotion. I was entrusted with the resolution to be moved at the meeting. Both these speeches are worth reading. I therefore hope to give them in the next letter. The other speeches were mainly formal and, therefore, I propose to omit them.

APOLOGY TO READERS

I had hoped that, during the early stages of the weekly *Navajivan*, I would myself contribute most of the matter or at least have a hand in much that was published. I had not foreseen that work in the Punjab would turn out to be so important or that I would be detained there so long. I do not now know when I shall be free to leave the Punjab. I shall not for the present be able to work as hard as I had meant to do on *Navajivan*. I hope my readers will forgive me for this. I take it that every reader will wish me to serve the Punjab and, in the meanwhile, I would request them to accept the service which Shri Indulal Yagnik may render.

[From Gujarati]

Navajivan, 23-11-1919

111. LETTER TO G.E. CHATFIELD

[After November 17, 1919]

DEAR MR. CHATFIELD,

I had your previous letter regarding the evidence to be given to Lord Hunter's Committee. I thank you for your letter of the 17th instant,¹ received at Gujranwala. I note that it is not necessary for me to submit notes of my evidence to you.

Yours sincerely,

G.E. CHATFIELD, ESQ., I.C.S.

DISTRICT MAGISTRATE

AHMEDABAD

From a photostat of the handwritten draft : S. N. 6981

112. TELEGRAM TO C.F. ANDREWS

[LAHORE,

November 18, 1919]

ANDREWS

[CARE] MRS. JEHangir PETIT

PEDDAR ROAD

BOMBAY

CERTAINLY RETURN VIA ENGLAND.² STAY AFRICA TILL MISSION³
REACHES.

Bombay Government Records

¹ This read as follows: "I am instructed to inform you that Government has not yet selected the witnesses to be cited by them before the coming Commission. Will you please consider this office Notice No. P.O.L.I., dated 28th October 1919 as cancelled? I am sorry to have troubled you unnecessarily in the matter. If you desire to tender evidence, will you kindly apply to the Committee direct in the manner indicated in the Press *Communique* issued by it?"

² In his letter of November 17, Andrews had written: "I should propose to wait for Shastri, explain, then, everything to him as far as I could and go to England to report there and then come back to you here as soon as possible."

³ The reference is to the Commission of Enquiry appointed by the Union Government. Andrews had mentioned that it was to start its sittings about the middle of February 1920.

113. BHAI PARMANAND

Mr. Andrews has dealt with the case of Bhai Parmanand in pathetic language in the columns of the *Tribune*. Bhai Parmanand belongs to the band of Indians daily growing in numbers who have set apart their lives for India's service and have accepted comparative poverty as their lot. It was in that spirit that, under the influence of Lala Hansraj, he joined the D.A.V. College at Lahore as a professor. By his unassuming manners, industry and sterling character he made himself popular with the students as also the staff. He then paid a visit to South Africa and preached on the necessity of religion as a factor in life-building. He left on my mind a deep impression as a man full of truth and nobility. He came in close touch with me during his visit to that sub-continent and was for nearly a month my honoured guest. I had many a chat with him on various matters and I believe that his patriotism was of a lofty type a patriotism that would disdain to use violence to serve national ends. He went to England from South Africa. There he came in touch with the school of violence headed by Pandit Shyamji Krishnavarma¹. But the truth in him burnt as brightly as ever even in the midst of temptation. His frank and fearless statement before the court shows that he has hidden nothing. He has made admissions which are damaging to him. He was not bound to make any statement, but he would not flinch. He felt that he would hide nothing even though his statement involved a conviction. His statement itself provides no material for a conviction. But the special court tacked to it other evidence and condemned him.

The able petition presented by his wife and reproduced elsewhere contains a convincing analysis of the case. I do not propose to refer to it for the moment. My purpose is to show that the Government have grievously erred in treating an honourable man as a common felon. Assume his guilt. It was still wrong to send him to the Andamans. It was easy, if he was an enemy, to turn him into a friend by humane treatment. If he was really dangerous, it was right to deprive him of his liberty. But it was cruel to herd him with ordinary prisoners or to send him to the Andamans. I have taken care to ask many men in Lahore and elsewhere about Bhai Parmanand. Not one man believed in his guilt. Every one of them considers him to be

¹ Editor of *The Indian Sociologist*; vide "An Indian Philanthropist", 3-6-1905

innocent of the crime imputed to him. A government that exists by terror does not deserve to exist at all. For such a government has cowards, not brave men and women, to govern. Bhai Parmanand has been long enough in jail. His wife and children were deprived (I think illegally) of their personal effects under the order of forfeiture. His letters show that Bhai Parmanand, instead of being embittered, has been leading in the Andamans a life of religious introspection. It is not right for the government to keep such a man in prison. I trust that His Honour the Lieut.-Governor of the Punjab will examine the case, and what is more, inquire about Bhai Parmanand's record in the Andamans and discharge him without delay. I trust, too, that the public and the press will study this case and urge the Government to release Bhai Parmanand.¹

Young India, 19-11-1919

114. LETTER TO MAHADEV DESAI

GUJRANWALA,
[November 22]² 1919

BHAISHRI MAHADEV,

I have your telegram about Lala Lajpat Rai. I do not understand how he can have asked for money. He has plenty with him. All the same, I shall see his son and make sure. You must have received all my articles.

There was a letter from Narahari today, from which I learnt about your visit to Sojitra. I do not know what took you there.

Narahari writes about the progress of the construction work. I was indeed very happy to read about it. If a few buildings get ready, we shall have some relief. I am leaving for Delhi today and shall reach Lahore on Tuesday morning. You will be able to see my itinerary in *Navajivan* itself.

Blessing from
BAPU

From a photostat of the Gujarati : S. N. 9856

¹ He was later released in 1920.

² Gandhiji left Gujranwala for Delhi on this date and arrived in Lahore on November 25, which was a Tuesday.

115. HOW TO PROTECT THE COW

I have been receiving letters from many people on the question of cow protection. The latest of them says that I should work for the cause, even giving up that of *swadeshi* for the purpose. I formed my views on this subject many years ago. They run contrary to the current efforts. I feel that, in the name of cow protection, we knowingly or unknowingly kill cows. But I have no desire, just now, to place before the reader all my views on cow protection. I merely want to place before him some portion of the letter I have received from Maulana Abdul Bari Saheb. He says:

I thank you for the success of the day of prayer for Khilafat appointed for promoting unity between Hindus and Muslims. The stand you have taken in this matter has made a deep impression on the Muslims, especially on those among them who are religious-minded. Some *Ulemas* have particularly asked me in their letters to convey their congratulations to you. One of them is Maulana Suleman Saheb of Fulwari. He writes to say that he has decided not to kill cows in future and to dissuade others likewise from doing so. If people like you go on working for unity, the country will progress the sooner and the causes of discord will disappear.

Let us leave aside what part I have played in bringing about unity. The lesson I want to draw for the reader from this letter is that, if we would protect cows, we could do so only through service of our Muslim brethren. A gentleman sent me a message to the effect that we should help the Muslims on the Khilafat issue only on condition that they stop killing cows. The letter referred to above gives a reply to that gentleman. There can be no zest or point in giving help in expectation of a return. Our Muslim brethren have not sought our help on the issue of Khilafat. If, however, we want their friendship, if we regard them as our brethren, it is our duty to help them. If, as a result, they stop cow-slaughter, it will be a different matter. That will not be surprising. But we cannot offer them our help on condition that they stop cow-slaughter. Duty seeks no reward. But it is the obvious duty of those who are eager to protect cows to give all possible help to the Muslims on the Khilafat issue.

In December, we shall again have occasion for giving this help. There will be Peace Celebrations from the 13th to the 16th December. I am convinced that, so long as the Muslims have not been satisfied,

we ought not to participate in those celebrations. So long as those who have a heavy stake in the outcome of the War do not know what their position will be, so long as they entertain the utmost fears about it, Peace Celebrations can have no meaning for them.

[From Gujarati]

Navajivan, 23-11-1919

116. SPEECH AT KHILAFAT CONFERENCE, DELHI

[November 23, 1919]

PRESIDENT AND BRETHREN,

You will pardon me for keeping my seat for I cannot address standing. It had been said that Hindus have laid Mussulmans under a debt by sharing their feelings of sorrow and protest, but I maintain that they have done no more than their duty. You have passed a resolution of thanks to Hindus, but the fulfilment of duty and the settlement of debts deserve no thanks. It was their duty because there has been much talk of unity lately. But the test of unity and real fraternal feeling lies in sharing one another's sorrow and happiness alike. How can twenty-two crore Hindus have peace and happiness if eight crore of their Muslim brethren are torn in anguish? The pain of eight crores is also the pain of the other twenty-two crore inhabitants of India; therefore, although peace has been concluded, India has not known any real peace.

He then continued to say that he had been telling the Viceroy and Government to secure a just and honourable peace for Turkey, if it was intended that Mussulmans should be satisfied and then all Indians would join the rejoicings in the best spirit. He then admonished his hearers not to lose faith in their spiritual potency nor to lose hope.

Theirs was a just cause and if they meant to succeed, it was their duty to be prepared for sacrifices, for sacrifices would be demanded by so sacred a cause as theirs. They should not play at religion or trifle with such great issues, but embark on their task in all humility, firmness, sincerity and a determination to succeed. He further declared that after having resolved to abstain from the forthcoming rejoicings, it was incumbent on all Hindus and Mussulmans to observe their vow with scrupulous regard. No alms and treats should be accepted and no one should go to witness fireworks and illuminations, if any. But no one should interfere in any way with those who voluntarily participate in the carnival. . . .

Mr. Gandhi was also requested to express his views.¹ He spoke with evident earnestness, and opposing the resolution, said that he was there to offer his opinion not from a religious, but a secular point of view. He was a satyagrahi and his creed was to avoid injury of any kind. Boycott meant economic punishment and he would countenance no idea of punishment. He was sure that Maulana Hasrat was an advocate of practical work, but this kind of practical work might lead to nothing really useful. He was opposed to the idea of boycott.

The Bombay Chronicle, 29-11-1919

117. SPEECH AT KHILAFAT CONFERENCE, DELHI

November 24, 1919

HAKIM SAHIB³ AND BROTHERS,

You will pardon me for not being able to address you standing, as my health does not permit me to keep standing for long. I always feel ashamed to have to ask you to excuse me for addressing you sitting. I am grateful to you all for doing me all this honour today. I have always been writing and saying that those who want to serve the country require no thanks. The service of the country carries its own guerdon. Those dedicated to the service of the motherland derive happiness from their devotion to the country. For them there is no happiness beyond that. The reason for us all, Christians, Parsis, Hindus and Mussulmans, to come together is to consider the Khilafat question and to determine what we ought to do. The Moslems held an exclusive conference yesterday and passed a number of resolutions. Today representatives of all other communities born in and inhabiting India have assembled here to deliberate over the same question. Some people wonder at the reciprocity of friendly feelings between Hindus and Moslems, but born of the same mother, belonging to the same soil; what, indeed, must they do, if not love one another! When it is said that Hindus should join the Moslems in regard to the Khilafat question some people express surprise, but I say that, if Hindus and Moslems are brothers, it is their duty to share one another's sorrow.

¹ Gandhiji was asked to speak on the resolution calling for boycott of British goods.

² Gandhiji presided over the joint session of the conference, attended by Hindus and Muslims. He spoke in Hindi. Brief reports of the speech appeared in *Young India*, 3-12-1919 and 10-12-1919.

³ Hakim Ajmal Khan

There can be but only one question and it is whether the Moslems are in the right and their cause is just. If it is legitimate, then every child of the soil must sympathise with them as a matter of duty. We must not say that the question of Khilafat is exclusively for the Moslems to grieve over. No, it belongs to all Indians.

I shall now address myself to my Hindu brothers who are present here. Today our friend, Mr. Asaf Ali, addressed me two letters in which he said that he hoped it would be possible for the Khilafat Committee to be instrumental in solving the question of preservation of the cows. But I should like to affirm that, if one brother is in trouble, it is the duty of the other to render him all possible help. When Hindus are in trouble, Moslems should help them and, if Moslems are in trouble, Hindus should come to their rescue. We want no return for our assistance and sympathy. If you Moslems are in the right, we shall offer you unconditional help. This is a hereditary privilege of the Hindus. If the Moslems themselves voluntarily conceded anything it would be welcome, but we would not care to play the role of mercenary soldiers. Whatever we give we give for duty and ask its reward of God only. Let me tell my Hindu brothers that I hold the cows as dear as any of you do, but we cannot save the cows by quarrelling with Moslems. You can save the cows only by following my example, by doing your duty. (Cheers.) Please hear me out. There is no occasion for cheers. If you have any doubts as to justice of the cause for which the Moslems are standing out, let me call Mr. Lloyd George, the Premier, to witness. When soldiers and recruits were needed, an assurance was vouchsafed that nobody had an eye on Moslems' provinces which would remain with Moslems themselves. Now justice should be done if Muslims' dissatisfaction and grief are to be dispelled. They are struggling in respect to the Khilafat question on just grounds, and all Hindus and Parsis should share their sorrow. It is our duty to demonstrate to the British people, the King and responsible Ministers that we regard the sentiments of Mussulmans with respect and consider their cause just. It is not right that eight crore Mussulmans should have to face mental torment. They are in the right and they should be helped. On 17th October, the whole of India excepting the Punjab observed a fast and hartal and prayed. But this will not be adequate. The Khilafat question is a very big one and it belongs to the whole of India. It will require a corresponding degree of sincere devotion. Let me here tell Indians not to despair. Despondence robs one of all energy. We can yet demonstrate to

Britain how deeply we are affected by this problem and they must listen to us without our willingness to sacrifice. We need have no hope for the fulfilment of our desire. But the readiness of 30 crores for sacrifice can obtain them the fulfilment of any of their desires in the world. Neither the Government nor anyone in the world can maintain that there is any peace for us. On the contrary, we are under the shadow of a calamity. Where is peace? I do not see it. No peace has yet been concluded with Turkey, and so long as an honourable peace has not been concluded with Turkey, Mussulmans cannot possibly join the celebrations. And it would mean unhappiness for us all.

In the first place, with a heart oppressed with grief they cannot possibly participate in the forthcoming rejoicings, and, if they are forced to do so, their feelings would be far from those of genuine rejoicings. There is no sense in a hypocritical display. Since eight crore Moslems regard the Sultan of Turkey their religious head, we, as their neighbours and compatriots realising the justice of their feelings, should join them in the resolution¹ they passed yesterday. God knows we are with them, because we know them to be justly aggrieved. We would not be with them otherwise.

The Mahatmaji then said that if Alsace and Lorraine were not restored to France, there would be no peace for France. Similarly, Indians could say that so long as eight crore Indian Moslems were not relieved of their anguish regarding the Khilafat question, Indians could have nothing to do with the celebrations. If, however, that question were satisfactorily settled, all Indians would spontaneously and respectfully join the rejoicing. He continued :

Rich people say, that, if we refrain from taking part in the celebrations, the Sircar will be angry with them. They regard money as their God. Some people seem to be afraid that, without the big people they can do nothing, but they do not realise that God is with them, if theirs is a righteous cause. Even the big ones will be with us one day if we are all united in our purpose and demand. We shall witness quite another India on 13th December. Mr. Lloyd George shall have to yield to us, but should it not come to pass, we must do our duty. The Mussulmans have, therefore, resolved that, if the Government fail to secure them the fulfilment of their righteous demand, then they will cease to lend Government co-operation. In this they are within their rights. It is a very difficult thing indeed. But they have put their inmost thoughts before Government in plain words. It

¹ This called upon the people not to participate in the Peace Celebrations.

amounts to this: 'If you cannot help us, it is our privilege to withdraw our help from you. Let it be said in plain language that we do not want to cooperate with you to help you to crush us. Spare us your help. Let there be no reciprocation of any kind between us. We do not help you and want none of your help.' This is a sublime decision and Mussulmans have already adopted it.

But they have also adopted a step which looks ridiculous, for they have also decided to observe a progressive boycott of British goods in the event apprehended. I advise them to abrogate this decision. Let me tell them once again that there is a world of difference between withdrawal of co-operation and boycott. It is a man's privilege to withhold co-operation when he likes, but we must have regard for the opinion of the world before adopting any political step. What we intend to do cannot be effected through boycott. We must enlist the sympathy of the world and, therefore, I respectfully request you to forgo boycott in preference to withdrawal of co-operation. We have only one resolution before us today which deals with non-participation in peace jubilee. Hindus must join Mussulmans in this resolution.

Some people say that we must include our grief for Punjab horrors among our reasons for abstaining from forthcoming celebrations. But I will not yield on this point. For, I hold a contrary opinion. Nobody can be more deeply grieved for the Punjab than myself; but, my grief notwithstanding, I would not mix up the question of the Punjab with that of peace celebrations as they affect the Khilafat question. I hold that the Khilafat question is so intimately connected with peace that, so long as it is not satisfactorily settled, we have the right to say that we shall have nothing to do with a celebration which relates to an incomplete peace. Nor would it be in our power to visit the celebrations even if the Punjab were at this hour in the grip of horrors. As it happens, the affliction of which we complain regarding the Punjab cannot be undone. It can be healed. All we want in respect of it now is justice and two Committees are doing their work with that end in view. The Hunter Committee is one and the other committee is working under Pandit Malaviya. Their findings are awaited. We shall have the right to comment on their findings as to whether they are just and right or otherwise. We can wait for these findings. But we cannot wait regarding the Khilafat question as its decision is in view and we must place our feelings before the world before final settlement. We must deal with this question at once,

as it is sure to be finally settled before three months are out. Therefore, these two questions are distinct, and again, we have met today primarily to consider the Khilafat question. In the usual order of things, the Punjab question is beyond our scope. Another conference can be convened to deal with this question separately and to decide that we do not propose to participate in peace jubilee until the Punjab question is definitely settled. Nor must we forget that we have no right to say so in regard to the Punjab question. But we can certainly say so in respect of the Khilafat question. The Punjab has nothing to do with peace, particularly as we have various other ways of having our grievances redressed. But when peace is incomplete and has not been concluded according to justice, we can refuse to be party to it and thereby prove our non-acquiescence in it.

Now I am nearing the conclusion. We have not come here today to listen to famous speakers. We are often treated to great disquisitions by our brother Hasrat Mohani. He tells us our duties and if we were to look into his heart, we would find that there is no distinction between Hindus and Mussulmans there. He wishes that we should achieve something practical and I, too, shall request you not to forget this when you leave this hall. Trust in God and pray to him every morning. If the Khilafat question is based on right and justice, God will do justice and you, too, should be prepared to make sacrifices which are necessary for obtaining justice. If you pray to God, He will turn all the kings of the earth in favour of justice and, Mr. Lloyd George, too, will yield when he realises that doing justice to Turkey means also doing justice to the sentiments of 30 crores of Hindus and Mussulmans of India. You have to be active to achieve something. You have to read the *Gita*, the Quran and the Bible and the Zend to go to Paradise. You will, if you mean to achieve your object, have to be active and all will come right. I shall be profoundly grateful to you if you listen to what I am about to say and act upon it. Whether it is the Khilafat or the Punjab question, remember that whosoever is in the right gets his right. You should not be angry or use [harsh] words. By anger man degrades himself and, although in the right, fails to obtain his right. I shall, therefore, request you not to forget your human duties nor to lose patience. Don't forget that the sword alone does not kill, but words can do the same. You should be violent neither in deeds nor even in words. You should utter not a word not thoroughly weighed and considered. You can inspire, you can injure your country's cause and your object by one wrong word, and now I pray

to God in all earnestness that He may so direct Hindus and Moslems that they may serve one another. (Loud cheers.) And all united may die serving their country [and lead it] to progress. (Long and continued applause.)¹

The Bombay Chronicle, 6-12-1919

118. PUNJAB LETTER

LAHORE,
November 25, 1919

MR. ANDREWS' SPEECH

In the last issue I had promised to give my readers the speech delivered by Mr. Andrews on the occasion of his departure from Lahore for South Africa, and my own speech, as both are of great importance. The following is the gist of Mr. Andrews' speech:²

It is a very difficult thing to say goodbye after months of such close and intimate fellowship in work, as we have had together both in Delhi and in the Punjab. My words will therefore be few. Except for matters of immediate practical urgency, I have kept my lips sealed on all controversial points (both on the platform and in the Press during the time I have been personally working). But now that I am leaving immediately for South Africa and shall not be returning for at least four months, I don't think it would be honest on my part to go away silently without any statement at all (of what I have seen and witnessed). I wish to go at once to the main issues and I think I can put my own position quite briefly in the following manner: I hold as strongly as possible (after my inquiry) that no provocation whatever can excuse the cowardly and brutal murders of Englishmen by the mob which occurred at Amritsar and elsewhere, nor the burning of the holy places of the Christian religion. Most cowardly and dastardly of all I regard the murderous attack on

¹ At the conclusion of the address, the following resolution was adopted:

"That this meeting of Muslim and non-Muslim representatives of India convened to consider the Khilafat question is of opinion that in as much as the Khilafat question, which is part of the Peace programme and affects the vital interest of eight crores of Mussulmans of India and is therefore a national question, is still unsettled, it is not possible for Indians to participate in the forthcoming celebrations, and further respectfully requests His Excellency the Viceroy of India to postpone the celebration of Peace pending a satisfactory and honoured settlement of the Khilafat question."

² What follows is the English report of the speech found in *Young India*, 26-11-1919. The portions in brackets were omitted in the Gujarati version.

Miss Sherwood who was loved by every Indian¹ who knew her and who was a true follower and disciple of (the gentle Saviour) Christ. But just as I condemn, without one single word of palliation or excuse, these acts, so all the more utterly and entirely do I condemn the cold and calculated massacre of Jallianwala Bagh.

The massacre of Glenco in English history is no greater a blot on the fair name of my country than the massacre at Amritsar. I am not speaking from idle rumour. I have gone into every single detail with all the care and thoroughness (that a personal investigation could command) and it remains to me an unspeakable disgrace, indefensible, unpardonable, inexcusable. And I am obliged to go on from that incident to what followed under Martial Law. I have seen with my own eyes the very men who have endured the crawling order, the compulsion to grovel on their bellies in the dust, the public flogging which was administered to hundreds of men and hundred other desecrations of man's image which according to our Christian scriptures is made in the likeness of God. This ruthless and deliberate emasculation of manhood by the brute force of the military and the police appears to me no less an indelible stain on the fair honour of my country than the massacre at Jallianwala Bagh itself. These are the very few words which I have felt compelled as an Englishman to say with regard to the culminating acts of the Disturbance. Every day that I have been working side by side with my Indian fellow-workers, the deep sense of the wrong done has come home to me, and each act has been in very truth an act of penance, of atonement, an act of reparation for my country.

When in Lahore, I have gone out each morning to watch the sun rise over (the great and noble Eucalyptus trees in the Montgomery) gardens and have walked there all alone trying to collect my thoughts for the day's work. And this morning there came to me (out of the stormy time I have been passing through) these words from my own scriptures:

"He maketh His sun to rise upon the just and upon the unjust.

Be ye therefore perfect even as your Father in heaven is perfect."²

These were the very words of Christ, my Master, which taught his disciples that forgiveness was the final thing in life, not vengeance, love was the end, not hate.

That same word was uttered long ago in India itself by Buddha who came to save and help mankind. It was this and this alone which was given to me on

¹ The Gujarati version has "who loved Indians".

² *St. Matthew*, V, 45, 48.

this last day in Lahore before my voyage out.

We must probe down to the depth the wounds that have been made in order to draw out all the evil from them. But the last is not probing but binding up the wounds ≈ the work of healing.

And I would urge you as you go forward and face all the facts of evil which have been done, not to dwell merely upon vengeance but rather upon forgiveness, not to linger in the dark night of hate but to come out into glorious sunshine of (God's) love.

MY WORDS

This was Mr. Andrews' speech. My speech came before his as I was to propose the resolution expressing gratitude to him. I had not read his speech in advance. Since, however, mine turned out to be in the nature of an introduction or explanation of his and both speeches were made in order to place an important truth before the people, I propose to reproduce my speech here. The following is the gist.

"Mr. Andrews is like a brother to me. I therefore find it difficult to say anything about him. The sacred relationship between us stands in the way. I can, however, say this, that Mr. Andrews is a staunch Englishman but has dedicated his life to India. Through his actions he tells us: 'Even if you feel that you are oppressed by my countrymen, do not think ill of them, look at me.' If we revere Mr. Andrews, it behoves us to imitate his love. Our love must not be blind, but such as Prahlad showed for his father. Mr. Andrews' life teaches us that, although we must resent and resist oppression and injustice, it is also our duty to bear no enmity towards the wrongdoer. The Government has placed us in a difficult position. They have refused even a temporary release of the prisoners. We had intended to give evidence before Lord Hunter's Committee but the Government has made this impossible. We must not, however, yield to anger on account of this thoughtless step of the Government's. Mr. Andrews has done far more for India than many Indians have done. He has not spared his countrymen but that does not mean that his love for the English is any the less. In like manner, we, too, can fight for justice and self-respect without harbouring ill will against the British or the Government.

OUR DUTY

"Mr. Andrews has poured out his very life for India. He is no ordinary Englishman. He is a man of great learning, comes of an illustrious family, is a poet and a theologian. If he had wished, he

could have become a high dignitary, he could have been the Principal of a big college or, if he had wanted, he could have been in a high position as priest. But he has not cared for wealth or for position and, today, wanting nothing for himself, he is ever on his feet in the service of India. What is our duty towards such an Englishman? As long as there is even one Andrews among the British people, we must, for the sake of such a one, bear no hatred to them. If we hate them, we cannot bear real love for Mr. Andrews and we shall forfeit the right to accept his service. This is clear enough.

“The question is: When massacres like the one at Jallianwala Bagh take place, when British soldiers abuse us, kick us, debar us from sitting with them in trains, British officers want to keep all power to themselves and British merchants try to monopolize the principal trade of India, how can we help being angry with them? How can we ever feel affection for them? The difficulty is obvious. Wherever one turns, one finds hatred, anger, scorn and falsehood. When Indians do not always feel affection for one another, what can we expect from them with regard to the British? But these doubts arise from want of faith in God. An intellectual acceptance of the existence of God does not make one a believer. To believe in God but not to love people is a contradiction in terms. Faith implies truth and love. If these qualities could shine forth within us in their perfection, we would ourselves be God.

“Accepting this truth, we should move in its direction. This is the lesson to be learnt from Mr. Andrews’ life: his penance is for this, it is the true meaning of his *tapascharya* hidden from the eyes of men. I have seen him sitting silent for hours in our homes. Even when we have disregarded him I have seen that he has shown no anger. I have seen him eating contentedly whatever was offered him in our homes. I have known him setting out for South Africa at a moment’s notice at the late Mr. Gokhale’s behest.¹ This is true and silent *tapascharya*. His work on our behalf in South Africa and other countries is there for us all to see and, therefore, we recognize it as such. But the invisible sacrifices that he is ever making are even more precious.

“But it is not only out of respect for Mr. Andrews that we must banish all hatred for the British. By doing so we shall ensure early success of our efforts for if we work on in patience, as he does with

¹ In December 1913

perseverance and with all regard for truth, the British will have no occasion to visit their evil propensities on us. And just as he is able to do the work of many, standing alone, so also if even one Indian follows in his footsteps, he will do as much alone, and will accelerate our progress.”

GUJRANWALA

Last week I visited Gujranwala. It is a township with a population of 30,000. There also I found the same love as in Amritsar. As I had to examine the evidence there, I had taken Mr. Purushottamdas Tandon and Dr. Parasaram with me. We stayed at the house of Divan Mangalsen, who is at present in jail. I had, therefore, the privilege of meeting his wife and was indebted to her for her hospitality. In Lahore I am the guest of Smt. Sarladevi Choudhrani and have been bathing in her deep affection. I first met Sarladevi in 1901. She comes from the famous Tagore family. Of her learning and sincerity, too, I get evidence in ever so many ways. In Amritsar, I also met the wives of Dr. Kitchlew and Dr. Satyapal. All these ladies bear their sorrow with great fortitude.

Two large meetings were held in Gujranwala ≈ one for women, the other for men. I explained the philosophy of the spinning-wheel to the women and they, in their turn, promised to take up spinning.

Gujranwala is the birthplace of Ranjit Singh. I saw the house in which he was born and in which he lived. I drew the people's attention to the extensive damage done to this place. I observe that I meet with no difficulty in consequence of my pointing out to people their lapses at every place. All acknowledge the fact that they have made mistakes. In Gujranwala the officers stopped at nothing by way of revenge and cruelty. It is not necessary to describe these.

[From Gujarati]

Navajivan, 30-11-1919

119. SPEECH AT KASUR

[November 26, 1919]

After referring to the unfortunate incident¹, Mr. Gandhi explained why the Congress Sub-committee had decided to withdraw co-operation from Lord Hunter's Committee and invited those who had not already made their statements before the Sub-committee to do so now. The speaker also dwelt strongly on the excesses committed by the mob and said that India's deliverance lay through resistance of wrong by quiet and dignified suffering. Truth and fearlessness were necessary for the removal of all wrongs.

Young India, 10-12-1919

120. LETTER TO VALJI GOVINDJI DESAI

LAHORE,

Magshar Sud 5 [November 27, 1919]²

BHAISHRI VALJI,

Undoubtedly, you have been overwhelmed by a great misfortune. What consolation can I give you? May your *jnan* help you; it will, of course. If you do not possess all the virtues of your brother which you have recounted, make them your own and make him live in you. But what advice can I give you? What do you intend to do now? Will you stay on in Ahmedabad or look for other means of livelihood? If you intend to put any of the boys in the national school, you may do so.

Vandemataram from

MOHANDAS

From a photostat of the Gujarati original in Gandhiji's hand: C.W. 3165

¹ Two Indians were beaten by Marsden, the Sub-Divisional Officer, at Kasur for displaying Khilafat notices. Marsden later realized that the notices were quite inoffensive. He apologized and paid Rs. 10/- to one of the injured as compensation. Gandhiji discussed the incident with Marsden and declared at the meeting that the officer had apologized in a "handsome manner" for the error committed by him.

² Sunderji Govindji Desai, the addressee's elder brother, died sometime between November 8 and November 22, 1919. This letter was written soon after.

121. LETTER TO BENARASIDAS CHATURVEDI

SATYAGRAH ASHRAM,

SABARMATI,

[November 1919]¹

BHAI BENARASIDAS,

I have your letter. The English article will be published. Readers of *Young India* read only English. *Young India* is published for Englishmen and for those given to reading only English. By publishing Hindi article in it I can neither promote Hindi nor stress the subjects of those articles. The purpose of *Y.I.* should be understood. The telegram from Fiji means what it says because abolition of the indenture system was on the cards and the Viceroy had clearly said that those under indenture would shortly be freed. Even if the telegram from Fiji means this, there is no harm in publishing your letter. I consider it a poignant utterance. Where it Totaramji?² An article written by him in his own hand will give much more. It does not matter if it is in Hindi. I shall translate it and publish it with the original. The article should avoid all adjectives; it should be adorned only with facts and arguments.

Yours sincerely,

MOHANDAS GANDHI

From a photostat of the Hindi: G.N. 2554. Courtesy: National Archives of India

¹ The letter is most likely to have been written in November 1919 about the time Gandhiji's article on Fiji appeared in the *Navajivan* (vide "Fiji", 9-11-1919), wherein he says "fresh news has arrived removing our fear of the prolongation of this slavery," namely, the system of indenture.

² Totaram Sanadhya, who had lived twenty-one years in Fiji and written a book on his life there

122. PUNJAB LETTER

[About *December 1, 1919*]¹

KHILAFAT MEETING

From Gujranwala we proceeded direct to Delhi. On the 23rd a meeting was held there only for Muslims and on the 24th there was a public meeting for both Hindus and Muslims. The meeting of the 23rd was private and there were very few non-Muslims present. I was present by special invitation. The Hon. Maulvi Fazlul Haq presided over the meeting. It will be recalled that he has also been appointed one of the Commissioners in connection with the work in the Punjab. A number of resolutions were to be passed in the meeting and a Subjects Committee had been appointed for drafting them. This Committee sat from 4 to 9.30 in the evening. There was a great deal of discussion. One resolution, in which the Hindus were thanked, was unanimously accepted. The second resolution, calling for non-participation in the Peace Celebrations, was also passed. The third important resolution was about boycott and was hotly debated. Many violent speeches were made and it was suggested that the boycott should cover articles from other countries of Europe also, but few were agreeable to this. My advice was sought and my suggestions listened to with great attention and courtesy. Many agreed with my view. I explained that boycott implied bitterness and enmity. As a result, our task would be made difficult rather than easy. The resolution, however, was accepted by a majority.

I suggested that, instead of advising boycott, they could, if they had the strength, resolve to withhold co-operation. We had the right to pass such a resolution and it could also be regarded as our duty. This suggestion too met with general approval and was accepted.

Finally, the general meeting commenced at night. The resolutions prepared by the Subjects Committee were placed before it and there was much discussion on the boycott resolution. Usually, the resolutions presented by the Subjects Committee are not debated at any length in the general meeting, but on this occasion

¹ Gandhiji visited Kasur and the other places mentioned in the letter on November 26, 1919. Probably he wrote this letter on the Monday of the following week, which fell on this date.

permission was given for an exhaustive debate. The Hon'ble. Mr. Reza Ali, Mr. Abdulla Haroon, Mr. Syed Hussain and I spoke against boycott and made an effective impression on the audience, which gave us a patient hearing. Finally, however, the boycott resolution was passed. This meeting continued till 3 a.m. Many well-known Muslims such as Haji-ul-Mulk Hakim Ajmal Khan, Dr. Ansari, Maulana Abdul Bari Saheb and others were present.

JOINT MEETING OF HINDUS AND MUSLIMS

A joint meeting was held on the following day to which pressmen were invited. Mr. Sheppard of *The Times of India* was also present. I was in the chair. The meeting was held in the Sangram Theatre which was filled to capacity. Admission was by tickets. Sannyasi Swami Shraddhanand, Mr. Bomanji of Saharanpur, Dr. Choithram¹ of Sind, Mr. Krishnakant Malaviya of Prayag and others were present. The Hon'ble Pandit Motilal Nehru, Mr. C.R. Das, and others had sent telegrams intimating their moral support.

The Secretary of the Conference, Mr. Asaf Ali, had intimated in the papers circulated by him that the issues of cow-protection and the Punjab would also be considered at this meeting. Many had looked forward to their being discussed. My ideas on both had been already formed. If I allowed the issue of cow-protection to be discussed, the cause would be harmed. If I threw open the Punjab issue for debate, both the Punjab and the Khilafat causes would suffer. I could not let this happen. My position, therefore, was extremely delicate. I had to take upon myself the responsibility of causing pain to people whom I knew. I was obliged, therefore, to refer to all these matters in my speech, the gist of which I give here so that readers will understand my intentions. The English report of it which has been published was also prepared by me. But it does not contain all the arguments. My speeches here, as also those of others, were in Urdu and I could see that those present followed everything well.

MY SPEECH

"I am grateful for the resolution passed yesterday thanking the Hindus in general and me in particular. I wish also to say that whatever help the Hindus and others have rendered in connection with the Khilafat is no more than their duty. Duty is a kind of debt. There can be no return for its payment. Mr. Asaf Ali has, in the notices he

¹ Dr. Choithram Gidwani

sent about this meeting, mentioned the subject of cow-protection. My humble opinion is that the issue of cow-protection may not be raised on this occasion by the Hindus. If we are one people, if we regard one another as brothers, then Hindus, Parsis, Christians and Jews born in India have the clear duty of helping the Muslims, their fellow-countrymen, in their suffering. That help which demands a return is mercenary and can never be a symbol of brotherhood. Just as adulterated cement cannot hold bricks together, so mercenary help cannot make for brotherhood. The noble traditions of the Hindus require that they help their Muslim brethren. If the Muslims feel themselves bound in honour to spare the feelings of Hindus, then, whether we help in the matter of the Khilafat or not, they may stop the slaughter of cows. Though, therefore, I yield to none in my reverence for the cow, I do not wish to make my help in the Khilafat conditional on anything. On the contrary, I feel that there is greater protection for cows in help given unconditionally. Only if we serve one another without laying down conditions can affection and fraternal love grow amongst us and the path to cow-protection be cleared. I, therefore, hope that all Hindus will make the Khilafat cause their own without insisting on any conditions.

“Our second problem is the issue of the Punjab. A demand has been made by several persons that we keep away from the Peace Celebrations because of the sufferings of the Punjab. I differ here also. I have probed deeply into these sufferings of the Punjab. Others may have felt these equally, but I will not admit that anyone was more grieved than I was. Even so, I am of the opinion that we cannot mix up this issue with that of the Khilafat. Personally, I feel that, whatever the sufferings of the Punjab, we cannot, on a local issue, dissociate ourselves from a celebration which concerns the whole Empire. We have other means by which to publicize the wrongs of the Punjab. Nor can we dissociate ourselves from the celebrations on the ground that justice has not been done in the matter of the Punjab, because we still hope for justice. It is for this purpose that the Hunter Committee is sitting and our Commissioners are working. We may abstain from the Peace Celebrations only if we have any cause for dissatisfaction or doubt arising directly from the peace terms. The Khilafat is the only issue of this kind. Though it is among the issues to be settled in the peace terms, not only are we quite in the dark about it but we have good reasons to suspect that the final settlement will not be satisfactory to us. Hence it is only on the Khilafat issue that we can

refuse to join the Peace Celebrations. If we mix up the Punjab issue with this one, we shall be accused of thoughtlessness and of lacking a sense of proportion, and the causes, both of the Khilafat and the Punjab, will suffer in consequence. The Khilafat issue is a grave matter and one which demands immediate solution. A decision in this regard will soon be taken. We may not, therefore, risk harm to this cause by dragging in other issues on this occasion. I, therefore, hope that the Punjab issue will not be brought up for consideration here.

“The question now is whether or not on the Khilafat issue our Muslim brethren have justice on their side. If their demand has no justice in it, then, neither the Hindus nor any others should help them, nor can they expect help. Even if they receive help, they will not succeed. But the Prime Minister of England has himself testified to the justice of the Muslim demand, as also some former distinguished officers of India. We have a right, therefore, to keep away from the Peace Celebrations. So long as the future of Turkey is not known, peace has no meaning either for the Muslims or for the rest of us. It would not be surprising if France refrained from joining the Peace Celebrations in case the matter of the Alsace-Lorraine were not settled. The Khilafat issue affects the Muslims in the same way. I hope that the Viceroy will himself postpone the Peace Celebrations until after the problem of Turkey is settled.

“The Muslims took one more important decision also last night. Should the conditions for peace go against them, which God forbid, they would no longer co-operate with the Government. In my opinion, subjects have this right. No one is bound to accept titles or employment from the Government. This is a matter of one’s own free choice. It is clear that there can be no obligation to help anyone whose actions are not for our good. We accept Government employment for the purpose of livelihood and, if we are alive to the good of society, then, in order to serve it. If, on the contrary, there is a likelihood of our being harmed instead of benefited, we should certainly not serve [the Government]. How, then, can we assist a Government which harms us on an urgent, religious cause like the Khilafat? If, therefore, the decision about the Khilafat goes against us, we have the right to refuse our co-operation.

“But to proceed from non-co-operation to boycott is like abandoning a seat on an elephant to ride on a donkey. To refuse co-operation is our right and we can, by this method, bring about striking

results. But we have no right to resort to boycott; and its result is bound to be undesirable. We do not have this right because boycott implies an intention to punish the British people, and such an intention ought to be eschewed. Our grievance is against the Government. The results, too, will be unfortunate because a satisfactory solution to a problem like that of the Khilafat can be secured by winning world opinion over to our side. By resorting to boycott it is very likely, on the contrary, that we may antagonize it. Thus, boycott is as much objectionable as non-co-operation is advisable. Moreover, the British have extra-ordinary commercial skill and they can, by many devious means, ensure that their goods reach us. They can do that by way of Japan. Thus, the effect of boycott will be to invite the hold of other foreign powers on our country, rather than to keep out British goods.

“Boycott is a sign of anger; to refuse co-operation, on the other hand, is a sign of firmness. Boycott indicates our weakness; non-co-operation proves our strength. The solution to a momentous issue like the Khilafat can be secured not by weakness but only through strength.

“I would therefore submit to the people that, if we want a happy solution to this problem, we should develop qualities such as patience, firmness, truth and fearlessness. We have all come across examples of worthy causes being spoilt by the weakness, ignorance, foolishness or impatience of the workers. It is not enough that we merely refrain from acts of violence. We have known of murders committed by words. Therefore, just as our hands and feet should be kept under control, so should our tongue be. Our struggle has truth on its side. I am, therefore, confident that, if we fight on in the faith that truth is ever victorious, we may still succeed in securing a happy solution to this problem.”

RESOLUTION PASSED BY MEETING

I could see that this speech had very good effect. My fears that many objections would be raised at the meeting turned out to be mistaken and the resolution was passed without a single dissident comment. In fact it was passed enthusiastically, all standing. The resolution was to the effect that, as the Khilafat issue was a part of the peace settlement and was one which intimately affected one-fourth of India's population, viz., the Muslims, and, as such, the whole country, no Indian would be able to take part in the Peace Celebrations. The

meeting, therefore, requested H.E. the Viceroy that he be pleased to postpone these celebrations until such time as the question of the Khilafat was satisfactorily settled.

RS. 501 FOR ONE PICE

Great enthusiasm was evident among the audience. A committee has been appointed to instruct the public how to keep away from the Peace Celebrations. I proposed that money be collected for the purpose and I was asked to contribute one pice. I did not in fact possess even that. It was given by Khwaja Sahib Hasan Nizami. The coin was then auctioned by Brother Syed Hussain and Mia Chhotani bought it for Rs. 501. In ten minutes Rs. 2,000 were collected on the spot in cash and many others promised contributions. Hakim Ajmal Khan, Swami Shraddhanand, Shri Krishnakant Malaviya, Shri Bomanji and others spoke on the resolutions. All the speeches were restrained but forceful.

MAULANA ABDUL BARI

Maulana Abdul Bari Sahib then stood up to thank the Chair. He said:

Mahatma Gandhi may say what he pleases with regard to keeping the subject of cow-protection out of the matter in hand. It is to his credit and to that of our Hindu brethren. Should the Muslims, however, forget the assistance rendered by their Hindu brethren, they will have forgotten their noble traditions. I say that, whether they help us in the Khilafat issue or not, we and they are of one land and, therefore, it behoves us to stop the slaughter of cows. As a Maulvi, I say that, in refraining from cow-slaughter of our own free will, we in no way go against our faith. Nothing else has created so real a spirit of brotherhood between us as the magnanimity shown by the Hindus on the Khilafat issue. I pray that God may preserve for ever this friendship between the two communities.

The audience responded to this speech with cries of "Amen". After this, Bari Sahib spoke very feelingly about the Khilafat and made a deep impression.

HINDUS' DUTY

Thus, the Khilafat Conference came to an end. But this does not mean that everything is now over. On the contrary, the responsibility of each one of us has increased. But here I want to address a few words exclusively to the Hindus. They can help a great deal in this matter and, by doing so they will succeed in drawing the Muslims

closer to them than by any other means. To bring about unity between Hindus and Muslims will be no mean achievement. That eight crores of people live in genuine amity with 22 crores of another community is a consummation greatly to be desired. It is certain, too, that for either to live suppressed by the other will do no good. We have, therefore, to promote mutual affection by living in equality and independence. The Khilafat movement alone provides the opportunity for this. From the 13th to the 16th December neither we nor our children should take part in the fireworks or illuminations. We should keep ourselves at home. If the highly placed could refrain from accepting titles on that day, they would have done a great thing. Maulana Abdul Bari Sahib has shown us that this is a far simpler and easier way to ensure the protection of cows than to spend huge sums and quarrel with the Muslims for the purpose.

VISIT TO KASUR

When I went to Delhi, a wire had arrived from Kasur that the local Deputy Collector had severely belaboured a Muslim. The reason was that a notice of the Khilafat Conference had been pasted on his wall. The notice was entirely harmless and, in any case, had not been put up by the man himself. I felt that what the Deputy Collector had done was a terrible thing. It was intolerable that a British officer should have taken the law into his own hands. I, therefore, returned from Delhi and proceeded to Kasur, accompanied by Dr. Parasram who is acquainted with that place. There we recorded the evidence of the man and another Muslim who also had been beaten. Meanwhile, a note came from Mr. Marsden, the Deputy Collector, inviting us for a talk. I met him and had a long conversation. He informed me that he had apologized to the Muslims and had also paid him Rs. 10. I replied that, as he had severely beaten an innocent man, it behoved him to make a public apology. It was undesirable that people should be beaten up by British officers. He thereupon gave me permission to make his apology public. He had already ordered the notice to be put up again. Immediately after this interview, I had to go to a meeting. Three or four thousand people had already collected on the maidan. There were as many women as men present. I announced Mr. Marsden's unqualified apology and the people were greatly pleased. Kasur is 35 miles from Lahore and had a population of about 20,000. In April people had committed most reprehensible things there. I referred to these in the meeting and, as I was not going

to have an opportunity to meet the women again, I also requested them to take to the spinning-wheel.

WAZIRABAD

From there, I went to Wazirabad on the following day. I had to investigate what had happened there during the Martial Law. Wazirabad is a small town but it is a railway junction, through which, moreover, all main-line trains pass. The town is more than 50 miles from Lahore. The people there were in such a state of panic that in many places we were refused accommodation and were finally put up in a Sikh temple. Even so the popular enthusiasm was as boundless as ever. All day men came for *darshan*. By now I have myself grown tired of *darshan*. It is not possible simultaneously to work and to give *darshan*. In the end we had to keep the doors closed. The whole day was passed in listening to the tales of people's sufferings.

VISIT TO NIZAMABAD

Nizamabad is scarcely three-quarters of a mile from Wazirabad. The people there are held responsible for the same crime as the people at Wazirabad. Nizamabad may be said to be a village consisting of a narrow lane. Its population is 2,000 and is mainly Muslim. Most of them are blacksmiths. The best knives in India are made here. I had a look at the shops; almost all tools were old but the work had a finish and was of the best quantity. Excellent wooden handles are also made here and the finest guns are manufactured by hand. A double-barrelled gun which I saw had elaborate carving too. The craftsmen told me that it took him one month to produce a gun of this kind. The price, he said, was Rs. 200. I felt proud of the skill of our craftsmen when I saw this workmanship and felt extremely grieved that we should have turned our back on swadeshi. When we do not make full use of such skill, what can we expect but starvation? The craftsmanship of Nizamabad ought to be known all over India, whereas even a man like me so much in love with swadeshi had not heard of this small village.

OUR FILTHINESS

But the craftsmanship of Nizamabad was equalled by its filth. It has only one lane. Seeing the filth in it, the 15 minutes which I had to spend there seemed like a punishment to me. There was a drain in the centre of the street and filth was showing in it. The street was full of refuse.

Having made our pilgrimage to this lane, we proceeded to the place of a certain gentleman there and examined witnesses. I was then asked to make a speech. I talked about the filthy conditions and about swadeshi. What do those people prove who keep their shops clean but the streets dirty [I asked]? If I clean my house and throw the refuse on to the street, or keep my urinal clean and dirty the street, it shows that I have no consideration for the feelings of my neighbour, no pity or love for him. When this is so, how can I claim to be one with the people? Can those whose streets are dirty have clean minds? If I am highly skilled in a craft but my skill has no effect on the condition of my lane, it will only prove that there is no limit to my selfishness. The Nizamabad street is so short and narrow that every day it could be cleaned in 15 minutes. If people so active as they cannot arrange that much, it shows that they are not fit even to manage their small affairs; how, then, would they manage bigger ones? Swaraj ought to begin with our streets. And so I concluded my speech by saying that, when I came again to Nizamabad, I hoped to see the street as clean as the shops and their contents.

[From Gujarati]

Navajivan, 7-12-1919

123. DURGADAS ADWANI

Durgadas Adwani is one of the best workers I have had the privilege of meeting. I came to know him through correspondence,¹ immediately on my arrival in India in 1915. The occasion that gave rise to the correspondence showed the true man in Durgadas. He has been a consistent, conscientious and zealous worker in Sind for many years. He has now gone to jail for one year with hard labour. I have been asked to give my opinion on the judgment of the Appellate Court. In my humble opinion the judgment is unsound. The Court has erred in holding that “New Call” was a seditious leaflet and it has strained the analysis of evidence to record a finding against Durgadas. But in giving this opinion, I admit I may be biased in favour of Durgadas. I do not believe him to be capable of telling an untruth in order to avoid imprisonment. The evidence may bear the meaning placed upon it by the Appellate Court.

¹ *Vide* “Telegram to Maharaja of Kasimbazar”, 4-3-1917.

But as a friend and as a satyagrahi, I must decline to condole with Durgadas or his family upon his incarceration. Durgadas has after great deliberation taken the Satyagraha Pledge. And I seize the opportunity offered by this case of placing before the reader my views about such cases. We spend too much money in litigation and in appeals. We have an excessive dread of prisons. I have not a shadow of doubt that society will be much cleaner and healthier if there was less resort to law courts than there is. The rush after the best counsel is undignified. It is unpardonable when it is indulged in at public expense. But it is sinful when a satyagrahi spends money after the best legal talent or after appeals. I was therefore pained when I heard of appeals in the "New Call" convictions. If one has committed an offence, one must plead guilty and suffer the penalty. If he has not and is still found guilty, imprisonment for him is no disgrace. And if he is a satyagrahi, he has 'no business' to fear the hardships of jail life.

We in India, whilst we are living in an atmosphere surcharged with suspicion and distrust and in the midst of a secret police department unrivalled, perhaps, in the world, for its duplicity and unscrupulousness, must use ourselves [*sic*] to the gaol life if we want to mend that department and remove distrust and suspicion.

The best and quickest way to deliverance from the distrust and secret police department is to rid the country of false fear and all violence. But till that far-off day arrives, the handful of satyagrahis must be prepared to treat the prison as their second home.

I hope therefore that the friends of Durgadas will not advise him or his wife to petition for mercy nor add to the wife's unhappiness by commiserating with her. On the contrary, it is our duty to ask her to steel her heart and feel glad that her husband is in jail for no fault of his own. The truest service that we can render to Durgadas would be to offer Mrs. Durgadas such assistance, pecuniary or otherwise, as she may need. I understand that the "New Call" cases have cost nearly Rs. 15,000. The money could certainly have been utilised to better purpose. It is not right to beggar ourselves by fighting against odds. It is hardly manful to be over-anxious about the result of political trials that involve no disgrace.

Here in the Punjab I find mothers with stricken hearts coming and shedding tears over the imprisonment of their sons whom they regard as innocent. I know I am helpless. But it is so difficult to

comfort them. To give them false hope would be a sin. To ask them patiently to endure what cannot be cured brings no comfort. I am therefore endeavouring to perform the uphill task of asking them to be satyagrahis enough to realise that we shall only perpetuate political convictions so long as we fret and foam and worry over the imprisonment of our dear ones. Needless to say I am not here thinking of imprisonments for acts of actual incendiarism or murder.

Young India, 3-12-1919

124. LETTER TO ESTHER FAERING

LAHORE,

December 4, 1919

MY DEAR CHILD,

Why have you become ill? You ought not to take upon yourself tasks which are beyond you. You are not capable of going 3rd class to Bombay. Indeed you need not have gone to Bombay. However do be well quickly by asking for all the service you may need. What was the matter with you? Mr. Mahadev has described your malady somewhat. Please tell me all about it.

With love and prayers.

Yours,

BAPU

From a photostat of the original in N.A.I.; also *My Dear Child*, p. 24.

125. LETTER TO ANASUYABEHN SARABHAI

LAHORE,

Monday [December 15, 1919]¹

PUJYA BEHN,

Pandit Jagat Narain² asked me where he should stay. I have suggested your brother's bungalow. Please sound him and if he agrees to invite Pandit Jagat Narain, tell him to send a telegram. Pandit Jagat Narain will be in Lucknow by the 22nd. You will receive this letter on the 17th, so you will be in time if you send the wire here. If you send the telegram after the 20th, then it should be sent to Lucknow. He will reach Ahmedabad on January 27. Please arrange for him to stay somewhere else if Brother is not willing to accommodate him. I have suggested your house too. He is willing to stay with you. Please let me know by wire whatever you decide to do.

I am sure I shall reach there by the 1st.

Vandemataram from

MOHANDAS

From a photostat of the Gujarati: S.N. 32831

¹ From the reference to the letter reaching its destination on the 17th and from 'Monday' and 'Lahore' in the dateline. 15th December, 1919 was a Monday and Gandhiji was in Lahore. This date is further confirmed by reference to Gandhiji's reaching Ahmedabad by the 1st of the following month. He reached Ahmedabad from Lahore on January 4, 1920.

² Member of the Legislative Council of the United Provinces; one of the three Indian members of the Hunter Committee.

126. LETTER TO MATHURADAS TRIKUMJI

LAHORE,

*Magsar Sud 14 [December 6, 1919]*¹

CHI. MATHURADAS,

Bhai Ratanlal of *Hindustan* has passed away. Please go and look up his family. Let me have an idea of their situation. Also let me know who now looks after *Hindustan*. You should also meet Bhai Mavji Govindji and inform me of the latest position regarding the Padhiar memorial.

CHI. MATHURADAS TRIKUMDAS

247 BAZAR GATE STREET

FORT, BOMBAY

From the Gujarati original: Pyarelal Papers, Nehru Memorial Museum and Library. Courtesy: Beladevi Nayyar and Dr. Sushila Nayyar

127. PUNJAB LETTER

SHEIKHUPURA,

Magshar Sud 15 [December 7, 1919]

VISIT TO OTHER PLACES

From Wazirabad, we proceeded to Akalgarh and then to Ramnagar. The two places are close by; Ramnagar is about four miles from Akalgarh. The population of the latter is not likely to be more than 4,000, it may even be less; that of Ramnagar may be 3,000. At one time, both were prosperous villages and as such enjoyed the favour of Ranjit Singh. They are both so small that one can go round either in ten minutes. In Akalgarh live the grand-children of Mulraj, the well-known Nizam Diwan of Multan. Both the places have fallen on evil days now. I was touched by the sight of Ramnagar. There were, here, the beautiful mansion and the garden of a governor of Ranjit Singh's. Today they are inhabited only by birds. The mansion is slowly crumbling away. One storey has come down altogether and

¹ The year and month are from the postmark, and *Magsar Sud 14* corresponded to December 6 in 1919.

the remainder is gradually decaying. The garden looks like a waste land. One sees other ruined building too. At one time Ramnagar had a flourishing trade in leather bottles for carrying ghee. One entire street was inhabited by people who made these. That street is now desolate. There is only one worker living there now. Tin cans have taken the place of leather bottles and, in consequence, India loses that amount of money to foreign countries.

Similarly, formerly there were many weavers in Ramnagar. This class has not yet been completely wiped out. A few looms are still working, but their business is declining day by day. At one time Ramnagar produced all the cloth it needed, and some more for others. The people of this same Ramnagar now get their cloth from abroad. To be sure, it is not that Akalgarh, Ramnagar and similar other towns do not have enough workers with courage and a spirit of service in them. Only, everyone labours under the delusion that, as a matter of course, cloth must be imported and that ghee must be stored in tin cans. To be in the fashion, one should engage oneself in some kind of political activity, or work to provide relief in times of epidemics such as the plague and, if possible, collect money and start a school, forgetting all about it afterwards. Consequently, these are the things on which workers waste their time.

Of course, they are not satisfied with these things and so, when I speak of truth, fearlessness, swadeshi and national education to them, those to whom these things appeal listen to me attentively and do not like to leave my side. If I am ready to give *darshan* all day, they would willingly sit by me all the time. That is the state of both men and women.

At Akalgarh and Ramnagar, both men and women were beside themselves with love. They showered flowers on me. At both places, besides collecting evidence, I spoke at great length on swadeshi and other matters.

GARLANDS OF YARN

I am distressed with these masses of flowers and the useless expenditure incurred on them. I have, therefore, started asking for garlands of hand-spun yarn and I have been getting them. In Akalgarh, they piled up by my side heaps of yarn spun by ladies of good family, and of cloth woven from such yarn, which included beautiful khadi sheets and towels.

THESE INNOCENT VILLAGES

I got the impression that the people of Akalgarh and Ramnagar were entirely innocent. The best among them have been arrested and put to harassment. They have been imprisoned, insulted, abused and fined. We in Bombay Presidency cannot even imagine some of the things which I saw here.

HAFIZABAD

I do not, however, want to keep the reader too long over the tale of suffering of the Punjab people. Having forged a bond of love with these two villages, we moved on to Hafizabad. This is, comparatively, a larger village. It has rice mills and has a brisk trade in other things as well. In consequence, the place looks more like a town than a village and has an air of prosperity. The people here cannot be held altogether blameless, but the punishment meted out to them has been out of all proportion to their transgressions. The officers seem to have but one idea put into their head to humiliate the leaders of the people and, if possible, to ruin them altogether.

THE LORD'S WILL PREVAILS

But man does not always have his way. One recalls on this occasion Narasinh Mehta's poem "If man's efforts could avail, we would find none in misery". The officers thought that they would now be able to suppress the people totally and be free to do as they liked. But their efforts at suppression have had the opposite effect. The leaders have not been cowed down nor have the people abandoned them. Slowly people are shedding their fear. Thus, man proposed one thing and God disposed it otherwise. Those who at one time were timid have now given up all fear.

I think the officials, too, are repenting. They may not do so in public, and General Dyer may say what he likes; they do feel ashamed, none the less. They dimly realize that they have made a mistake and, I am certain that, if we go about our task in a clean way, the time will come when they will repent openly.

In Hafizabad, I also got an opportunity of addressing some students. I pointed out to them that their education, being exclusively of the intellect, was incomplete, that if it could be intellectual, emotional and physical, it would nourish all three the mind, the soul and the body, and that it was such education which would profit India. The mind [I said] could be developed only through one's own

language, the heart and the soul only through dharma; this latter the pupils would imbibe only if the teacher's conduct was informed with it, if they saw it in every word and act of his. Physical education could be given by teaching the pupil agriculture and weaving and hardening his body through them. Every teacher or school or town which was taken could make a beginning in this programme. No one need wait for others or for the establishment of swaraj. If the seed is sown anywhere, it will bear fruit and will have an effect somewhere else. The head master is planning to make an experiment in his school.

WOMEN'S MEETING

The women in Hafizabad could not attend the men's meeting as the time and place did not suit them. Hence, they asked for a separate meeting and I agreed to it. The result was that the women came in even greater numbers than the men. I always confine myself to two subjects when addressing women one, that they should exert themselves for the sake of those of their dear ones who are in jail, but abandon all anxiety and grieving, and, two, that they should take up the spinning-wheel as a religious duty. At the end of my talk, there was a heap of hand-spun yarn before me. There were garlands of yarn, too, ever so many of them. Several women vowed always to wear hand-woven cloth made from hand-spun yarn.

REQUEST TO GUJARATI WOMEN

The women of Gujarat have much to learn from their sisters in the Punjab. Punjabi women are extremely simple in their attire. Very few wear ornaments, or materials such as gold lace, and all know spinning. Not all these women are poor. It is quite likely that they possess as much money as their sisters in Gujarat. But they love the spinning-wheel and prefer simplicity. Their freedom and modesty appeal to me very much. The men show them great respect. When I arrived at Ramnagar, men and women came a mile out to meet me and the men always made way for the women. I have already referred to this courtesy and restraint and I still have the same experience. If any women in Gujarat have a doubt regarding the spinning-wheel, I would request them to follow the example of their sisters in the Punjab and I would ask the men to emulate the Punjabis' courtesy towards their womenfolk.

SANGLA HILL

From Hafizabad we went to Sangla Hill. This is a new village and, consequently, I did not observe here the seriousness I did in the other three villages. The people seemed to be new settlers, rather than long-established and mature residents. But there was nothing wanting in their love. As we reached there at night, the whole village was lighted up with little candles and there were thousands of them illuminating every street.

We were accommodated in the Thakurdwara Temple. The people felt that it would be fitting to welcome me in a religious institution. The reason why I was put up in a temple in Hafizabad did not, in fact, exist in the case of Sangla Hill. The idea there was to do me greater honour. I was, of course, happy, except that I feared that the people were showing me too blind a regard.

As in Akalgarh and Ramnagar, in Sangla also the people had been spared no suffering though they had done nothing wrong.

IN LAHORE

From here we went for a day to Lahore. It was necessary to meet Panditji. Shri Uttamlal Trivedi happened to be there with his wife and nephew. He had come on behalf of the Presidency Association to ascertain the reasons why the local committee here had boycotted the Hunter Committee. I could have a talk with him. Panditji had already had a talk with him.

MEETING WITH MR. NEVILLE

Mr. Neville has been invited by the Sub-committee. He is a well-known solicitor from England and has come to help in the collection of evidence. I had a meeting with him, too. He has met the Lt.-Governor and also seen the work of the Hunter Committee. For the present, he will remain in the Punjab. Pandit Motilal has recovered and has come down. He has now taken a separate house for himself and stays with his family. As he has been elected President of the Congress, he is busy preparing his speech.

SHEIKHUPURA

Having stayed 36 hours in Lahore, we proceeded to Sheikhpura, from where I am writing this letter. This is a tiny village 25 miles from Lahore. Here, too, the position is the same as that at Sangla Hill. The people are innocent. Gujranwala and the other

villages I have mentioned are all in the same district and, therefore, under one administrative officer who, it seems, knows no difference between justice and injustice. Consequently, Sheikhpura is in the same plight as Akalgarh and other villages, having had to suffer the same repression.

[From Gujarati]

Navajivan, 14-12-1919

128. LETTER TO ESTHER FAERING

LAHORE,

[December 7] 1919

MY DEAR CHILD,

I have your two letters including the long one. You have done well in sending it. As I have already said, you have come to the Ashram not to lose your Christianity, but to perfect it.

If you don't feel the presence of God at the prayer meetings, then remember that the names Rama and Krishna signify the same as Jesus to you.

You should most decidedly not attend these meetings and you should pray in your private chamber. The prayer meetings are not meant to force anyone into a position. They are meant for free men and women. The children must attend. Those who abstain from sheer laziness must attend. But for you, no one can misunderstand your abstinence. You will therefore please do that which gives you the greatest peace. The Ashram is nothing if it does to enable you to realize God more and more fully day by day. If on Sundays or any other days you would go to Church, of course you shall do so.

I am so glad you have given me that long and beautiful letter and enabled me to enter more fully into your heart. Your coming is a joy to me. It will be a greater joy, if upon experience you find it gives you peace, health and real joy and if it thereby enables the other Christians to see that God and Christianity can be found also in institutions that do not call themselves Christian and that truth is the same in all religious though through refraction it appears for the time being variegated even as light does through a prism.

I feel like you that it is too early for you to go to Madras even to meet Miss Petersen. Will she not come to the Ashram? She ought

to. Let her come and see it in its new habitation and feel its progress if there is any made. Please give her my love.

I do hope you have now completely recovered. You should not trifle with your body. You cannot take the liberties that those born on the soil can. You must therefore insist on the comforts your body needs.

With love,

Yours,

BAPU

From a photostat of the original in N.A.I.; also *My Dear Child*, pp. 45-6

129. LETTER TO MAGANLAL GANDHI

CHUDKHANA,

Sunday [December 7, 1919]¹

CHI. MAGANLAL,

I got your letter while I was touring. I shall return to Lahore the day after tomorrow, Tuesday. I had a telegram from Harilal to say that he was coming to see me.

With Ba things are as you say and I am unhappy about it. So long as she does not consider you all with the same regard as Harilal, her staying in the Ashram is in vain. But we cannot escape the situation and, therefore, must submit to it and feel compassion for Ba.

There was no help but to send Santok. I do not expect the results which you do, for the thing is extremely difficult. Keep up your efforts, though. It will not be convenient to build a house for me outside the Ashram. I think it will be desirable to have one in the Ashram itself, which would give me some privacy. This is already included in our plan. It will suffice if the house is a part of the library.

I have sent a telegram so that I may know what Chi. Anandlal has to say. I do not think it possible to revise the prices. Anandlal must have in mind the prices in Kathiawar. However, it would be better to make sure.

As for the kitchen, we are not to prepare any vegetables. I think that is the best course if it helps us to save and to keep better health.

¹ The date has been inferred from the fact that the letter was received by the addressee on December 10.

At any rate, this should be the ultimate goal. Just as we do not look out for company when going for evacuation, we should have no one to keep us company at meals. If we can really regard eating as in no way different from evacuation, we would attend to this also in private. It would be shameful for us to arrange for separate cooking for ourselves, so that we might indulge our palate. But I know that our experiment is not inspired by the high ideal mentioned above. If, therefore, such separate cooking has unhappy consequences, we should certainly stop it.

Plan your work yourself. If only we can achieve our aim somehow, that is all we want.

Blessings from

BAPU

From the Gujarati original in Gandhiji's hand: C.W. 5780. Courtesy: Radhabehn Choudhri

130. SWARAJ IN SWADESHI

The much-talked-of Reforms Bill¹ will become the law of the land within a few days and in due course the new legislatures will take the place of the old. H.E. the Viceroy has announced that he is going loyally to abide by the new scheme and that he will try to make it a success. I have refrained from expressing an opinion on the report of the Joint Committee for, I do not feel sufficiently interested in it. It is not possible to be enthused over a thing which when analysed means little for the people. So far, therefore, as the Reform Scheme is concerned, I would simply urge that we should take the fullest advantage of it and, like the Viceroy, loyally work to make it a success. That it is an improvement upon the original measure is admitted by all.

But the real reform that India needs is swadeshi in its true sense. The immediate problem before us is not how to run the government of the country, but how to feed and clothe ourselves. In 1918 we sent sixty crores of rupees out of India for buying cloth. If we continue to purchase foreign cloth at that rate, we deprive the Indian weaver and spinner of that amount from year to year *without practically giving*

¹ The Government of India Act, 1919, embodying the Montagu-Chelmsford proposals for constitutional reforms

him or her any other work in exchange. No wonder a tenth at least of the population is cruelly half-starved and the majority of the rest underfed. He who has eyes may see for himself that *the middle-class people are already being underfed and our babies are not getting enough milk for themselves.* The Reform Scheme, no matter how liberal it is, will not help to solve the problem in the immediate future. But swadeshi can solve it *now*.

The Punjab has made the solution still clearer to me. God be thanked that the beautiful women of the Punjab have not yet lost the cunning of their fingers. High or low, they still know the art of spinning. They have not yet burnt their spinning-wheels as many Gujarati women have done. It is to me a perfect delight to find them throwing balls of yarn into my lap. They admit they have time at their disposal for spinning. They admit that the khaddar woven from their hand-spun yarn is superior to the machine-spun yarn. Our forefathers were well able to clothe themselves with little effort and with perfect comfort without having to buy from the foreign markets.

This beautiful art and yet so simple is in danger of being lost if we do not wake up betimes. The Punjab gives proof of its possibilities. But the Punjab too is fast losing her hold of it. Every year witnesses a decrease in the output of hand-spun yarn. It means greater poverty in our homes and greater idleness. The women who have ceased to spin are not utilising their time in any other or better manner than gossiping.

But one thing is needful to undo the mischief. If every educated Indian will realise his clear primary duty, he will straightway present the women of his household with a spinning-wheel and provide the facilities for learning the art of spinning. Millions of yards of yarn can be produced from day to day. And if every educated Indian will condescend to wear the cloth produced from such yarn, he will support and assist in rebuilding the only possible cottage industry of India.

Without a cottage industry the Indian peasant is doomed. He cannot maintain himself from the produce of the land. He needs a supplementary industry. Spinning is the easiest, the cheapest and the best.

I know this means a revolution in our mental outlook. And it is because it is a revolution that I claim that the way to swaraj lies through swadeshi. A nation that can save sixty crores of rupees per

year and distribute that large sum amongst its spinners and weavers in their own homes will have acquired powers of organisation and industry that must enable it to do everything else necessary for its organic growth.

The dreamy reformer whispers, "Wait till I get responsible government and I will protect India's industry, without our women having to spin and our weaver having to weave." This has been actually said by thinking men. I venture to suggest that there is a double fallacy underlying the proposition. India cannot wait for a protective tariff and protection will not reduce the cost of clothing. Secondly, mere protection will not benefit the starving millions. They can only be helped by being enabled to supplement their earnings by having a spinning industry restored to them. So whether we have a protective tariff or not, we shall still have to revive the hand-spinning industry and stimulate hand-weaving.

When the War was raging, all available hands in America and England were utilized in the naval yards for building ships and they built them, too, at an amazing pace. If I would have my way, I would make every available Indian learn spinning or weaving and make him or her do that work for a certain fixed portion of every day. I would start with schools and colleges presenting as they do ready-made organised units.

Multiplication of mills cannot solve the problem. They will take too long to overtake the drain and they *cannot distribute* the sixty crores in our homes. They can only cause concentration of money and labour and thus make confusion worse confounded.

Young India, 10-12-1919

131. LETTER TO MAGANLAL GANDHI

LAHORE,

Wednesday [December 10, 1919]¹

CHI. MAGANLAL,

I got your letter.

Chhotalal is not able to move about. He has a boil on his thigh. Actually it was only a pimple. It has been opened. He will be all right in a day or two. I am put to no inconvenience.

¹ From the reference to Harilal being with Gandhiji, it appears the letter was written on the Wednesday following December 7. *Vide* "Letter to Maganlal Gandhi", 7-12-1919.

Harilal has come here. He will leave tomorrow. He has only come to see me about his business.

The Ashram inmates have not at all grown strong enough in body yet to satisfy me. I feel worried. Personally, I take full care of my health. I have no doubt about this at all. If I exercised greater control on myself, I think I could be fitter still. I eat twice a day, for that is the only way I can keep the body fit. I have realized from experience that, when under pressure of work or touring, eating less does no harm to the body at all. We cannot run away from work which comes to us unasked. If a man is being burnt to death, we should run to his help even at the risk of our life. If a serpent runs towards a child to bite it, we would even sacrifice our life to save it. Only a body which has been put to use in this manner and has survived can be of any service. The Ashram inmates have a duty to build up sound health. I have done so and now I use the body, but with due care. We may take only as much care of it as is consistent with its full use. If I exercise self-control so as to be more regular still and thus save time, I can safeguard my health better. That requires plenty of courage. I must be blunt with the people and tell them that I have had enough. This is not always possible. This. . . .¹

I think it impossible, and improper as well, to meet each and every need. More, you may decide yourself.

I thought we used to get some money from Krishnamma, rather than the other way about. I see no objection to his being given sixteen rupees. Give it on the Ashram account. Manindra's also should be on the Ashram account. However, make a note about those who work in the press and draw according to the fixed rate of payment, so that the entries balance. Anything given in excess of what a person has earned through his work should be drawn from the Ashram.

I think we cannot give more than ninety rupees a month to Shamaldas. So long as he has not written to me, I do not write to him. Do what you think best. I shall certainly write, if you wish.

I understand what you say about the buildings.

Blessings from

BAPU

From the Gujarati original in Gandhiji's hand: S. N. 7021

¹ A page is missing here.

132. LETTER TO NARAHARI PARIKH

LAHORE,

Wednesday [December 10, 1919]¹

BHAISHRI NARAHARI,

I have your letter. I congratulate you on your losing the cook. Let the boys have some training in cooking their own meals. If Dwarakanath takes over cooking as well, it will be still better. He may have a servant to help him. Dwarakanath is not a Brahmin, of course. These are, however, fanciful suggestions. Do what you think best. Why should it not be possible to get an educated Brahmin to cook? Our ship the nation's ship itself is going in the wrong direction.

Tell Girjashankar that I have not forgotten about the hotel trust; only I have had no time.

We shall now be meeting in a few days, I think. Tell Kishorelal that even when in Bombay he should not forget the work of the school and that it will certainly be possible for him to attend to the work for swadeshi.

Blessings from

BAPU

BALKRISHNA

Iron, arsenic and quinine.² Two pills to be swallowed half an hour after meals. Take one tea-spoonful of maltine³ with milk thrice a day.

Walking for exercise.

DURGA

*Liquor arsenicalis acidus*⁴.

Two drops after meals in a glass with an ounce of water twice a day. To be increased up to four drops. After eight days, stop taking for four days.

Exercise, very little; may go out for a walk, no fetching of water.

¹ From the post-script to this letter, it seems likely that it was written on the same day as the letter to Maganlal Gandhi; *vide* the preceding item.

² Gandhiji gives the names in English

³ *ibid*

⁴ Gandhiji uses the Latin term.

PRABHUDAS

Take injections again. After a month, a little exercise. Not to read much.

From the Gujarati original in Gandhiji's hand: S. N. 7014

133. LETTER TO REGISTRAR, HIGH COURT, BOMBAY¹

[DELHI]

December 11, 1919

With reference to your letter regarding the publication of the letter of the District Judge, Ahmedabad, in the matter of the satyagrahi lawyers, I beg to state that I have now consulted legal friends and given much anxious consideration to the suggestion made by His Lordship the Chief Justice. But I regret to state that I find myself unable to publish the suggested apology. The document in question came into my possession in the ordinary course and being of great public importance I decided to publish and comment upon it. In doing so I performed in my humble opinion a useful public duty at a time when there was great tension and when even the judiciary was being affected by the popular prejudice. I need hardly say that I had no desire whatsoever to prejudge the issues that their Lordships had to decide.

I am anxious to assure His Lordship the Chief Justice that at the time I decided to publish the document in question, I had fully in mind the honour of journalism as also the fact that I was a member of the Bombay Bar and as such expected to be aware of the tradition thereof. But thinking of my action in the light of what has happened I am unable to say that in similar circumstances I would act differently from what I did when I decided to publish and comment upon Mr. Kennedy's letter. Much, therefore, as I would like to act upon His Lordship's suggestion, I feel that I could not conscientiously offer any apology for my action. Should this explanation be not considered sufficient by His Lordship, I shall respectfully suffer the penalty that their Lordships may be pleased to impose upon me.

¹ This was published also in *Young India*, 10-3-1920.

I beg to apologise for the delay caused in replying to your letter. I have been touring continuously in the Punjab, and am not likely to be free before the beginning of the next month.¹

From a photostat of a copy: S. N. 7128a; also *The Bombay Law Reporter*, Vol. XXII

134. REFORMS

By the time this article appears in print, the Reforms Bill will have become or will be about to become law. What shall we do with these reforms? The answer to this question depends on the kind of reforms they are.

If we measure them with the yardstick of the Congress League Scheme², we ought to reject them; if we accept the resolutions passed at the last Congress, we shall find an ocean of difference between them and the reforms.

What do we mean by “rejecting” the reforms? “Rejecting” them means refusing to work them. Not working them means abstaining from voting, from enlisting ourselves as voters or standing for election as members. No one is ready for such rejection, nor have we made any efforts towards that end. The deputations³ which went to England gave no indications to that effect.

It must also be admitted that the nation is not yet ready for such rejection; it has not had the required political education. Whenever something is disapproved by us so utterly that its acceptance will kill the soul, then we are entitled, we owe it as a duty, to reject that thing; the idea that it is only by such rejection that we can raise ourselves in the shortest possible time has not yet taken root in us.

¹ Before however this letter reached the Registrar, he had, on the same day, “*suo moto* applied for a rule *nisi* calling upon Messrs Gandhi and Desai to show cause why they should not be committed or otherwise dealt with according to law for contempt of court in respect of the publication of the said letter”. The application was granted by Justices Shah and Crump on that day, but the rule itself was not actually issued till December 19.

² *Vide* “The Congress-League Scheme”.

³ The reference is to the several deputations which visited Britain to represent the reactions of different schools of political thought to the Government of India Bill, which was introduced in the House of Commons in July, 1919. These were: the Congress deputation, among whose members were Vithalbhay Patel, Lokamanya Tilak, B.C. Pal and V.P. Madhava Rao, the Moderate deputation, the Justice Party deputation and two Home Rule deputations representing the division of opinion in the All-India Home Rule League.

According to the canon ‘the doubter goes to destruction,’¹ we shall not be ready for great sacrifices so long as we doubt this idea. We are able to experiment thus only in small matters. By “small” we mean such matters as those in which sacrifice brings immediate result and involves no risk of serious danger. If we reject the reforms, it seems more likely that we shall get no immediate benefit. Hence, it will not be advisable for us to reject them.

We may certainly criticize the reforms, but the criticism should be moderate and intended only as an expression of our disappointment. We can and must say that we will struggle for more.

But the more important thing is to find out how we can make the best use of these reforms and use them so.

We must acknowledge here that the Bill introduced in the House of Commons has been amended and important rights have been conceded to us. At one time we had very little hope of securing them. It even used to be said that the Reforms Bill would not be passed at all at present. Instead, the Bill will now pass with some welcome amendments. We may derive what comfort we can from these things. There is no doubt that the real credit for these improvements goes to Mr. Montagu. That the Reforms Bill will pass in no more than a few days now should also be credited to Mr. Montagu’s account.

After studying the reforms, the nation should try to send honest and competent representatives to the legislatures. To the extent that the representatives care little for honour, for position and consequential material benefits, to the extent that the service of the people is their chief aim, the reforms will be better used and we shall be qualified the sooner for full responsibility and succeed in securing it.

What about the Rowlatt Act? What about the Punjab? We had the best remedy for these, if we could have rejected the reforms. Now the only course for us is to make good use of the new councils for securing justice in both these matters. The Rowlatt Act ought to be repealed and agitation to that end can be carried on in the Legislative Assembly. If we fail, our weapon is ever ready with us. The same about the Punjab. It has yet to get justice and the place where we can secure this, too, is the Legislative Assembly. In both these matters, the new representatives and the reforms will be on their trial.

[From Gujarati]

Navajivan, 14-12-1919

¹ *Bhagavad Gita*, IV, 40

135. LETTER TO ESTHER FAERING

LAHORE,

Sunday [December 14] 1919

MY DEAR CHILD,

I have your letter and had the vest also. May I thank you for it? I am having it washed.

Have you commenced spinning? I would like you to study my article on swadeshi in *Young India*.¹ Will you please learn spinning and religiously give it one hour every day? Your and my forefathers wore only hand-spun and hand-woven clothing. The words spinster (from spinning) and wife (from weaving) are highly significant. I would like you to set an example to the ladies of the Ashram in regular spinning. Is Fatima doing any now? If not please tell her and Amina not to neglect it. They were to do it for a fixed time every day and so were all the ladies for that matter.

I am glad they all nursed you during your illness. Mutual help and service is really the first step to a truly godly life.

With love,

Yours,

BAPU

From a photostat of the original in N.A.I.; also *My Dear Child*, pp. 46-7

¹ Vide "Swaraj in Swadeshi", 10-12-1919.

136. LETTER TO EDMUND CANDLER

2, MOZANG ROAD,
LAHORE,
December 15, 1919

DEAR MR. CANDLER,

I thank you for your letter¹ of the 12th instant. I appreciate the friendliness underlying it and I entirely accept your assurance that no offence whatsoever was intended by you.

My attention was drawn to the article in question and I did consider that it was unwisely worded. I felt too that both Hindus and Mahomedans were likely to be offended by the manner in which I was caricatured. But your letter must silence all hostile criticism. Modern journalism certainly permits attacks on the supposed weak points of those whose policy is criticised and I grant that you intended to do no more. I thank you too for putting me the questions you have. They enable me to explain my position more fully than perhaps it has been by my writings and speeches.

As to your first question I do not wish and have never wished to embarrass Government and I have never worked up an anti-British campaign for any cause whatsoever. My personal religion would forbid me to do either the one or the other. But sometimes one's right conduct does embarrass those who do not for the moment appreciate it and in that sense I admit that my conduct like that of any reformer has embarrassed people. But I cannot be accused of partiality. Relentless pursuits of truth and conduct flowing from it have embarrassed the dearest ones not excluding my wife and children. But I was no more anti- the dear ones than I am anti-British. I have the privilege of the friendship or the goodwill of hundreds of Englishmen and Englishwomen. I would be unworthy of their friendship or goodwill if I harboured anti-British feelings. My stubborn opposition to some acts of the British Government must not be mistaken for unfriendliness. Such peculiar notions are entertained about friendliness and loyalty in India that any strong expression of displeasure in regard to acts of Government passes for disloyalty. You

¹ Vide "Swaraj in Swadeshi", 10-12-1919.

will agree with me that real loyalty that dares to utter unpalatable truths must in such an atmosphere be a rare virtue.

As to your second question, I confess that my regard for the claims of the Turk is derived totally from my regard for my fellow-countrymen, the Mahomedans. I should forfeit the right to call them fellow-countrymen if I did not feel for them in everything vitally affecting them provided that their cause was just. The peace of my country is likely to be placed in jeopardy, not by my earnest effort to guide the Mahomedan feeling in the right channel, but it certainly will be by any thoughtless or ignorant action of British Ministers. I venture to claim that I have rendered a service of the highest order by advising the Mahomedans of India to express their sentiments in a restrained manner and by advising the Hindus to make common cause with them.

You are right, however, in questioning the wisdom of going against the opinions of men like Gladstone, Morley and Bryce, for whom I certainly entertain high regard, but the necessity for the question really arises from your not knowing the Mahomedan claim for Turkey. I invite you to study their view-point. They ask for nothing that has not been granted to the other Powers or that was not vouchsafed to them by the British Ministers themselves. Their claims, as you may be aware, has been backed by the majority of the ex-Governors and other distinguished Anglo-Indians. What has the treatment or ill-treatment by Turks of subject races to do with the Khilafat question, i.e., the integrity of Turkey or the Turk's custody of the holy places of Islam? Must Constantinople be wrenched from the Turks in order to safeguard the rights of subject races? If you as a journalist and an Englishman would preserve the peace of India and would have India to celebrate peace in a true manner, you would ask Englishmen living in India to make common cause with the Mahomedans and thus let the British Ministers know the real feeling of India so that justice might be done whilst there is yet time.

As you have permitted me to publish your letter, I am sending it and my reply to the Press.

Yours sincerely,

M. K. GANDHI

The Tribune, 18-12-1919

137. LETTER TO ANASUYABEHN SARABHAI

LAHORE,

Monday [December 15, 1919]¹

PUJYA BEHN,

Pandit Jagat Narain² asked me where he should stay. I have suggested your brother's bungalow. Please sound him and if he agrees to invite Pandit Jagat Narain, tell him to send a telegram. Pandit Jagat Narain will be in Lucknow by the 22nd. You will receive this letter on the 17th, so you will be in time if you send the wire here. If you send the telegram after the 20th, then it should be sent to Lucknow. He will reach Ahmedabad on January 27. Please arrange for him to stay somewhere else if Brother is not willing to accommodate him. I have suggested your house too. He is willing to stay with you. Please let me know by wire whatever you decide to do.

I am sure I shall reach there by the 1st.

Vandemataram from

MOHANDAS

From a photostat of the Gujarati: S.N. 32831

138. PUNJAB LETTER

[About December 15, 1919]³

CHUHARKANA

I wrote my last letter from Sheikhupura. This town was built by the Emperor Jehangir and has a fort and a large temple. They are said to be worth a visit though, of course, I did not have the time to go there. It is said that the Golden Temple at Amritsar is a copy of this one, and smaller.

¹ From the reference to the letter reaching its destination on the 17th and from 'Monday' and 'Lahore' in the dateline. 15th December, 1919 was a Monday and Gandhiji was in Lahore. This date is further confirmed by reference to Gandhiji's reaching Ahmedabad by the 1st of the following month. He reached Ahmedabad from Lahore on January 4, 1920.

² Member of the Legislative Council of the United Provinces; one of the three Indian members of the Hunter Committee.

³ Gandhiji's visit to Delhi, referred to in the letter, took place on December 11. Probably he wrote it on the following Monday, which fell on this date.

From Sheikhpura we went to Chuharkana. This village is some distance from the station. Our work was in the Chuharkana *mandi*. Here the market is called *mandi*. But there is a difference between the bazaar of Gujarat and the *mandi* of the Punjab. Here the *mandi* means a large square surrounded by houses. All kinds of goods are brought to the square and the shops are situated round it. The *mandi* in Chuharkana is comparatively large and goods worth thousands lie there. Some big canals start from near Chuharkana and, as a result, there is a large yield of cotton and other crops. We noticed that the people had set the station on fire and had done other damage also. As usual, a large meeting was arranged near the *mandi*. Crowds had collected at the Chuharkana station and we have to walk with them to the place where we were to stay. But the crowd surged towards me with such force that we could scarcely proceed. The people around me tried their best to protect me but my bare feet were crushed all the same. Every person coveted *darshan*. There is always much dust near a village and not a little of it went into our mouths, noses and ears. The noise was no less. At the meeting, therefore, I spoke to the people at great length about the need for discipline. I said that it was certainly to be welcomed that people feel respect for those whom they look upon as great, but that, unless this feeling of respect expressed itself in the right manner it was bound to harm the country. There is greater inconvenience, moreover, where proper arrangements have not been made and people trained in advance. It is easy to ensure, with a little training, that people make way for others and walk behind and at some distance from the person whom they wish to honour, make no unnecessary noise and follow the directions of a leader.

DISORDER AT MEETING

When the meeting commenced, the uproar was beyond description. Everyone was shouting. This state of affairs became intolerable to me. I immediately made a polite appeal to the people, telling them that, if they did not become quiet and sit down, they would prevent themselves from hearing the very words for which all this noise was being made. The people then sat down and became perfectly quiet. I pointed out the mistakes they had, out of their love, made when we were near the station. When the meeting ended, the crowd dispersed quietly and did not press round me. There is no lack of understanding or power of thinking among the people, they only need someone to guide them. I explained to them in this meeting that

the mistakes they had committed in attempting to set fire to buildings were also the result of lack of training. Many had had no intention of setting fire to buildings but, when one person started doing so, another followed suit. If the people had been trained to think before doing anything and to follow a responsible leader, such incidents would not have occurred.

A SCENE IN DELHI

On December 11, I had occasion to pay a flying visit to Delhi. I was to go there for work in connection with South Africa, but I accepted an invitation to preside over a function of the Seva Mandal established by Shri Ram, a well-known barrister there. It became known that I was to preside. Consequently, uninvited guests flocked in their thousands and pushed their way in through the entrance. They could not tolerate the idea that only ticket-holders should be allowed entry on such an occasion. All were embarrassed. So was I. How unseemly that these people who had come to see and honour me should not have been able to behave with greater restraint!

LEADERS AND PUBLIC

But this was not due to discourtesy. Are we taught anywhere that our habit of rushing towards a person whose *darshan* we seek is improper? Not in places of pilgrimage. Whether in temples or in *havelis*¹, “first come first served” and “might is right” are the laws that prevail. The educated or highly placed either avoid such places or, if they visit them at all, make special arrangements for themselves. The evils remain as they are. The Seva Mandal gave assistance during the plague, arranged for cremation of dead bodies and provided medicines. All this is certainly necessary. If even this had not been made available all over the country, we would have been wiped out long ago. But this is not enough. It is very limited service. Prizes and certificates were to be distributed at the Seva Mandal meeting. These were all in English! The reason for the rush then became clear to me. There is no close touch between the leaders and the people. We do not realize the need to provide the people the most necessary training, nor have we secured the means for it. Those who had forced their way in did not know English. We gave medicine but, when the patients were cured, we did not know how to teach them to play their part in a democracy. We think that for this they must first learn English

¹ *Vaishnava* temples

because we think we ourselves have got the training through English. And so the common people rushed in today, as is their wont. I placed these facts before the meeting. The audience understood my meaning and was ashamed. There is a new awakening in the country. The common people now want to play their part, are ready for self-sacrifice, but do not know the way. And so long as we do not speak to the people in their own language, what can they understand? How can they understand?

LYALLPUR

I shall now revert to Chuharkana. From there we went to Lyallpur. This is a separate district and is one of the five where Martial Law had been proclaimed. The district takes its name from Lyallpur, which is quite a new town named after Sir Charles Lyall¹. The town came into being in 1896. There is a clock tower at the centre of the city, set in a large circle from which eight roads fan out. Houses and shops have been built along them. We can see that all these have been newly built. This is the place known as the main canal colony. The finest wheat and cotton crops grow in this canal area and the people are fairly prosperous. Lyallpur has a population of about 30,000. During the Martial Law, hell had been let loose here. The people had done no harm whatsoever, yet many prominent persons were arrested and unnecessarily harassed. Here also there was a huge meeting. There was a separate meeting for women and, although the men's meeting was held far from the town, women were present in large numbers. The arrangements at Lyallpur were comparatively good. Wherever the people have received even a little training, the effects are immediately apparent. I have been informed that the spinning programme can succeed very well in the Lyallpur area.

SPINNING-WHEEL WITH TEN SPINDLES

A craftsman from Ludhiana has left a ten-spindled spinning-wheel with me. The design is quite good, simple and cheap. But he could not spin on all the spindles simultaneously. He was intelligent but had not been able to make progress for want of experience. When the thing was explained to him, he followed it all right, and he has promised to try again. Having seen this spinning-wheel, I have a hope that we may see a ten-spindled spinning-wheel in India. Someone

¹ Sir Charles James Lyall (1845-1920); English orientalist; served in Bengal Civil Service, Chief Commissioner of Central Provinces, 1895-98; Secretary, Judicial and Public Department, India Office, 1898-1910

from Kanpur has also informed me that he has constructed such a model. I hope that craftsmen familiar with this work will make efforts and produce, within the time limit, a spinning-wheel which will win the prize.

JOURNEY ENDS

The visit to Lyallpur was the last lap of my journey. Still the Gujarat district remains. But I have decided to devote time now to writing the report. After giving a week to this, I hope to tour the Gujarat district.

ARRIVAL OF MR. JAYAKAR

Mr. Jayakar¹ has come from Bombay to assist the Congress Sub-committee. At the moment he is helping Mr. Abbas Tayabji². Mr. C.R. Das has done with Amritsar and come to Lahore. Pandit Motilal Nehru, having accepted the Presidentship of the Congress, has resigned as Commissioner and Pandit Malaviyaji has accepted the resignation. The Hon'ble Fazlul Huq who went to Bengal has not yet returned. Pandit Motilal Nehru is busy preparing his speech. It is expected that he will deliver it in Hindi-Urdu. Copies of the English translation will be kept ready and will be distributed to those who do not know Hindi or Urdu. Though the report of the Sub-committee will be completed early, it will not be published till after the report of Lord Hunter's Committee is released. This is only proper because it will be discourteous to make our report public before Lord Hunter submits his.

[From Gujarati]

Navajivan, 21-12-1919

¹ Dr. Mukund R. Jayakar; Barrister; Member, Bombay Legislative Council; worked with Gandhiji in 1919 on Congress inquiry into Punjab repression; Federal Court Judge, 1937-9; Vice-Chancellor, Poona University

² Abbas Tayabji, Gandhiji's friend and lieutenant in the earlier civil disobedience campaigns in India

139. INDIAN SITUATION IN EAST AFRICA¹

LAHORE,

December 16, 1919

Mr. Gandhi, in explaining the position, states that:

The anti-Indian agitation in East Africa is utterly unscrupulous and lacks even the plausibility that attached to the kindred agitation in South Africa, for the European colonist in South Africa claims South Africa as his home and further claims that he is the pioneer settler, whereas in East Africa the European can advance no such claims. He is there purely and simply for exploitation. It is the Indian who was the pioneer settler in East Africa long before a single European set foot on the East African soil. Before the uplands of East Africa were developed through Indian labour, European greed had found no scope for itself; but now that Nairobi affords a beautiful climate and an unlimited opportunity for game, the European has become impatient of the Indian merchant and landed proprietor. It is impossible to tolerate any diminution in our right in East Africa to settle there and to exercise even political influence. It is to be hoped that the Government of India and the Imperial Government will jealously guard the rights of Indians in East Africa and that the public bodies throughout India will speak with no uncertain voice upon the question.

The Bombay Chronicle, 17-12-1919

¹ This was Gandhiji's explanatory note with reference to the following message received from C.F. Andrews, from Nairobi: "The East African Indian situation is most critically dangerous because a united attempt is being made by European Associations to close the door against future immigration and to stop Indian franchise. The chief reason is stated to be that through the Indian contact depravity is the result, but advance under Christian Western civilization. The Government Economic Commission report recently published takes the same attitude mentioning specifically the Indian moral depravity and approving the South African exclusion policy. Intense indignation was expressed here by the local Indian Congress gathering which was remarkable for its weight and numbers. I have decided, on urgent request, to stay till January here. The Congress Committee decided on my suggestion to abandon the claim for preferential treatment in German East Africa while demanding complete continuance of all existing rights. Circulate and explain the situation." The statement appears to have been released generally to the Press as an Associated Press message and was published in several newspapers. The text of the cable quoted here has verbal variations from that quoted by Gandhiji in the following item.

140. FRAGMENT OF LETTER TO CHHAGANLAL GANDHI

[Before *December 17, 1919*]¹

I am enclosing an article on Indians abroad for *Young India*, as also a report of the Deputation's discussions with Smuts. They are in no way confidential. It does not seem likely that I shall be there before January. But I hope to reach there when the Hunter Committee commences work. The text of my statement is ready in my mind.² I will put it on paper when I get some time.

I got the two large envelopes you had sent containing numerous letters. They are badly torn. This convinces me that we cannot escape spending more money. The cloth-lined envelopes are stronger and you should use them.

From a photostat of the Gujarati : S. N. 7928 A

141. INDIANS ABROAD

South Africa, East Africa and Fiji present to-day problems for solution and test our capacity for nationalism. Not until we feel for the meanest of our countrymen as each one of us feels for himself, can we be said to have a consciousness of our nationality. Those of our countrymen who have settled in the different parts of the world look to us for guidance, help and protection.

And just as the spirit of nationality is being tested, so is that of imperialism. If imperialism means anything, it must mean and include the capacity for protecting all interests that belong to it. According to that test, Indians who have settled abroad claim double protection, viz., from us and from the Imperial Government.

And yet, both seem so far to have mainly failed in the discharge of their trust.

For though we may gain before the end of the year a final declaration that the Fiji indentures are over once and for all, it reflects no credit either on the Imperial power or on us that the corrupt and immoral system could persist for so many years. And if we gain the

¹ From the reference to the article "Indians Abroad", published in *Young India*, 17.12.1919; *vide* "Indians abroad", 17-12-1919.

² For Gandhiji's statement to the Disorders Inquiry Committee,

end, it would have been due largely to the single-minded efforts of those two gentle Englishmen Messrs Andrews and Pearson. But much more yet remains to be done. The Fiji Government has so cruelly neglected the welfare of these unhappy labourers that they are without proper facilities for education. They are in search of men who would educate them and guide them. Frankly we have not men enough in India who would do such work as a labour of love.

The problem in East Africa is becoming more and more serious, as the following cablegram, received by Mr. Gandhi from Mr. Andrews who is at Nairobi, shows:

East African Indian situation is now most critically dangerous because united attempt is being made by European associations to close the door against future immigration and to stop Indian franchise. The chief reason is stated to be that Africans morally deteriorate through Indian contact but advance under Christian Western civilization. Government Economic Commission's report recently published takes the same attitude mentioning specifically Indian moral depravity, approving the South African exclusion policy. Intense indignation was expressed here by the local Indian Congress gathering which was remarkable for its weight and numbers. I have decided on urgent request to stay till January here. The local Congress Committee has decided on my suggestion to abandon the claim for preferential treatment in German East Africa while demanding complete continuance of all existing rights. Circulate and explain situation in the Press and the Congress.

The cablegram shows the unscrupulousness of the agitation against the Indians. Those who prate about the Christian civilization are strangers to the Christian teaching and know nothing of the manner in which the Indian settler has raised the native of Africa. They ignore the teaching of history that the Indian settler penetrated East Africa when there was no European there and affected for the better manners and customs of the people. The Indians who went to South Africa did not force their customs upon the Africans nor did they take the brandy bottle in the one hand and the gun in the other, for they did not go to East Africa with the intention of "civilizing" the barbarians. They frankly went there to trade among the natives of the soil with their permission and left traces of their civilization among them in the same manner as any two sets of people are bound silently to be affected by each other's conduct. It is a simple misrepresentation of known facts to say that the presence of Indians in the

midst of East Africans has been in any shape or form detrimental to the latter.

What are we to do in the teeth of this unscrupulous agitation? In East Africa the European has not even the plausible argument, that he has in South Africa, of being the pioneer settler, for the Indian is the pioneer. The development of East Africa is due to Indian labour which worked in the midst of grave danger to health. If the Imperial Government surrenders an iota of the rights of Indians to the interested agitation of the European rivals, it would be a betrayal of trust. Mr. Andrews mentions the claim of domiciled Indians to preferential treatment. They have wisely give it up; not that they are not entitled to it in accordance with the standard of their detractors, but they give it up in order to smooth the situation an in order to keep themselves absolutely in the right. Here then is another problem for us and the Imperial Government, if we are to justify our respective claims.

Then there remains South Africa, which is really the most difficult of all. We reproduce in this issue the text of General Smuts' not unsympathetic reply¹ to the Indian Deputation that waited on him. Never has a community been engaged in an unequal fight such as our countrymen are in South Africa. Compared to their rivals they are poor. They have no political power and they have been engaged ever since 1880 in protecting the right to exist with self-respect a right which any civilized Government would not deny even to utter strangers. It speaks volumes for their courage and resourcefulness that they have been able to hold their own in the manner they have.

Young India, 17-12-1919

¹ *Vide* Appendix "General Smuts' Reply to Deputation", 24-12-1919

142. LETTER TO SIR GEORGE BARNES

[After *December 19, 1919*]

[SIR GEORGE BARNES
DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE & INDUSTRY
GOVERNMENT OF INDIA
NEW DELHI]

DEAR SIR GEORGE BARNES,

Several postal clerks have been to me. They have been asking for an increase since 1918 but none has yet been granted. They have recently learned that an increase has been granted to the telegraphists. That has made them more restless. The latest reply given to them is over the signature of the Postmaster General, Punjab, as follows:

POST AND TELEGRAPHS
SPECIAL CIRCULAR NO. 11

LAHORE,
December 19, 1919

TO
ALL SUPERINTENDENTS, HEADS AND SUB-POSTMASTERS
PUNJAB AND N.W.F. CIRCLE

I have received a number of telegrams and representation from the staff regarding the revision of pay of the clerical establishment. These representations give the impression that nothing has been done in the matter. This is not the case. The question was taken up by the Director-General early in the calendar year and his proposals were placed before the Government of India. The scheme is a large one and is now before the Secretary of State. It is hoped that his orders will be received by the end of the current month and that the new scale of pay will have retrospective effect. I much regret the delay for which the Director-General is not responsible. Meanwhile it is merely waste of time and money to send telegrams and representations to the Government of India and the Viceroy.

P.G. ROGERS,
POSTMASTER-GENERAL,
PUNJAB AND N.W.F. CIRCLE

The reply can hardly satisfy those who have not enough for bread and butter. I have asked the clerks to exercise patience. But I

trust you will treat this as a matter of urgency and issue some reassuring declaration.

Yours sincerely,

From the pencilled draft in Gandhiji's hand : S. N. 7082

143. FRAGMENT OF NOTE¹

[After *December 19, 1919*]

But the best part of Mr. Shastri's work for his country is being done behind the curtain. When however the history of the reforms comes to be written, the country will know what part Mr. Shastri has played in the advancement of the cause we have all at heart. There is a great deal too. . . .

From a photostat of a copy in Gandhiji's hand: S. N. 7082

144. PUNJAB LETTER

LAHORE,

Sunday [December 21, 1919]²

JALLIANWALA BAGH

I accompanied the Hon'ble Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya and Mr. Neville to Amritsar, Jallianwala Bagh and the streets where passers-by were made to crawl on their stomachs. We travelled by car and, on the way, got down to see the Khalsa College. This College has an extensive campus. The students are mostly Sikhs. There is an attached hostel. The College owns 100 acres of land. The buildings are still under construction. Mr. Wathen is the Principal. The students are taught agriculture too, the training being of a practical nature. I hope to give further information about this some other time.

We went on to Jallianwala Bagh. The name Bagh is a misnomer. Jallianwala is a surname and belonged to the original owner of the Bagh. This Bagh is now the property of about 40 people. It is not a garden but a rubbish dump. It is flanked on all sides by the backs of

¹ It is not clear whether this formed part of a letter or other writing. It was written at the back of "Letter to Sir George Barnes"; *vide* the preceding item. The reference to Shastri is to V.S. Srinivasa Sastri.

² The letter was evidently written on the Sunday preceding the Congress session.

houses and people throw refuse on to it from their rear windows. It contains three trees and one small tomb. It is an open space which can be approached by a narrow lane. It was through this that General Dyer made his entry. Hence the people who had collected there on April 13 were virtually trapped. There are 3 or 4 exits, but to use them one has to jump over a wall. It was in this way that thousands that day saved their lives.

There flowed in this Bagh a river of blood, the holy blood of innocent people. Because of this the spot has become sanctified. Efforts are being made to obtain this spot for the nation. It will, indeed, be a matter of shame for us if we do not succeed.

PREPARATIONS FOR CONGRESS

By the time this letter is published, the first session of the Congress will have been over. All preparations are under way. Thousands are expected to attend. Pandit Motilal is working on his speech. Swami Shri Shraddhanand is ready with his. It is in Hindi.

MISCELLANEOUS

Mr. Jayakar, who is here, has been appointed Commissioner in place of Pandit Motilal.

The Hunter Committee's work in these parts is nearly over. It will commence its sittings in Ahmedabad on January 5.

[From Gujarati]

Navajivan, 28-12-1919

145. LETTER TO MATHURADAS TRIKUMJI

LAHORE,

[On or before *December 22, 1919*]¹

CHI. MATHURADAS,

I have your letter.

You can come any time you like. It will no doubt be better to come at the time of the Congress session. Of course I shall not be able to provide you all the facilities you may need. But one can put up with anything for a few days. Bring a lot of warm clothing. It is very cold here. I find that a quilt gives greater warmth. Bring your woollen

¹ The year has been inferred from the contents. Monday prior to December 29, 1919, when the Congress session was scheduled to begin, was December 22.

coat. You may even need to wear socks. Of course I do not wear socks. But then, I do not have to go about at night and I keep my feet covered with a blanket. When you decide to come send me a telegram. Come only by the B. B. & C. I. train.

The additional work of the swadeshi Sabha has got to be done. I am surprised by the reply of the Gokhale Society members. If you have faith in the spinning-wheel, keep on Working to the best of your capacity. What about Taramati? Is she continuing to work or taking it easy?

Blessings from

BAPU

From the Gujarati original: Pyarelal Papers. Nehru Memorial Museum and Library. Courtesy: Beladevi Nayyar and Dr. Sushila Nayyar

146. SPEECH AT ALL-INDIA HUMANITARIAN CONFERENCE¹

AMRITSAR,

December 28, 1919

Before dissolving the Conference, Mahatma Gandhi said that he could not conduct the proceedings when there was so much confusion and noise and it would be cruel on his part to prolong the sitting in that state. He considered himself the most unfortunate in that he could not address the Conference at that stage, but he appealed to them, if they had any regard for him, to follow vegetarianism and to abstain from killing animals of any sort. People of the Punjab, he was told, were flesh-eaters and it would be a happy day, indeed, to see them understand the value of vegetarianism. He also spoke of ahimsa in detail and the importance of preserving milch and dry cattle, which were the real wealth of the country. He then declared the Conference dissolved.

The Tribune, 31-12-1919

¹ Held under the auspices of the Bombay Humanitarian League, it drew such a vast concourse of people that it was difficult to address them. After the resolution had been adopted, Gandhiji spoke briefly.

147. SPEECH AT AMRITSAR CONGRESS¹

December 29, 1919

Mahatma Gandhi rose² amid tremendous cheering and in proposing the second resolution said the resolution³ entrusted to him was a very important one. All the Indians were agreed that India was entitled to responsible Government. If that was so, they must render help to their brothers and sisters who were at that time suffering in South Africa. The atrocities to which their brethren in the Punjab had been subjected this year were heart-rending, and there was not a man in India who did not sympathise with them in their troubles. But the conditions in South and East Africa were still worse and demanded their immediate attention. Mahatma Gandhi traced the introduction of the indentured system to the request of the whitemen of Natal in South Africa to the Indian Government for Indian labour. That system, he was bound to say, was enormously worse than life in the Indian jails. Sir William Hunter had called it a system of slavery. Under this system their brethren had gone to South Africa.⁴ The success of Indians in trade had given rise to those tyrannies under which they were now suffering. Their trade was crushed. It was ruled that indentured labourers could not enter into trade but must live under indenture. It was said that Indians were of dirty habits, and being of a different civilization from the whitemen's, the latter could not live with them. False charges were laid against them and it was tried to send them back to India. South Africa was the place where the Indians had fought in order to keep up the honour of their country and twenty thousand⁵ men had to go to jail for it. The result was that they were allowed to remain there. In 1914 several privileges were granted to the Indians. Similar was the case of the Transvaal. The Indians there wanted proprietary rights and rights of trade, but these were denied to them. They wanted the Indian Government to secure those rights for them and to use means to maintain the honour of India. The second part of the resolution related to East Africa. There the people had not gone under indenture, but for purposes of trade. Several Mohammedan brethren had gone to Zanzibar and had succeeded so well in trade that even the

¹ The Indian National Congress held its session at Amritsar during December 27, 1919 and January 1, 1920. Gandhiji first spoke in Hindi.

² Gandhiji was reported to have made the speech seated because of indisposition.

³ This was on Indian settlers in South Africa. The second part of the resolution dealt with conditions in East Africa.

⁴ According to reports in *The Leader*, *The Tribuns* and *New India*, Gandhiji here cited the example of Ali Bakar Ahmed who had migrated to the Transvaal and prospered.

⁵ This is obviously an error; the figure is 2,000, as mentioned in newspaper reports.

Africans had come under their influence. They had to cross wild, dense and dangerous jungles to reach those places and began by means of love with the natives to trade there. After a time the whitemen too plucked courage to go to those places. They then called the Indians for their help. Our Sikh brethren went to Uganda, etc.; and it was through Indian labour that the construction of the Railway was made possible there. After all this the whitemen wanted to turn the Indians out of the place which they had made habitable with their labour. Mahatma Gandhi proceeded to say that they asked the Indian Government, who was a trustee for India, and the Indian National Congress, which was a representative body, to interfere¹ in the matter and to save their suffering Indian brethren in Africa. Mahatma Gandhi then read the resolution which was as follows:

(a) This Congress protests against the attempt being made in South Africa and particularly to deprive the Indian settlers of the right of property and trade hitherto enjoyed by them and trusts that the Government of India will secure the repeal of the recently enacted legislation and otherwise ensure the protection of the status of the Indian settlers in South Africa.

(b) This Congress is of opinion that the anti-Indian agitation now going on in East Africa is utterly unscrupulous and trusts that the Government of India will safeguard the right of free and unrestricted emigration from India to East Africa and the full civic and political rights of the Indian settlers in East Africa including the East African territory conquered from Germany.

Mahatma M.K. Gandhi speaking in English said:

This is the letter addressed to the Congress by Mr. C.F. Andrews.² As you know, he was at the time in East Africa investigating the position there. He writes:

Gentlemen of the Indian National Congress, you will understand the deep pain and indignation which the following challenge to Indian residents in East Africa on the part of the European settlers has caused me. I enclose at the end of this letter a copy of the two principal documents dealing with the subject. My indignation has grown deeper still since I have seen with my own eyes how unjustified the attack on Indian moral character has been. If the challenge had been made merely on economic grounds, the attack could have been met without any feeling of resentment. There is no dishonour in being

¹ Perhaps, this should be 'intervene'.

² This was published in *The Indian Review*, January 1920. Verbal discrepancies in this version, extracted from the Congress Report, have been corrected in the light of the text in the *Review*.

called more industrious and thrifty than other people, and hitherto, this has been the only ground, openly alleged, for refusing Indian immigration. But this new challenge from East Africa is of an entirely different nature. Here the main line of attack is against the Indian moral character itself. It is brutally stated, the Indian moral depravity is so great that Indians cannot be allowed to contaminate the Africans any longer. Let me quote from the two main documents which have levelled this gross charge against us. The first is a declaration of the Convention of Associations of East Africa, the most important non-official body of Europeans in the country, which has often gone by the name of the Whiteman's Parliament. The declaration beings as follows: "This Convention wishes to point out to the Government that during the discussion of a petition regarding Indians as also those affecting the native peoples of this country, they had the assistance of four missionaries, one being a Roman Catholic and three being from the Missionary Conference which was sitting in Nairobi at the same time as the Convention."

It proceeds in this way: "That whereas our national ideals of enlightenment and progress are crystallised in our Christian Western civilisation and it is our duty to make sure that the best contained therein is readily available for the needs of awakening Africa, and whereas the maintenance of this country depends entirely on the prestige and force of character of the white man, and, whereas certain Indians have entered this country as traders, clerks and assistants and whereas these people follow in all things a civilisation which is Eastern and in many respects repugnant to ours." Here then is the main charge stated in somewhat guarded language. It is more openly explained in the conclusion. The Declaration proceeds: "We conceive short of the retrocession of the territory to Germany, of no transaction more immoral and more certain to recoil on our heads than the betrayal to the Asiatic of a section of the African peoples whose destinies have fallen into our hands and who at present are unable to protect themselves. We submit that to buy off Indian or other agitation at the expense of the natives of Africa would be a policy neither wise nor honourable."

The second document is of even greater practical significance. It is, to all intents and purposes, an official record. It forms part of the report of the Economic Commission which was presided over by one of the leading Government officials. The findings were unanimous. I quote the following:

"There are", again I am quoting from the Declaration, "unfortunately other reasons of even greater weight against all Indian immigration into this or, indeed, any part of Africa. Physically, the Indian is not a wholesome influence because of his incurable repugnance to sanitation and hygiene. The

moral depravity of the Indian is equally damaging to the African who, in his natural state, is at least innocent of the worst vices of the East. The Indian is the inciter to crime as well as to violence. It is our firm conviction that the justification of our occupation of this country lies in our ability to adapt the native to our own civilization. If we further complicate this task by continuing to expose the African to the antagonistic influence of the Asiatic as distinct from European philosophy, we shall be guilty of a breach of trust."

Mr. Andrews proceeds:

The only minority report on the Indian question was an additional note of Mr. Powys Cobb. He states that the quotation which he makes about Indians was drafted by the whole body of the Commission but was omitted at the last meeting. But Mr. Powys Cobb would not be satisfied with its omission, and inserts it under his own signature as a note. It is significantly similar to the Declaration of the Convention of Associations, and proves that there is practically no difference between the official and the non-official view of Indian morality among Europeans generally. Mr. Powys Cobb's quotation which, you might as well have, is as follow:

"We (i.e., the Commissioners) have already stated in Chapter VII what we submit are final reasons against the betrayal to the Asiatic of any section of the African peoples, the responsibility for whose destinies has fallen into our hands. Short of the retrocession of the territory in question to Germany (Mr. Cobb's advice is) . . . if India requires an outlet, there are vast empty spaces in Asia awaiting development to which it might now be practicable for her to apply her energies."

Mr. Andrews concludes:

Gentlemen of the Congress, if there had been valid grounds for this attack upon the moral character of the Indian community, I should not have hesitated to expose the facts. On a former occasion, in Fiji, I had to do this very thing with regard to Indians labouring under the indenture system. I did not shrink then, as you all know, from telling you the plain unvarnished truth. But here, after the most careful examination on the spot, I am convinced that the attack is groundless in its main challenge. I have found young Gujaratis, who now form the main body of those that have come from India to East Africa, leading a domestic and social life which, taken as a whole, is a credit to their Motherland. I cannot do more in this letter than state emphatically this conclusion to which I have come. If it had been possible for me, I should *have returned* myself to lay before you the whole matter. But I must proceed immediately to South Africa. I trust that you yourselves, gentlemen, will

accept the challenge and uphold the character of the children of the Motherland. I trust also that you will protest both at the Congress itself and at the All-India Muslim League and throughout the length and breadth of India against this deliberate policy of excluding Indians on the ground of moral unfitness from the whole of Africa.

I commend both the resolutions to the Congress, and I hope, and I have not the slightest doubt, that the Congress will take up the challenge and return the reply that is deserved by the Europeans in East Africa.¹

Report of the Thirty-fourth Session of the Indian National Congress

148. RESOLUTION FOR CONGRESS

AMRITSAR,

[December 30, 1919]²

This Congress offers its respectful sympathy and condolences to the relatives of those whether English or Indian who were killed or wounded during the April disturbances.

This Congress resolves that the site known as Jallianwala Bagh in Amritsar be acquired for the nation and be registered in the names of the Hon'ble Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya and the Hon'ble Pandit Motilal Nehru and that it be used as a memorial to perpetuate the memory of those who were killed or wounded on the 13th day of April last during the massacre by General Dyer and in order to give effect to the intention of the Congress the following are appointed a committee: Madan Mohan Malaviya, Motilal Nehru, C. R. Das and Swami Shraddhanand, with power to devise the best method of perpetuating the memory of the dead, to have a proper trust prepared, and to collect subscriptions for the purpose and otherwise to carry out the trust.

This Congress is of opinion that it is impossible to have real peace in India until the legislation popularly known the Rowlatt Act which was passed in the face of the unanimous opposition of the country [is withdrawn]. This Congress therefore respectfully urges upon the Rt. Hon. the Secretary of State for India to advise His Majesty to veto the said Act.

¹ The resolution was seconded by Nadirshah Cama from South Africa and supported by K. Natarajan, editor of *The Indian Social Reformer*, and others.

² The resolution was moved by Gandhiji at the Congress session at Amritsar on December 30, 1919.

This Congress enters its emphatic protest against the action of the Government of India in prematurely passing the Indemnity Bill even though the acts in respect of which indemnity was granted were to be the subject of investigation by an official inquiry and in spite of the strong opposition by the Press, numerous public bodies and the majority of the non-official members of the Imperial Legislative Council.

From a copy: A.I.C.C. File. Courtesy: Nehru Memorial Museum and Library

149. THE ROYAL PROCLAMATION

The Proclamation issued by the Sovereign on the 24th inst. is a document of which the British people have every reason to be proud, and with which every Indian ought to feel satisfied. Coming on the top of the disclosures made before Lord Hunter's Committee, the Proclamation gives one an insight into the true British character. For, as the Proclamation shows it at its best, General Dyer's inhumanity shows it at its worst. The Proclamation is the evidence of the intention to do justice, as General Dyer's deed is proof of man becoming devil under fear and excitement. I believe that the juxtaposition of the two events is a pure accident. The Proclamation was the inevitable consequence of the great measure which has received Royal assent. It was the finishing touch. The Reforms Act coupled with the Proclamation is an earnest of the intention of the British people to do justice to India. And it ought to remove suspicion on that score. But that does not mean that we may sit with folded hands and may still expect to get what we want. Under the British Constitution no one gets anything without a hard fight for it. No one for a moment believes the statements made in the Parliament that the reforms have not been granted because of the agitation. We must lay to heart the advice of the President of the Congress that we shall gain nothing without agitation. We would have been nowhere if there had been no Congress to agitate for the rights of the people. Agitation means no more than movement towards something. But just as all movement does not mean progress, so does all agitation not mean success. Undisciplined agitation, which is a paraphrase of violence of speech or deed, can only retard national growth and bring about even unmerited retribution such as the Jallianwalla Bagh massacre. Disciplined agitation is the condition of national growth. The most correct agitation, therefore, consists in the most correct action and we have

little doubt that the Royal Proclamation and the Reforms mean not less agitation and less work but more agitation and more work of the correct type.

The Reforms are undoubtedly incomplete; they do not give us enough; we were entitled to more, we could have managed more. But the Reforms are not such as we may reject. On the contrary they are such as to enable us to expand. Our duty, therefore, is not to subject them to carping criticism, but to settle down quietly to work so as to make them a thorough success and thus anticipate the time for a full measure of responsibility. Our work, therefore, may now well consist in agitation turned inward. Let us concentrate on riding ourselves of social abuses, on producing a strong electorate and on sending to the councils men who would seek election not for self-advertisement but for national service.

There has been much mutual distrust between us ≈ the English and ourselves. General Dyer forgot the dignity of man and became unmanly because he was seized with distrust and consequent fear. He feared that he might be “assaulted”. The Proclamation, more than the Reforms, replaces distrust by trust. It remains to be seen whether the trust will filter down to the Civil Service. But let us assume that it will, and let us respond in the fullest measure. We cannot be wrong in so doing. To trust is a virtue. It is weakness that begets distrust. The best satisfaction we can show is undoubtedly to work gracefully and ungrudgingly. Our honest work will constitute the best guarantee for quickening the pace of progress towards the goal.

Throughout all these years, the one figure that has laboured for India without, for a single moment, turning back is Mr. Montagu. We have had many Secretaries of State who have adorned their office. But no Secretary has so well adorned it as Mr. Montagu. He has been a true friend of India. He has earned our gratitude. And for Lord Sinha? He has added lustre to his country. India has every reason to be proud of him.

Young India, 31-12-1919

150. LETTER TO ANASUYABHEN SARABHAI

Wednesday [December 31, 1919]¹

PUJYA BEHN,

I have sent a wire about the prisoners. I had some discussion with the judges. I shall not go into it here but shall tell you about it in person when we meet.

I have your letter. I shall fully abide by it.

I shall arrive there on Sunday. There is no time for more. I hope you are in touch with Saraladevi.²

Vandemataram from

MOHANDAS

From a photostat of the Gujarati: S.N. 32832

151. LETTER TO STUDENTS

[1919]³

A student means one who is hungry for learning. Learning is knowledge of what is worth knowing about. The only thing worth knowing about is the *atman*. True knowledge is thus knowledge of the Self. But in order to attain this knowledge, one has to know Literature, History, Geography, Mathematics, etc. All these are by way of means. Knowledge of letters is considered essential in order that one might acquire knowledge of these subjects. It is not as if men of knowledge without this equipment do not exist within our experience. One who knows this would not go mad after knowledge of letters or of literature and other subjects; he would become mad only after knowledge of the Self. He will give up anything which proves an obstacle in the pursuit of this knowledge and dedicate himself only to that which helps him in that pursuit. The student-life of one who realizes this never ends and, whether eating, drinking, sleeping,

¹ From the reference to Gandhiji's talk with the judges, presumably of the Hunter Committee; also from the reference to Gandhiji's reaching Ahmedabad on Sunday. Gandhiji reached Ahmedabad on January 4, 1920, which was a Sunday and the Wednesday preceding this date fell on December 31, 1919.

² Saraladevi Chowdharani

³ The date of this letter is not available.

playing, digging, weaving, spinning or doing any other work, he is all the time growing in this knowledge. For this purpose, one has to develop one's faculty of observation. One would not, then, always need a multitude of teachers or, rather, would look upon the whole world as one's teacher and accept everything in it which is good.

BAPU

From the Gujarati original in Gandhiji's hand: C.W. 5982

152. SPEECH ON REFORMS RESOLUTION AT AMRITSAR CONGRESS

January 1, 1920

Mr. Gandhi, speaking in Hindi, said that he was pained to speak against the resolution moved by Mr. Das and seconded by Mr. Tilak. He agreed with the resolution to a great extent but he was not prepared to characterize the Reform as "disappointing"².

By "disappointing" it was meant that one was unable to do any work in that connection. But those who called the Reforms "disappointing" had said that they would fill the Council with their own candidates. Mr. Gandhi asked the Congress to consider that. If they wanted to utilize the Reforms Act, why should they call it "disappointing"?

He, then, moved his amendment which different from the one printed in the agenda paper yesterday. Mr. Gandhi's altered amendment omitted the word

¹ Gandhiji spoke on the resolution moved by C.R. Das which read as follows: (a) "That this Congress reiterates its declaration of last year that India is fit for full Responsible Government and repudiates all assumptions and assertions to the contrary wherever made.

(b) That this Congress adheres to the resolutions passed at Delhi Congress regarding Constitutional Reforms and is of opinion that the Reforms Act is inadequate, unsatisfactory and disappointing.

(c) That this Congress further urges that Parliament should take early steps to establish full Responsible Government in India in accordance with the principle of self-determination."

The resolution was supported by S. Satyamurti, Hasrat Mohani, Rambhuj Dutt Choudhry and Chandra Bansi Sahai. The report of Gandhiji's speech in Hindi is taken from *The Tribune*, 3-1-1920.

² Tilak had observed in his speech that "the expressions 'inadequate, unsatisfactory and disappointing' were not at all new. They had expressed them in previous Congresses and their objection still remained. Some people would have liked to take away the word 'disappointing'. He saw no reason for this. Nothing had happened in the interim to change their view."

“disappointing” at the end¹ and ran:

Pending such introduction [of Responsible Government] this Congress begs loyally to respond to the sentiments expressed in the Royal Proclamation, namely, “Let it (the new era) begin with a common determination among my people and my officers to work together for a common purpose” and trusts that both the authorities and the people will co-operate so to work the Reforms as to secure an early establishment of full responsible government and this Congress offers its warmest thanks to the Right Hon’ble E.S. Montagu for his labours in connection with them.²

MY DEAR FRIENDS,

I have done with Hindi, and by the indulgence of the President of this Congress who has laboured for us throughout all these anxious days in the midst of the greatest difficulties of which you can have no conception, I shall occupy a little more of your time and make a final appeal to those friends who have not been able to follow me in this matter. You have heard those who spoke in English. I do not need to read my amendment to them. You have seen the amendment that stands in my name. I want to give you the fullest assurance that nothing could have pleased me more than not to have appeared before you in order to divide this House, but when I found that duty demanded of me that I should say a word, even against revered countrymen of mine, even against those who have sacrificed themselves for the sake of the country, when I found that they did not make sufficient appeal to my head or to my heart, and when I felt that an acceptance of the position that underlay their proposition would mean something not good for the country, I felt I at least should have my own say and make my own position clear to the country. Throughout my life I have understood the principle of compromise; I have understood the spirit of democracy. I yield to no one in my regard for both these things, but throughout my life I have also found that there come occasions in a man’s life who wants to regulate his life according to the voice of his own conscience, according to the immutable laws of God as he understands them; I say there come occasions in the life of such a man when he must grasp and embrace, as he would embrace a brother parting with his dearest friends, and

¹ As a consequential change the word “and” after “unsatisfactory” was shifted and placed after “inadequate”.

² Gandhiji then spoke in English.

that time stared me in the face two days ago. It is not a matter of removing a word here and a word there. If I could have managed to have the word “disappointing”, believe me, I would not have risen before this audience, wasted your time and my nation’s valuable time in higgling over a word. I say to you it is not right to have the word “disappointing”. You saw an amendment¹ in my name yesterday which I have withdrawn. It expressed my opinion in more graceful language: I do not claim any better knowledge of English on that account, but I had pinned my heart on it, and that is my estimation of my own phraseology. I contend that that amendment expresses the same thing in more graceful language, but I say to myself, and I said to myself yesterday, “Never mind the grace. If you can get the substance in another language, you shall take it.” I have, therefore, taken those three paragraphs in the resolution in their entirety with the exception of the adjective “disappointing”, because that also entirely represents my feeling. I do believe with Tilak Maharaj, Mr. Das and all the other friends, that we are fit for responsible government fully to-day. (Hear, hear). I do believe that what we are getting falls far short of the Congress ideal. (Hear, hear). I do believe that at the earliest possible moment we should have responsible government. I am in accord with them. What then? All that is gone. But how are we to build our future? That is a question to which they addressed themselves and I addressed myself, and their conclusion was, let the country go as it will. We shall not give the lead to the country from this platform. What was the meaning of it? The meaning as I gave to it was, our policy must be obstructive, ‘co-operation’, yes, but in the mind, it shall not be in the air. If there is to be co-operation under definite conditions, then I say, let us lay down those conditions. But let us make our point perfectly clear. Their position again was, why should we thank a servant of ours? After all, who is Mr. Montagu? He is our servant. If he has done a little bit of his duty, why do you want

¹ The amendment was to the following effect: “In the opinion of the Congress, whilst the Reforms Act falls short of the requirements of the situation in India and therefore inadequate and unsatisfactory, the Congress recognizes, it is a definite step towards Responsible Government and without prejudice to its full rights to agitate at the earliest opportunity for remedying the glaring omissions in the said Act, it calls upon the people to co-operate with the authorities in making the Reforms a success and that this Congress expresses its cordial thanks to the Right Hon’ble E.S. Montagu and Lord Sinha for their labours on behalf of India in connection with the constitutional reforms.”

to thank him? It is an attitude you may sympathize with sometimes, but I say to this great audience that that is not an attitude which is worthy of yourselves. If in the heart of your hearts you can say that Mr. Montagu, throughout his career as Secretary of State for India, has done one thing, namely, he has overborne the opposition led by Lord Sydenham against this Bill and he has resisted all encroachments upon the liberal provisions, few enough I admit, but liberal provisions of that Bill, then I say to that extent and that extent only, Mr. Montagu deserves our whole-hearted thanks. (Hear, hear, and cheers.) That is all that my amendment means.

My amendment also means that we may not say these reforms are disappointing in the sense in which that word is used there. I suggest to you that if a man comes to me and disappoints me, I do not co-operate with him. If I get a sour loaf, I reject it; I don't take it. But if I get a loaf which is not enough or which does not contain sufficient condiments in it, I shall see to it that I get condiments too at a later stage, but I take a bite; then it is not disappointing. Therefore, my amendment means nothing more and nothing less than that. We should stare the situation in the face as it exists before the country today, and if, as I say, Tilak Maharaj tells you that we are going to make use of the Reforms Act, as he must, and as he has already told Mr. Montagu, as he has told the country, that we are going to take the fullest advantage of the Reforms, then I say be true to yourselves, be true to the country and tell the country you are going to do it. But if you want to say, after having gone there, you shall put any obstruction, say that also. But on the question of the propriety of obstruction, I say, that the Indian culture demands that we shall trust the man who extends the hand of fellowship. The King-Emperor has extended the hand of fellowship. (Hear, hear.) I suggest to you that Mr. Montagu has extended the hand of fellowship, and if he has extended the hand of fellowship, do not reject his advances. Indian culture demands trust, and full trust, and if we are sufficiently manly, we shall not be afraid of the future, but face the future in manly manner and say, All right, Mr. Montagu, all right, all officials of the bureaucracy, we are going to trust you; we shall put you in a corner, and when you resist us, when you resist the advance of the country, you shall do so at your peril.' That is the manly attitude that I suggest to you. I therefore say you are bound that, if in the heart of your hearts you consider that these reforms enable you to advance further to your goal, if you believe that these reforms can be used as a

stepping-stone to full responsible government, then I say, give Mr. Montagu his due and tell him, 'We thank you'. But if you say to Mr. Montagu, 'We thank you', the corollary to that is that we shall co-operate with him. If you say to Mr. Montagu, 'We do not thank you, we know what your reforms are, we know your intentions, we shall frustrate those intentions by obstructing you at every stage;' if that is your position, make it clear before the world and work for it. I shall challenge that position, and I shall go across from one end of India to the other and say we shall fail in our culture, we shall fall from our position if we do not do our duty that culture demands, if we do not respond to the hand that has been extended to us. I decline to distrust him, and I say we shall co-operate in so far as the country's good is advanced. We shall obstruct you, we shall fail you, we shall defeat your purpose, if your purpose is in any shape or form to diminish the glory of India. That is the amendment that I have come to place before you. I again appeal to Tilak Maharaj, and I appeal to Mr. Das and to every one of you, not on the strength of my service ≈ it counts for nothing, not on the strength of my experience ≈ but on the strength of inexorable logic. If you accept your own civilization, I ask the author of the commentaries on *Bhagavad Gita*¹, if he accepts the teachings of *Bhagavad Gita*, then let him extend the hand of fellowship to Mr. Montagu (Here, hear, and applause.)²

Report of the Thirty-fourth Session of the Indian National Congress

153. TELEGRAM TO HABIBUDDIN³

[AMRITSAR,]
January 3, 1920

UNABLE COME. EXPLAINED FULLY YOUR REPRESENTATIVE.

From the pencilled draft: S.N. 7024

¹ *Gitarahasya*, which Tilak wrote during his incarceration at Mandalay.

² The resolution was seconded by M.A. Jinnah and supported by Madan Mohan Malaviya, Dr. Pattabhi Sitaramayya and C.S. Ranga Iyer.

³ Gandhiji was invited to visit Jamshedpur in connection with a strike.

154. LETTER TO DY. REGISTRAR, HIGH COURT, BOMBAY

SATYAGRAHA ASHRAM,
SABARMATI,
January 4, 1920

MR. GHARDA,
DEPUTY REGISTRAR
BOMBAY

DEAR MR. GHARDA,

I have just arrived from the Punjab to find the rule *nisi* served on me. I take it you received my letter¹ addressed to you from Delhi in the matter. It is evident that the order was granted about the time I wrote my letter from Delhi. I observe that I have to appear on or after 21st day after the service of your notice. The notice was served on the 2nd instant. Does it mean that the matter will not be heard on the 23rd instant? All I wish to say is that I have not yet finished my work in the Punjab. I expect to be in the Punjab about the 20th instant and to be there for nearly two months. I shall therefore esteem it a favour if His Lordship the Chief Justice will accommodate me for that period.

I may mention too that I do not desire to engage counsel or to offer any defence, save for a statement like the one embodied in my letter from Delhi of 11th Dec.' 19, and I am anxious, too, that the date of hearing may not be known to the public. Will you therefore kindly see His Lordship and let me know whether a date for the hearing can be fixed sometime in April?²

I take it that the matter against the publisher, Mr. Desai, will be heard the same day as against me.

Yours sincerely,

From a photostat of the handwritten office copy: S. N. 7128-A

¹ *Vide* "Letter to Registrar, High Court, Bombay", 11-12-1919.

² The hearing was fixed for March 3; *vide* "Letter to Registrar, High Court, Bombay", 24-1-1920.

155. STATEMENT TO DISORDERS INQUIRY COMMITTEE

[SABARMATI,
January 5, 1920]

For the past thirty years I have been preaching and practising satyagraha. The principles of satyagraha, as I know it today, constitute a gradual evolution.

Satyagraha differs from passive resistance as North Pole from 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.

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.¹

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 on one's self.

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 law-giver by way of petitions and the like, the only remedy open to you, if you do not wish to submit to error, is to compel him by physical force to yield to you or by suffering in your own person 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.

¹ Vide "Gujarati Equivalents for Passive Resistance Etc.", 7-3-1908 and *Satyagraha in South Africa*, Ch. XII.

The law-breaker breaks the law surreptitiously and tries to avoid 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 occasion, generally rare, when he considers certain laws to be so unjust as to render obedience to them a dishonour. He then openly and civilly breaks them and quietly suffers the penalty for their breach. And in order to register his protest against the action of the law-givers, it is open to him to withdraw his co-operation from the State by disobeying such other laws whose breach does not involve 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 called indentured Indians, with excellent results.

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 which are repugnant 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 emphasizing its civil resistance aspect. And as it is purely an inward and purifying movement, I suggested the observance of fast, prayer and suspension of all work for one day the 6th of April. There was a magnificent response throughout the length and breadth of India, even in little villages, although there was no organization and no great previous preparation. The idea was given to the public as soon as it was conceived. On the 6th April there was no violence used by the people and no collision with the police worth naming. The hartal was purely voluntary and spontaneous. I attach here to the letter¹ in which the idea was announced.

The observance of the 6th April was to be followed by civil disobedience. For the purpose the Committee of the Satyagraha Sabha had selected certain political laws for disobedience. And we

¹ This was given as Annexure A; *vide* "Letter to the Press on Satyagraha Movement", 23-3-1919.

commenced the distribution of prohibited literature of a perfectly healthy type, e.g., a pamphlet¹ written by me on Home Rule, a translation of Ruskin's *Unto This Last, The Defence and Death of Socrates*, etc.

But there is no doubt that the 6th of April found India vitalized 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, Dr. 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 the 8th April and had telegraphed to Dr. Satyapal, whom I had never met before, to meet me at Delhi. But after passing Muttra² 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[other] order prohibiting me from entering the Punjab and confining 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 Police who arrested me acted with every courtesy. I was taken to Muttra by the first available train thence by goods trains early in the morning to Sawai Madhopur, where I joined the Bombay Mail from Peshawar and was taken charge of by Superintendent Bowring. I was discharged at Bombay on the 10th April.

But the people of Ahmedabad and Viramgam and in Gujarat generally had heard of my arrest. They became furious, shops were

¹ Vide "Hind Swaraj", 22-11-1909

² Mathura. The order was served at Kosi.

closed, crowds gathered, and murder, arson, pillage, wire-cutting and attempt at derailment followed.

I had worked in the midst of Kaira *raiya*s just before and had mixed among thousands of men and women. I had worked at the instance of and with Miss Anasuya Sarabhai among the mill-hands of Ahmedabad. The mill-hands appreciated her philanthropic work and adored her. The fury of the labourers in Ahmedabad reached white heat when a false rumour was started that she too was arrested. Both of us had visited and interceded for the mill-hands of Viramgam when they were in trouble. And it is my firm belief that the excesses were due to the great resentment of the mobs over my arrest and the rumoured arrest of Miss Anasuya Sarabhai.

I have mixed with the masses in practically the whole of India and talked to them freely. I do not believe that there was any revolutionary movement behind the excesses. They could hardly be dignified by the term 'rebellion'.

And, in my opinion, the Government erred in prosecuting the offenders for waging war. This hasty view has caused unmerited or disproportionate suffering. The fine imposed on poor Ahmedabad was heavy and the manner of collecting it from the labourers was unnecessarily harsh and irritating. I doubt the justice of inflicting on the labourers a fine so large as 1,76,000 (one hundred and seventy-six thousand) rupees. The imposition of the cost from the farmers of Barejadi and from the *Banias* and *Patidars* of Nadiad was totally unjustified and even vindictive. I think that the introduction of Martial Law in Ahmedabad was also unjustified and its thoughtless administration resulted in the loss of several innocent lives.

At the same time, and subject to the reservations mentioned by me, I have no doubt that, in the Bombay Presidency, the authorities acted with considerable restraint at a time when the atmosphere was surcharged with mutual suspicion and the attempt at wrecking the train which was bringing the troops to restore order had naturally angered the authorities.¹

Evidence Before Disorders Inquiry Committee, Vol. II, pp. 251-4

¹ The statement was accompanied by three other annexures; for Annexures B and C, *vide* "Speech at Mass Meeting, Ahmedabad", 14-4-1919 and "Message to Countrymen", 9-4-1919, respectively. Annexure D is not available. The statement was also published in *Young India*, 14-1-1920.

*156. LETTER TO SECRETARY, DISORDERS INQUIRY
COMMITTEE*

SATYAGRAHA ASHRAM,
SABARMATI,
[January 5, 1920]¹

DEAR SIR,

I beg to enclose herewith my statement² for submission to the Disorders Inquiry Committee. If the Committee wish to entertain my evidence I shall esteem it a favour if I am given *an early day* so as to free me for my other engagements.

I wish to apologize for the delay in sending my statement. My other preoccupations are my only excuse. I arrived in Ahmedabad only yesterday.

Yours s[incere]ly,

From a photostat of the original in Gandhiji's hand: S. N. 6988

157. THE CONGRESS

The Congress this time was for many of us a pilgrimage because of its having been held in Amritsar. Jallianwala Bagh was visited during the Congress week by the thousands of delegates and visitors with the pilgrim mind. It is said that some touched the blood-stained earth with their foreheads, some took away with them a little of that earth to be preserved as a sacred treasure. Some used it as *vibhuti*³ and smeared their foreheads with it. All went to the Bagh as a sacred duty. There is no doubt many went to the Congress only as a mark of their respect for the memory of the innocent dead.

The speeches of Swami Shri Shraddhanandji, the chairman of the Reception Committee, and of the Hon'ble Pandit Motilal Nehru were models of sobriety and breathed an earnest spirit. Each bore the individuality of its author. The Swami's had a religious ring about it. He was full of goodwill towards mankind. "How can we hate Englishmen if we love Andrews, Wedderburn, Hume, Hardinge and others? We must conquer the English with our love," said the Swami.

¹ The original has "5th April", which is evidently a slip.

² *Vide* the preceding item.

³ Sacred ashes

The Pandit's language, though perfectly courteous and restrained, is bitter. He compels a tear from the eye as he takes you with him through the different acts of the Punjab tragedy. He has examined the events of the Punjab with his legal acumen. Iron has entered his soul. He demands stern justice against the culprits.

The Presidential speech suffers for being in English. It was painful to see him labouring through his speech spoken in a foreign tongue before an audience of nearly 15,000 people not one-seventh of which could follow his English. The Congress proceedings have conclusively demonstrated the necessity of their being mainly, if not entirely, conducted in Hindi. That is the only course left open to us if we would work for the masses and draw upon them for delegates. In the Central Provinces, the United Provinces, Delhi, the Punjab and Bihar, only Hindustani is spoken and in all the other parts of India except the Presidency of Madras, Hindi can be generally understood. For it is a language cognate to the vernaculars of the other provinces. Madras alone presents any difficulty and, for the sake of a few hundred delegates from that Presidency, it would not be proper to do violence to thousands who cannot understand English but who can more or less understand Hindustani. The only straight, economical and politically sound course is to make the proceedings of the Congress predominantly Hindustani, the Dravidian members being free to speak in English or, for that matter, in Tamil or Telgu. I grant that for a few years the Subjects Committee must deliberate in English, but if we are to give a proper political education to the country through the medium of the Congress, it must be clear to everyone that it can only be done through Hindi. I trust, therefore, that those in the Madras Presidency who are desirous of doing all-India public work outside their Presidency and of aspiring after becoming delegates of the Congress will make haste to learn Hindi. They have got facilities in the Madras Presidency for learning Hindi, and if they will begin now and give at least one hour per day regularly to it, they will, by the end of the year, be able generally to follow the proceedings of the Congress. All must recognize that the insistent demand of the delegates from year to year for Hindustani cannot be resisted for any length of time.

Another absurdity which is becoming more and more grave needs also to be removed. Very few people could follow the President while he was reading his speech. The very best of leaders may not occupy the attention of the audience for longer than an hour. The

President's address was necessarily long. It occupied thirty-eight foolscap pages in print. Fortunately, Pandit Nehru skipped over many pages whilst he was reading it, but he would have taken no less than three hours if he had insisted on reading the whole of the thirty-eight pages. It is highly necessary, therefore, that the addresses of the chairman of the Reception Committee and the president should be printed in Hindustani (both in Devanagri and Urdu scripts), English and the vernacular of the province in which the Congress is held, and distributed at the entrance either gratis or for the cost price. They ought not to be distributed in the pandal, as is often done much to the inconvenience of everybody. Both the chairman and the president might read or orally give the summary of their addresses, each occupying no longer than thirty minutes.

The third absurdity is the terrible, evergrowing waste of money in creating a huge pandal. The Indian climate admits of holding meetings in the open air. But I refrain from saying more on this matter as the All-India Congress Committee has appointed a Subcommittee consisting of Messrs Kelkar I.B. Sen, A. Rangaswami, Iyengar, the Hon'ble V.J. Patel and myself to consider the whole constitution of the Congress.

The resolutions of the Congress show that there are very sharp divisions and, as time goes forward, parties are inevitable. Hitherto, the Congress has represented only one party but it cannot be kept any longer as a one-party organisation if it is not to have seceders from it on an increasing scale from year to year. Measures must be devised whereby all parties can be represented on it and the annual assembly can retain its truly national character.

Let us consider the resolutions. Take the condemnation of the excesses. There is no doubt that without that resolution some of the resolutions would have lost all force and value. We could not with any justification condemn the excesses of the authorities and therefore urge the dismissal of General Dyer or Sir Michael O'Dwyer or even the Viceroy's recall, if we were not ready to condemn our own. That resolution was the necessary *prayashchitta* for the mob frenzy in April. If we are to make orderly progress, we must unequivocally disapprove of violence being committed by the people in any shape or form. It is true that often in the West mob violence is resorted to, but by creating a strong popular opinion against it we must make such violence impossible in India. Few can deny that on the sixth of April India found itself in possession of a new force and a new power ≈ a

force that could prove irresistible under almost every conceivable circumstance provided that truth was on our side. It is my firm belief that had the development of satyagraha not been interrupted in April by our own folly, not only would the Rowlatt Act have been removed from the statute-book but we would have been spared the humiliating and degrading spectacle of a British general running amuck. Indeed, we shall find it impossible, when we have full control over our national affairs, to carry on the government of the country without self-restraint. In a vast country like India where the people are ordinarily peaceful, we shall find it impossible to carry on the government if mob rule becomes the custom of the land and, in order to check that tendency, popular opinion is a far greater and more potent instrument than the employment of physical force. I would, therefore, give the first place in point of importance to this resolution as a token of the correctness of our conduct and for the sake of a lead to the country. These resolutions of the Congress, especially those that require any action on the part of the people, are valuable for the formation of public opinion and I hope that workers, recognizing the full force of the truth underlying the resolution, will on due occasion impress upon the people the necessity of refraining from violence.

Only less in importance than the resolution on condemnation was the resolution on Reforms. Whilst I subscribe entirely to the proposition that India is fit now for Responsible Government, I do not for one moment believe that we can get it without working for it. We can work either by adopting obstructive tactics or by co-operation. Healthy obstruction is a condition of our being. We must ever obstruct untruth, injustice and evil. It was because I did not consider, and do not consider, the Reforms to be an evil or unjust and because I consider them to be a progressive step towards Responsible Government, that I decline to consider them to be disappointing, however inadequate and unsatisfactory they may be. I endorse Mr. Bepin Chandra Pal's opinion that for me to decline to consider the Reforms disappointing means that I did not expect them. I had certainly much fear that the Reforms might not go through when they did and I was unprepared for material improvements in the measure as it was originally published. The opponents of the amendment admitted that they would co-operate when co-operation was essential for the country's good and not hesitate to obstruct when obstruction

advanced it. That no doubt was the only meaning, and no other, of the amendment of which I had the honour to be in charge. But let it be said to the credit of the opponents that they resisted the amendment as long as they could because they frankly said that they had no faith in the bureaucracy even under the altered conditions. In my humble opinion it is a wrong attitude. The Royal Proclamation has been framed in a most liberal spirit. It is full of goodwill and it would have been wrong on the part of the Congress not to have responded to the King's call for co-operation. My faith in human nature is irrepressible and, even under the circumstances of a most adverse character, I have found Englishmen amenable to reason and persuasion, and as they always wish to appear to be just even when they are in reality unjust, it is easier to shame them than others into doing the right thing. Be that however as it may, it would be a fall from our culture and it would be unwise not to grasp the hand of fellowship extended through the Proclamation. If we are strong, we shall lose nothing by beginning with co-operation. We at once place the bureaucracy in the wrong by our readiness to co-operate for the common purpose.

It was equally important for us to thank Mr. Montagu for his valuable services in connection with the Reforms. The Hon'ble Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya, Mr. Jinnah and I therefore felt that, even at the risk of dividing the house, we were bound to press the amendment home. That ultimately there was a compromise shows the good nature of Lokamanya Tilak and Mr. Das. It was a perfect pleasure to see both of them, whilst holding to their views, anxious not to divide the house. And it was equally a pleasure to see so many on the platform working to secure a compromise.

Young India, 7-1-1920

158. LETTER TO G.E. CHATFIELD

SATYAGRAHA ASHRAM,

January 8, 1920

DEAR MR. CHATFIELD,

The manager of the Ashram, Mr. Maganlal Gandhi, has applied for some time for permission to build a stable in the non-Inami¹ Ashram ground, but the permission has not yet been received. The stable is to be used for keeping cattle. I understand that some inquiry has been made about the use to be made of the cattle. This question would have been unnecessary if it had been recognized that we are essentially an agricultural colony. The manner in which the whole ground is being used shows it. We have now a fairly large number of cattle. And it is risky to keep them without proper shelter for any length of time. I shall therefore thank you if you could see your way to issue the permission at once. I shall be able to satisfy you any day that we are not using the cattle for trade purposes. We keep cattle for ploughing for the manure they give, and the cows and buffaloes for the milk they give for our food in addition to the manure.²

Yours sincerely,

From a photostat of a draft in Gandhiji's hand: S. N. 7037

¹ State lands

² Chatfield replied the same day: "If it is simply a matter of using your own agricultural land for cattle byres or cattle stands, I shall not have the least objection. Indeed if the cattle are for use on your land here, such buildings are farm buildings and as such do not require my permission under the LRA."

*159. EVIDENCE BEFORE DISORDERS INQUIRY
COMMITTEE*

[AHMEDABAD,
January 9, 1920]

MR. M.K. GANDHI, BAR-AT-LAW, AHMEDABAD

*By the President*¹:

Q. Mr. Gandhi, we have been informed that you are the author of the satyagraha movement?

A. Yes, sir.

I would like you to give us an explanation of what that movement is.

It is a movement intended to replace methods of violence. It is a movement based entirely on truth. It is, as I have conceived it, an extension of the domestic law on the political field, and my own experience has led me to the conclusion that that movement and that movement alone can rid India of the possibilities of violence spreading throughout the length and breadth of the land for the redress of grievances, supposed or real.

So far as it has any bearing upon our enquiry, you adopted it in connection with the opposition to the Rowlatt Bill?

Yes.

And in connection with it you asked people to pledge themselves by what is

¹ The Disorders Inquiry Committee was presided over by Lord Hunter. The Committee consisted of Justice Rankin, W.F. Rice, Major-General Sir George Barrow, Jagat Narayan, Thomas Smith, Sir C.H. Setalvad, Sultan Ahmad Khan, and N. Williamson as Secretary. The Committee first met at Delhi on October 31 and from November 3 to 10, 1919; it then collected evidence at Lahore from November 13 to 21 and again on December 11. Among the non-official witnesses examined at Delhi were Hakim Ajmal Khan, S.K. Rudra, Lala Shankerlal and Swami Shraddhanand. Brigadier-General Dyer appeared before the Committee at Lahore. The session at Ahmedabad lasted from January 5 to 10. Chief among non-official witnesses who testified before the Committee were, apart from Gandhiji, Haribhai Desai, President, District Local Board, Jivanlal Vajrai Desai, Secretary, Ahmedabad branch of the Home Rule League, Krishnalal N. Desai, Secretary, Gujarat Sabha, Ramanbhai M. Nilkanth, President, Ahmedabad Municipality, Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel, Secretary, Satyagraha Sabha, Ambalal Sarabhai and Anasuyabehn Sarabhai. Gandhiji's evidence before the Committee was taken on January 9. The Committee held a one-day sitting at Bombay on January 15. A condensed version of Gandhiji's evidence before the Committee appeared in *Young India*, 21-1-1920 and 28-1-1920.

known as the satyagraha vow?

I did.

Am I correct in holding that the satyagraha vow is this? Starting with the narrative as to the objectionable paragraphs of the Rowlatt legislation, satyagrahis pledge themselves to civilly disobey the Rowlatt Act and such other acts as the Committee to be appointed may determine. Was it your intention to enlist as many satyagrahis as possible?

Yes, consistently with the carrying on of the movement in a proper way, that is to say, if I found a million men who were capable of understanding the truth and adhering by it and never using violence, I would certainly be glad to have the million men.

You will get as many satyagrahis as possible if you are satisfied that they understand the nature of the movement?

Yes.

Is not your movement a movement essentially antagonistic to Government? Don't you substitute the determination of this Committee for the will of Government?

Not in my opinion. This is not the spirit in which the movement has been conceived, and that is not the spirit in which the movement, wherever I have led it, has been understood by the people.

Look at it from the point of view of Government, Mr. Gandhi. If you are the Government yourself, what would you say to a movement that was started by someone to the effect that none of your laws were to be obeyed and instead the will of some committee was to be obeyed?

That would not be stating the whole of the case for satyagrahis. I would put it this way. If I was in charge of the Government of a country and I found myself face to face with a body of men who were determined to find out the truth, who were determined to seek redress in connection with unjust laws without inflicting violence, without rioting, without arson, I would welcome the body of men and I would consider that they were the best constitutionalists, as Governor, I could get by my side, because they would keep me in the right track.

I suppose it is the case in India as elsewhere that people differ as to the justice or injustice of particular laws?

Yes; and that is the reason, the main reason, why violence is eliminated here. The satyagrahi gives his opponent the same right of independence and feeling of truth that he reserves to himself, seeing that he wants to fight for truth he will do so by inviting injury upon his own person.

Before you come to the question of violence, I was looking at it from the point of view of the continuing of Government. Would it be possible to continue Government if a body of men stood up against Government who were to accept not the Government's view of what was right or what was wrong, but the view of an independent committee?

I think that it would be quite impossible, and I have found within my experience of 8 years of continuous struggle in South Africa that it was so. I found General Smuts who went through the whole of that campaign, said in the end, that if all conducted themselves as the satyagrahis had done, he should have nothing to say.

That was in connection with a particular campaign. There was nothing objectionable, but, so far as I recollect \approx I may be wrong \approx there was no such pledge as was given here?

Certainly. Every satyagrahi was bound to resist all those laws which he considered to be unjust and all those laws which were not of a criminal character in order to bend Government to the will of the people.

You see in your present pledge¹, you have gone a step further. It is not what laws the satyagrahi considers unjust but it is what the Committee considers unjust that he has got to disobey?

I was only this morning discussing about it. That pledge or part of the pledge is really restraint. If you will re-read it, you will find that that pledge or that part of the pledge is designed to be a restraint upon individual liberty so far as the breach of laws was concerned; and as I intended to make it a mass movement, I felt that some such step² was necessary that no man should become the lord of the masses, so far as the satyagrahis were concerned. Therefore I conceived this plan that

¹ This formed part of the manifesto drawn up at a meeting of the Satyagraha Sabha at Ahmedabad on February 23, and read as follows: "Being conscientiously of opinion that the Bills known as the Indian Criminal Law (Amendment) Bill No. I 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 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 we further affirm that, in this struggle, we will faithfully follow truth and refrain from violence to life, person or property."

² According to the report in *Young India*, this referred to "the constitution of some such committee" as the Satyagraha Committee.

the Committee should be able to say what laws may be broken *en masse*.

We know the saying that doctors differ, and I understand from Mr. Desai that even satyagrahis differ occasionally?¹

I have not the slightest doubt and I have found it to my cost.

I put this case to you. Supposing a satyagrahi was satisfied in his own mind that a particular law was a just law and ought to be obeyed but the Committee of satyagrahis said 'disobey this law', what was the satyagrahi who signed such a pledge to do?

He is not bound to disobey that law which he does not consider to be unjust and we had such satyagrahis in abundance.

According to the terms of the pledge, as I understand, he would be bound to disobey that?

Not as I have conceived the pledge and not as I have interpreted it. If the Committee will say that my interpretation of the pledge is faulty, all I can say is I should mend the error the next time I start a satyagraha campaign.

I do not wish to give you advice Mr. Gandhi, I know that you would not take it, if I did. But this satyagraha is a rather dangerous campaign.

I wish I could disabuse the Committee really of this attitude that it is a dangerous campaign. If you will conceive the campaign as designed in order to rid the country of the school of violence, then you will share the same concern that I have that, at any cost, a movement of this character should remain in the country and purify it certainly.

In connection with the Rowlatt legislation, I know we have been told that there was a very general widespread Indian opposition to the Rowlatt legislation. Look at that legislation from an independent standard, apart altogether from the Indian or European standpoint. Would you indicate briefly to me what the essence of your objection to the legislation is?

As I read the Rowlatt Committee's report and came to the end of it, and I saw the legislation that was fore-shadowed, I felt that it was not warranted by the facts that were produced by the Committee. As I read the legislation itself, I felt that it was so restrictive of human

¹ The reference is to the view of Jivanlal Vrajrai Desai, Secretary of the Home Rule League, Ahmedabad and a member of the Satyagraha Sabha. In his evidence before the Committee on January 8, he had expressed the opinion that the satyagraha movement "should be strictly confined to the educated classes".

liberty, that no self-respecting person or no self-respecting nation could allow such legislation to appear on its regular statute-book. When I saw the debates in the Legislative Council, I felt that the opposition against it was universal and when I found that agitation or that opposition flouted by the Government, I felt that for me, as a self-respecting individual, as a member of a vast Empire, there was no course left open but to resist that law to the utmost.

So far as the objects of that legislation are concerned, have you any doubt that the objects were to put down revolutionary and anarchical crimes?

I have no doubt that the object was laudable.

Those are quite laudable objects?

Quite so.

Your complaint, then, must be as regards the methods adopted?

Entirely that.

If I have understood it rightly, what you complain of is that greater power has been given to the executive than they enjoyed before?

That is so.

I understand that the executive had these powers during the period of the European War under the Defence of India Act?

That is true. The Defence of India Act was an emergency legislation. The Defence of India Act was designed to secure the co-operation of everybody in order to put down any violence that might be offered by any school at the moment; and it was with the greatest reluctance that the people really accepted the Defence of India Act, but the Rowlatt legislation was of a different character altogether as I apprehended; then the people had the additional advantage of having the experience of the working of the Defence of India Act.¹

Suppose now, Mr. Gandhi, that the Rowlatt legislation was to be put into operation; in the first instance, the Local Government should be satisfied that there was a state of anarchy existing, and in the second place, the Government of India had to take that attitude. Would you see any serious objection to it?

I would see most serious objection. I would not as legislator leave that power in the hands of an executive which I had repeatedly found wanting. I have known the executive Government in India to

¹ *Young India* here has: “. . . now the experience of the working of the former Act has strengthened my objections to the Rowlatt Act.”

have run mad. I would certainly not arm a Government of that character with any such arbitrary powers.

Then your objection really comes back to this, that you think that the Government of India in the prosecution of a laudable object adopted a wrong measure. Is not the proper method of dealing with that from a constitutional point of view to endeavour to get the legislation remedied by satisfying the Government of the inexpediency of the measure?

I tried to get that done. On bended knee I pleaded before Lord Chelmsford, and before other English officers I had the pleasure of meeting, and placed my view-point before him also. I am glad to say that some of them accepted the view that I placed before them, but they said that the Rowlatt Committee made these recommendations and they were helpless. I think we exhausted all the resources open to us.

If an honest opponent differs from your view, you cannot expect to satisfy him of the rightness of your cause all of a sudden. You must do so by degrees?

Yes.

Is not refusing to obey that or any other law you choose to select a rather drastic way of attempting to do that?

I respectfully differ. When I find that even my father has imposed upon me a law which is repugnant to my conscience, I think it is the least drastic course that I adopt by respectfully telling him, "Father, I cannot obey this." I do nothing but justice to my father when I do that. If I may say so without any disrespect to the Committee, I have simply followed that in my own domestic circle, and I found I had done so with the greatest advantage. I have placed that before Indians and everybody for acceptance. Rather than feel angry with my father, I would respectfully tell him, "I cannot obey this law." I see nothing wrong in that. If it is not wrong for me to say so to my father, there is nothing wrong for me to say so to a friend or to a Government.

Now, in the prosecution of your satyagraha movement against the Rowlatt legislation, you resolved to open a hartal throughout India?

Yes.

When the hartal was on, no business was to be done, thereby to show disapproval of Government's action?

Yes.

Hartal means then general cessation of business throughout the whole

country?

Yes.

If you have a general cessation of business for a brief time nothing harmful might result. But if the cessation is for a lengthened period, will it not be productive of great harm to the people?

Very great.

As regards your hartal, it was originally to be held on the 30th March?

I had simply said the second Sunday after the publication.

The second Sunday was the 6th April. Some people seemed to have made a miscalculation?

No miscalculation. Those who came to know of the Viceregal assent immediately after it was given, for them the calculation would be 30th March. That was brought to the notice of the people in Madras. I immediately sent a telegram fixing the 6th April, but at the end of the day telegrams had gone all over India when this letter¹ was published fixing the second Sunday after the Viceregal assent was given in Delhi. Unfortunately, the hartal came prematurely.

When the hartal came in Delhi, unfortunately serious riots took place?

Yes.

As regards the hartal, is it your view that the abstention from business should be entirely passive?

Entirely.

Then anything like what I may call active persuasion on the part of those who observed any hartal, to get others to follow their example, would be disapproved?

Entirely; if that active persuasion was exerted on the day of the hartal. In any case that would be disapproved. It will not be disapproved if in preparing the people for the hartal leaflets were distributed and people were told from platforms, in their different houses also, that it was a proper thing for them to do.

We know as a fact that there were a great number of meetings held in connection with your movement when gentlemen in sympathy with your views endeavoured to persuade the people generally as to the propriety of adopting the course you advocated; and in consequence of that general agitation, there was a very general campaign throughout the country to observe the hartal conforming to your views?

¹ Gandhiji issued the text of this to the Press on March 23, 1919. This was given as Annexure A to Gandhiji's written statement; *vide* "Statement to Disorders Inquiry Committee", 5-1-1920.

Yes.

But now if I follow you aright, you disapproved of any people observing the hartal endeavouring to make people to get down on the day of the hartal from their tongas or motor cars in which they happened to be driving?

I felt very much grieved when I heard that.

That would be fully against your doctrine?

Very fully.

And if anything of that sort occurred, inevitably violence or riot would ensue?

Yes, that would.

May I take it, that you won't disapprove of the action of the police or civil authority in interfering with those who were observing the hartal and also endeavouring to force others to adopt a similar course, so long as the police acted with sufficient restraint and forbearance?

I saw no recourse was open to the police but to do that.

And if that is your view, from what happened *a fortiori*, I take it as your view that it was improper on the part of any people to go to the shop-keepers and tell them to close their shops?

On the day it was highly improper.

It would be still more highly improper to jostle the unfortunate shop-keepers who have not been willing to close their shops, from the satyagraha standpoint?

I will hold it to be criminal.

In connection with the hartal on the 6th, there was no violence, but we had a considerable amount of evidence on all these times of persuasion being brought to bear upon people to make them observe the hartal?

There was that.

Those were indications of improper action?

Certainly.

Your lieutenant in Delhi is Swami Shraddhanand. . . ?

I would hardly call him my lieutenant. I would like to call him my esteemed co-worker.

He wrote to you a letter¹ upon the subject of hartal. He indicated to you that after what occurred in Delhi and, I think also in the, Punjab it was manifest that you could not have a general hartal without violence inevitably ensuing?

¹ The letter could not be traced by Gandhiji. Swami Shraddhanand produced only a draft, while giving evidence before the Committee at Delhi on November 5. He summed up the purport of his letter to Gandhiji as follows: "I thought the satyagraha started by Mr. Gandhi civil disobedience of laws was unsuited. The movement of Mr. Gandhi as regards civil disobedience being part of satyagraha was unsuited to the conditions in this country."

I do not think he said that in so many words. I cannot recall the contents of that letter

It was very much to that effect?

I think what he said was he went much further - that it was not responsible; he was not referring to the hartal, but the law-breaking campaign; he suggested that the satyagraha campaign could not be carried on with impunity among the masses of people, but there was really a difference between him and me. When I suspended civil disobedience he thought that I ought not to suspend civil disobedience, but when I found it necessary to suspend civil disobedience, because I had not obtained sufficient control over the people in order to prevent violence, then he said: "If this is the position you take up, the moral for me to draw is that satyagraha can never be put into action as a mass movement." I think that is the drift of his letter. I had to discuss it with him also.

Did he agree with you?

I do not know whether he is still holding that view today. Facts might have converted him. I feel that suspension of civil disobedience is as much a necessity as prosecuting civil disobedience.

You see, if you have complete abstention from work and simultaneously you have the application of such a doctrine as civil disobedience of law among the masses of idle people, there will be great difficulty in distinguishing between passive and active resistance, Mr. Gandhi.

I will like Your Lordship to draw a sharp distinction between hartal and satyagraha proper. Hartal may sometimes be satyagrahic or may not be. Here civil disobedience as such had absolutely nothing to do with hartal. Hartal had a two-fold purpose; one to strike the imagination of the people as also to strike the imagination of the Government; but the second was a discipline for those who have to offer disobedience. I had no method of understanding the mind of India except by some such striking thing. If I had simply satisfied myself with fasting. I would not have known how many fasted, or with prayer, I would have not known how many prayed. The hartal is a proper index to show how far I could carry my principle.

I quite follow the difference between the two things. But if you have the hartal in the same time as satyagraha doctrine is being preached? It was being preached at public meetings?

Certainly, on that very day.

Do you not create a condition of very great danger to peace and order?

On the contrary, I promote peace. And I have done it myself on the 6th of April, because I was there in Bombay, and there was some fear of people themselves offering violence. And I am here to tell you that no violence, no real violence was offered by the people, because people were being told the true nature of satyagraha. It was an amazing sight for me to see thousands of people behaving in a perfectly peaceful manner. That would not have been the case if the satyagraha doctrine had not been preached in the right key. It all depends on the doctrine of satyagraha or the doctrine of hate in the form of satyagraha. But to enforce satyagraha and call upon those who are engaged in hartal to break the law is a different application and it is that which I am trying to distinguish.

Coming to the occurrences in which you yourself were implicated, you intended to proceed to Delhi and to the Punjab and you were met at Palwal and escorted back to Bombay?

Yes.

As I understand, were you formally arrested?

I was absolutely in form and substance arrested and I was surprised to find it so often said that it was not so.¹ The train pulled up between Muttra and Palwal and the order was served on me when we reached the border and the police officer exceedingly courteously reasoned with me saying how bad it would be for them to arrest me at a wayside station and how it would not be possible to have a magistrate and that he did not know what proceedings would be adopted. We reached Palwal. At that station, I saw not only the Superintendent of Police, I think it was the Delhi Superintendent of Police, but also a party of officers. I suppose they were police constables, I cannot say exactly who they were and the officer placing his hand on my shoulder said, "Mr. Gandhi, I arrest you." He served two orders on me, then he asked me quickly to remove my luggage, not myself personally, but he had the luggage removed and I was called upon to point out the things that had to be removed. He asked whether there was any man who wanted to be with me. Then there was a friend who came with me. There was a police guard. I intended to

¹ In his evidence before the Committee on November 5, the Chief Commissioner of Delhi had parried the question whether Gandhiji was not in fact arrested and replied that "he was taken under surveillance".

go to the platform to clear my throat and the police challenged me. They were right. There were all the simple ingredients of proper arrest.

We heard of far-reaching ingredients.

I do not say it was anything bad. The police performed, as they themselves said, the painful duty, as gently and as courteously as any gentleman could possibly do.

Do not you understand that all that was required of you was, in consequence of the order of Government, you were not to proceed to Delhi or the Punjab but you should go back to Bombay?

Yes; that was what the police said at the place where the train was held up. By the time I was arrested I had actually committed an offence. Therefore I was arrested. The officer arresting me did not know how I was to be dealt with. When I came to Muttra I received further orders.

And the nature of the further orders was that you were asked to go back to Bombay?

Not at all. I was taken under escort. There were two changes at Muttra. There was this police officer. He did not know what was to be done. He said I would have to be taken straight to the Secretary and therefore I would have to await orders as to what would be done to me. Then he exchanged some words with Mr. Bowring at Sawai Madhopur where the Peshawar train joined the Bombay train. I was taken to the Commissioner who had certain orders and it was he who produced the order when I was taken to Bombay. But Mr. Bowring himself was unaware of what was to happen to me when I was to be taken to Bombay. He was met, I believe, at Surat by an officer who came there from Bombay. He had a chat with me. It was daybreak. Mr. Bowring had a conversation with this officer, then he told me that I would be free in Bombay.

It amount to this, that in consequence of an order of Government it was made clear to you that would not be allowed to proceed to Delhi or the Punjab, but if you remained at Bombay you will be allowed perfect freedom?

Certainly in the Bombay Presidency.

Of course that is a little different from the idea that you have been taken and forcibly thrown into jail?

I do not know if anybody charged Government with forcibly throwing me into jail. Everybody asked what is the truth, when I was

arrested. I do not think that anybody had made it a matter of complaint against Government, except that Government had no business to turn me away from a mission of peace which Government knew I was bent on.

There may be a difference of opinion, quite as honest difference of opinion, between you and the Government?

I have accepted that position.

Rightly or wrongly, if they had thought that if you were allowed to proceed to Delhi in order to propagate the doctrine, riot might ensue, they would be justified in taking that action?

From their own view. From their standpoint I have absolutely nothing to say.

Subsequently to your arrest, very unfortunately serious incidents occurred in Delhi and the Punjab and also in Ahmedabad here? The only matter we have got to deal with here is as regards Ahmedabad itself. In Ahmedabad, as we have been told, you enjoyed great popularity among the mill-workers on account of the fact that you intervened successfully in one of their disputes¹ and your arrest seems to have created a great resentment on their part, and very unfortunately again, on the part of the mob, on the 11th and 12th at Ahmedabad and Viramgam. So far as these incidents are concerned, you have no personal knowledge?

I have no personal knowledge.

I do not know whether there is any matter in connection with them on which you would like to present your views which would be useful in enabling us to form our opinion?

I would venture to present this thing in connection with these riots. I consider that the action of this mob, whether in Ahmedabad or in Viramgam, was totally unjustified, and I have thought that it was a very sad thing that they lost self-control.¹ I do not wish to offer the slightest defence for the acts of the mob, but at the same time I would like to say that the people amongst whom, rightly or wrongly, I was popular were put to such severe stress by Government who should have known better. I think that Government committed an unpardonable error of judgment and the mob committed a similar unpardonable error, but more unpardonable on the part of the mob than on the part of the Government. I wish to say that also as a satyagrahi, I cannot find a single thing done by the mob which I can

¹ The reference is to the Ahmedabad mill-hands' dispute during February-March 1918.

defend or justify. No amount of provocation, however great, could justify people from doing as they have done. It has been suggested to me that all those who did it were not satyagrahis. That is true. But they chose to take part in the satyagraha movement and came under the satyagraha discipline. These were the terms in which I have spoken to the people; and it gives me the greatest pleasure and also pain to declare my settled conviction before this Committee also. I have said this elsewhere. I would proceed further with what I have come to know.

Very well.

As soon as I came here I endeavoured to do what I was capable of doing in order to repair the mischief and the error, as I sensed at the time. I placed it before the people and at the disposal of the authorities also, and I had a very long interview with Mr. Pratt and with other officers. I was to have held a meeting by their consent. I think Mr. Robertson also was present at the time, on the 13th; but I thought that it would not be possible for me to hold the meeting that day. Whether it was Martial Law or whatever it was, that was not the deciding factor; my co-workers were not able to reach the people; they sent volunteers to send notices. I conferred with Mr. Pratt and he said, "Yes, you could hold the meeting on the 14th." So the meeting took place on the 14th.¹ There I adumbrated what I felt. It happened that there I used the words "organisation" and "education" both of which terms have been so much quoted against me and against the people.² If against me, it is no matter; but if against the people, it matters very materially. The speech itself was in Gujarati. If you will read it ≈ of course, you won't, but Sir Chimanlal³ will.

He will be able to guide the Committee there and he will correct me if I am misunderstanding or misinterpreting the meaning of the terms. I have translated a Gujarati word which simply means those who know how to read and write, *shikhela*, and I chose the word *bhanela* as I sensed the thing before me at the time. I had no time to

¹ Vide "Speech at Mass Meeting Ahmedabad", 14-4-1919.

² The actual passage under reference was: "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."

³ Sir Chimanlal H. Setalvad (1865-1947); leading lawyer and member of the Disorders Inquiry Committee

keep together all the evidence that could have come before me. I used the word *bhanela* in the sense of “leader”, “a man who can read and write”. I have spoken not of “organisation” but I might have said this thing: “done in an organised manner.” I do not wish to withdraw a single word from that. But I want the Committee to understand, if I could make the Committee understand, that I referred only to the events in Ahmedabad. I had then no knowledge even of what had happened in Viramgam; but at Ahmedabad, looking at the whole picture and talking to the people, because I had talked to a large number of people who were before me, not merely at the meeting but also before the meeting, I felt that this thing was organised and I hold on to that even now. I had no hesitation in saying to Mr. Guider¹, I had no hesitation in saying it to Mr. Chatfield. I am here to repeat that statement. In my opinion, the thing was organised, but there it stands. There was no question whether it was a deep-laid conspiracy through the length and breadth of India or a deep-rooted organisation of which this was a part. The organisation was hastily constructed; the organisation was not in the sense in which we understand the word organisation. There is my expression, “This thing has been done in an organised manner.” I certainly felt strengthened in my supposition as I marched along with the facts I was getting. I wish also to place my position before the Committee. When I was addressing many people, I was not concerned with what steps the Government will take and it was necessary for me to diagnose the situation before the people. I was not concerned with giving any information to the police and when Mr. Guider came to me, I said, “It was none of my business. I was simply a reformer, and if I could wean the people from the error of their ways,” my position was justified and my task was finished; if he thought that he could get a single name from me he was mistaken. I said I was taking a serious responsibility as a citizen and also I understood that responsibility. So you would put a proper valuation on my work. It is an improper valuation on that word to hitch it on to any organisation, real or fancied. If I confined that word to Ahmedabad alone, to masses of absolutely unlettered men, who would be able to make no fine distinctions ~ then you have got the idea of what that organisation is. This exactly is my opinion as given to him, and I have no hesitation in giving that opinion to the Committee.

¹ J.A. Guider, Deputy Inspector-General of Police, C.I.D. Bombay. He was entrusted with the investigation of the riots in Ahmedabad.

There were those poor deluded labourers whose one business was to see me released and see Anasuyabai released. That it was a wicked rumour deliberately started by somebody I have not the slightest doubt. As soon as these things happened the people thought there should be something behind it. Then there were the half-educated raw youths. This is the work of these, I am grieved to have to say. These youths possessed themselves with false ideas gathered from shows, such as the cinematograph shows that they have seen, gathered from silly novels and from the political literature of Europe. I know that school. I have mixed with these men and I have endeavoured to wean them. I may, however, tell the Committee that there are today, I won't be able to say 100, but I will not be surprised if I count it by the 20, men who have ceased to belong to the school of violence because of this. But it was an organisation of this character. I think I have now given the full meaning of what I have said. I want deliberately to except those who go by the name of university men or degree men. I do not for one moment wish the Committee to understand that the degree men and the university men are incapable of doing that. On the contrary, the university men have also often implicated themselves in these things but not in Ahmedabad, not for this purpose. I am not aware of a single university man having instigated these things.

As regards the organisation, you think it started on the 10th?

Mr. Chatfield has said that.¹ I have not really taxed my mind on it, but it was an organisation or attempt made before the rioting took place.

I am not going to ask you to name any people in connection with this matter. Your view in so expressing yourself was apparently that there was a common purpose among the people who were affected on the 10th and 11th?

I would not say there was a common purpose, I think I would be then exaggerating it on the other side. Not a common purpose that fired the whole mob, but I think Your Lordship will agree with me that a common purpose may be restricted to two or three men and they are able to affect a whole mass of people, but once they have affected the people with their ideas, although originally they are the responsible people, the whole people are affected.

¹ Chatfield had testified, during his examination on January 5: "Mr. Gandhi told me in private conversation that he knew that this was organised on the night of the 10th and that he knew who organised it."

On this particular occasion on the 10th, 11th and 12th the affection took the form of the obliteration of all trace of Government; was not that so?

I think it was certainly anti-Government and I had not yet been able to make up my mind whether it was anti-European also. I am not really able to assist the Committee on that point. I would like to believe that it was not anti-European. There were certainly silver lines to this cloud.¹ But I should certainly feel exceedingly hurt if I made the discovery, but I would place it before the Committee if I found that.

I am not sure whether you desire to answer this question or not. According to satyagraha doctrine, is it right that people who have committed crimes should be punished by the civil authorities?

I am not prepared to say that it is wrong but there is a better method. It is really a difficult question to answer, because you do not anticipate any pressure from outside. But on the whole I think that it would be the proper thing to say that a satyagrahi cannot possibly quarrel with any punishment that might be meted out to offenders and therefore he cannot be anti-Government in that sense.

But apparently it is against the doctrine of the satyagraha to give assistance to Government by way of placing information that would lead to the conviction of offenders?²

According to the [principles of] satyagraha you say it is inconsistent.

It is inconsistent?

That would be inconsistent.

Why?

For the simple reason that a satyagrahi's business is not to assist the police by that particular method which is open to the police or which the police adopts, but he helps the authorities and the police by making the people more law-abiding and more respectful to authority. But when he sees lapses, it is no part of his duty to combine

¹ For instance, certain European missionaries were spared by the mob.

² Gandhiji had telegraphed to J.A. Guider on May 11, 1919, that the inmates "cannot consistently with Ashram principles give evidence against people"; "Telegram to J.A.Guider", 11-5-1919

his reform work with police work. The two are contradictory and inconsistent. I know, Mr. Guider has challenged that.¹

You gave an answer to Mr. Guider and it was really on that answer that I was asking this question?

And he has not been able to dislodge me from that position.² And I am fully aware that I have not dislodged him from his position.

Supposing a satyagrahi had seen one of the more serious crimes committed in the course of these riots, actually committed in his own presence, would there be no obligation upon him to inform the police?

Of course I have answered that before Mr. Guider and I think I must answer that here also. I do not want to misguide the youth of the country, but my answer is that even then he cannot go and give evidence against his brother, and when I say against his brother there is no distinction here of country or anything of that kind at all.

As I understand your satyagrahi vow, it is wholly independent of India or European nationality?

Certainly. And what I would suggest is that it is inherent in the thing. He cannot do the two things. I have now mixed with criminals of the deadliest type for a number of years and I know that I have been instrumental, however poorly, but still I have been instrumental in weaning them over. I should forfeit their confidence if I disclosed the name of a single man. My business ends there. I should pay with my life, if I have the courage, in weaning the man who is about to do a criminal act, but if I have done that or after I have found myself unable to do it, the other duty does not devolve upon me, viz., of going and straightaway lodging the information before the police.

Of course, you see there is a distinction, Mr. Gandhi, between divulging a communication that has been made to you in confidence and making a statement as regards a crime that has been committed in your presence? And you say it is not the duty of a satyagrahi to assist the police?

¹ Guider had interviewed Gandhiji on April 17. His testimony before the Committee on January 7 was that Gandhiji had told him "that certain things had been known to him but he was not disposed to disclose them without the permission of the persons who had communicated them to him".

² Guider had reported this to Chatfield, who interviewed Gandhiji towards the end of May, but failed to persuade him to divulge the information. Similar attempts made by Commissioner Pratt had proved equally infructuous.

I would say that it is the straightest conduct of a satyagrahi not to do so and not to give evidence in a court of law even in connection with a crime which has been committed under his own nose and which he has assisted in preventing, but I do not want to carry that doctrine to that dangerous limit. I think it is open only in the rarest cases possible, but it would be a prostitution of the doctrine if a satyagrahi, having signed a pledge, absolved himself from bringing criminals to justice; nor does that follow from the satyagrahi pledge. But if a man modelled his life according to the principles of satyagraha as I venture to think I have conceived them, I think there is no room for him to do so. But in order that I may not be misunderstood, I am not able to say today that I will not give information against a man whom I have seen in the act of committing a crime because I do not claim to be a perfected satyagrahi, I am aiming at becoming it and when I have become that, probably God will never put such temptations in my way, but if they were there, I would certainly not give evidence. But today I am unable to say of myself that I would not do so.

Now there is one other point on which you may desire to express your views. As regards the measures which were taken by the Government to repress the riot, what have you to say about them?

In Ahmedabad I think that, whether there was technically Martial Law or whether there was not, the impression left on my mind by Mr. Pratt and the other gentlemen who were there was clearly that there was Martial Law. I feel that Martial Law was not necessary, but I am not really competent to judge that. I think that the Government acted with the greatest restraint and with forbearance under provocation of a serious character. In the case of a troop train, coming to suppress disorders, being in danger of being derailed and escaping derailment, I can understand troops of that character dealing destruction in a fit of fury.¹ It would be mad, but I would find it in my heart to excuse an act of that fury. I think, therefore, there was self-restraint on the part of Government and on the part of those who were actually conducting the business. I think, at the same time, that the terms in which the military notice was couched were open to very serious objections. I think they were totally unwarranted by the situation as it faced the military, and I do believe that as a result of that several inoffensive lives were lost. If the military rule or semi-military

¹ A train bringing reinforcements from Bombay was derailed near Nadiad on April 11; another escaped derailment at Barejadi station.

rule had been carried on for any length of time, I do not know what would have happened.

Do you know of any case where groups of people were fired on without first having been asked to disperse?

If I am to believe the statements that were made before me, I think that that has happened, and I should certainly not be surprised if that has happened. I saw the troops that were posted. Some of them were mere lads. Mr. Pratt brought that danger face to face with me. It is one thing, he said, to issue these orders; it is another thing to have these orders carried in the spirit in which they have been issued, and he himself did anticipate the danger of these young lads simply playing with the people and playing with fire and I do feel that some such thing has happened.

You think something of the sort may have occurred?

I do not say “may have”, I think something of that kind has occurred. I think the people who came to me did not exaggerate and I cross-examined them very severely and they said, “No, we have not received warnings.” It does not matter if you have got a group of 9 people, that is not a crime; a 10th man comes without wanting to be the 10th and the military fire, and what is the value even of a warning being given to men who do not know the thing?

Of course, the object of that order was to prevent groups of people going and indulging in acts of violence?

I think there was a much better way of doing that.

What better way?

A better way would be not to fire. To give these directions to irresponsible lads was the height of folly.

If a complaint is to be made that any irresponsible lad has acted contrary to the way in which he had instructions to act, we should know what that incident was and also the facts?

I quite agree with Your Lordship. I can only give you my impression. I am unable to prove the thing and I understand the responsibility rests on my shoulders; but if you ask me to give my impression, it is that such things must have happened. What I feel is that any civilian should have realised that as inevitable in the nature of things.

Is there any other matter in this connection?

I have said in my statement, and I should like to repeat it, that I do not know that the people were not sufficiently punished, though I would again make the admission, and make it with the greatest pleasure, that the work of the troops here was done consistently with the laws of civilised justice. There was nothing to be said against that. I have urged already that the sections under which the prosecutions were undertaken ought not to have been brought into use. There was nothing to warrant that, and certainly nothing to warrant that when the trial took place.

You mean the sections as regards waging war; of course, that is after all a legal question?

It is, but I place it before this Committee in order that they may have a proper bearing in so far as I can enable the Committee to have that, as to the measures taken by the Government. And as I have paid, and I think a deserved, tribute to the Government for their forbearance, I do not want myself to be misunderstood as endorsing all that has been done, and so I am as gently as possible urging upon the Committee these defects, even in this admirable handling by the administration.

But that looks very like as though you were making a complaint against the Government Advocate that he did not understand the proper charge?

I think it was more than that, it was not the Government Advocate who merely chose, though technically it was. But that is not how the thing happened. That is within my experience and quite rightly. No Advocate would take upon his shoulders the entire responsibility of choosing the section, but he would be naturally guided by the administrative bent at the time and the Government might have instructed the Advocate, the Government Counsel, not to do that; but I do ask myself whether it was necessary for them to impose that heavy contribution upon Ahmedabad.¹ But the most sorest point with me is that they should have imposed that very severe contribution upon the labourers and in the manner they did. The manner in which it was executed, in my opinion, was unforgivable.

We had a statement from Mr. Ambalal Sarabhai.¹

¹ Sarabhai had observed, *inter alia*: "The method of levy though inequitable and unjustifiable has been, in my opinion, the least provocative."

And I ventured to differ from him in spite of my regard for him and his fairness. I think he erred, and erred grievously, against his own people, the labourers.

I am not sure that you are not going a bit beyond the scope of our enquiry?

You have put before me a sore point.

There may be difficulties of course between employers and employees, but we have nothing to do with that.

I fully understood that and no man can more fully appreciate Mr. Ambalal's difficulty than I can. And I wish to finish this part of my statement by saying that I think that the action of the Government in connection with the Nadiad and Barejadi case was totally unjustified, and I would ask the Committee to read the correspondence¹ between Government and the Collector of Nadiad and you will find there arguments urged for inflicting that fine totally irrelevant to the scope.

It is a question really of the laws of India, but is it not in accordance with those laws that, if an additional police force has to be got for any particular district, that district has to pay for it?

Surely, Sir, it is not obligatory upon the Government to do that. It is open to the Government to make the people pay; it is open to the Government to single out a class of people for that treatment, but it is nowhere, according to my reading of that law, giving such wide discretion to the Government, obligatory upon the Government to take that expense from the people.

How are they to recoup themselves?

Recoup from the general revenue. If they consider a particular district is insufficiently policed, surely they do that. They get it from the general revenue. And I certainly hold very strong opinions, knowing as I do the people of Nadiad and the people of Barejadi, that there was no occasion whatsoever for posting a single additional policeman. The people of Nadiad under the most difficult circumstances acted with the greatest self-restraint, and I have investigated that matter as fully as I was capable of doing in conjunction with Mr. Ker, the Collector, and I am here to tell the Committee that it is my deliberate opinion that the people of Nadiad were not in league with those who went there to derail, but that they exercised all the powers that were at their disposal in order to restrain

¹ This is not available.

them, and they got a handsome tribute from the Collector and a compliment for their assistance. And I would say the same thing for the people of Barejadi.

That I think deals with the points you wish to bring before our notice?

I think so, Sir.

By the Hon'ble Mr. Justice Rankin:

Mr. Gandhi, you have given us your views about civil disobedience and I do not want in the least to make you argue the point over again with me. But I want to get some facts and dates roughly from you if I can. I think the satyagraha vow was settled somewhere about the third week in February?

I think that is very nearly right.

I think what has been called your *hukm* was dated somewhere about the 23rd of February?

Yes.

At that time the Rowlatt Bill No. 2 had not yet been passed, it was passed later on in March?

Possibly.

The vow¹ as printed, which is before us, shows that it was known that the Bill would be passed, but it had not yet been passed?

Yes.

And for some time before the 23rd of February I think the Press in India, not that it was any part of my duty to know this at that time, but from the papers put before us, the Press in India, seems to have been ringing with proposals about the way in which to protest against those Acts if they were passed. And I daresay you had to consider a great many suggestions before you made up your mind about the form of your protest, and among the suggestions you had to consider was there a suggestion, widely spread throughout India, that it would be a good method of protest if people were to refuse to pay their land revenue and taxes? I think you had a good many forms of protest suggested to you by irresponsible people, and the satyagraha vow which you settled in the third week of February was what you thought the best method of protest at that time?

Yes.

Now did you have to consider I ask you this because of a speech of yours which I think I have read ≈ were you asked to consider whether it should be laid down that orders passed by local magistrates under the Criminal Procedure Code should be

¹ This was the Satyagraha Pledge, quoted in the statement of the Government of Bombay to the Committee.

disobeyed?

Of course that was placed before me.

You never committed yourself to that? You thought it might be inadvisable?

Not only I never committed myself, but I opposed it strenuously.

Had you expressed, by the 8th of April let us say, a view on that subject one way or the other?

By the 8th of April I had sufficiently expressed that view, because it was urged upon me by friends that we should commit a breach of the laws governing processions and so on, and I had suggested that we could not possibly do that, we ought not to do it. I had even issued instructions that all police orders should be scrupulously obeyed and carried out.

Can you give me the date of my instructions that were issued publicly, either by yourself or the Bombay Sabha on that point?

I can only say it was between the 6th and the actual civil disobedience. I can only offer to the Committee to send all the papers that I can trace.

I do not want to put you to any undue trouble, but speaking for myself, if you can give me some document which shows that you have repudiated the notion that there was to be any disobedience against local magistrates, I shall be very glad.

I shall, if it is there, do that.¹

I am rather anxious, Mr. Gandhi, to find out from you exactly what made you start upon your journey to Delhi, which was interrupted. Will you tell me shortly in your own way the facts that led up to that act and what exactly you intended to do when you got to Delhi?

I think it was about the 1st of April, or even a little before, I had received a letter from Dr. Satyapal from Amritsar saying he had been trying to follow the satyagraha movement, that he appreciated the thing and he liked it immensely, but that he himself did not fully understand it, nor did the people. Would I not go over to Amritsar, be his guest, and deliver a few speeches explaining the doctrine of satyagraha, as they were, on a superficial observation of it, enamoured of the thing? As I happened to know from information given to me by the police officers that this letter was intercepted, copied by them

¹ Gandhiji sent some extracts with "Letter to Justice Rankin", 11-1-1920. The enclosures are not available.

and then given to me, I told Dr. Satyapal that I should do so at the very first opportunity that I had. Meanwhile I received a letter from Swami Shraddhanand saying that I shall go to Delhi. The people of Delhi were becoming unamenable to the control of the leaders. Really all these people never responded in Delhi, least of all the big cities of India, that is my impression and that is the information they have given me. He said if you only come here, even if it is for a day, I should be pleased, and he sent not only one telegram but he sent two or three, at least two I know.¹

About what date? Was it after the events of the 30th in Delhi?

Yes, after the events of the 30th of March and before the hartal of the 6th, and so I think I sent a telegram to him saying I would do so, but I would come immediately after the hartal.² I was most anxious for the thing to pass off nicely in Bombay and so it did. I was most anxious we should start our civil disobedience while the whole thing was arranged, so we did that for one day, and on the 8th I took the train. But I got his first wire between the 30th of March and the 6th of April.

Again, I do not want to put you to any trouble about it, but do you happen to have these wires or copies to them?

If I have them, I shall certainly let you have them. My general routine is to destroy all these documents, simply because I do not want to burden myself. But it is likely that I may have those telegrams. If I have them, I will furnish them.³

As I gather, the attitude the Swami adopted in writing to you was that, in order that the satyagraha movement might have the benefit of a further extension of influence through your going to Delhi, he wished you to go there?

Certainly.

¹ Swami Shraddhanand referred to the telegrams in his written statement to the Committee. In sending the first telegram, he "was certain that Mahatma Gandhi's personal contact with the people will make our task of infusing the principles of satyagraha into them easy". The second wire thanked Gandhiji for agreeing to visit Delhi.

² According to Swami Shraddhanand, Gandhiji replied that he would leave Bombay on the evening of Tuesday, i.e., 8th. On that day he wired again: "Reaching tomorrow evening. Please keep my arrival strictly private; can bear no public demonstration."

³ The source carries here a footnote: "Not traceable by Mr. Gandhi or elsewhere."

He was not inviting you to go to Delhi for the express purpose of pacifying the crowds that had got riotous and out of hand, but in the ordinary course of the satyagraha propaganda?

Not in the same manner that it was arranged for me to be in Amritsar. He definitely mentioned that “we may not be able to restrain the crowd”. He said, “I have tried my utmost up to now, but I may fail and so I would like you to come up. Your presence will have a pacifying influence.” If I can get those letters, I shall be pleased to give them to you.

Am I right in supposing that, so far as you are concerned, it was no part of your intention in going to Delhi for the first time in order to have a collision with the authorities in the interests of the satyagraha movement?

None at all.

You knew, I think, at that time, that the Swamiji was having difficulty in getting the crowds in Delhi to do what he wanted and that the police authorities were having an anxious time of it?

Yes.

You say you had no intention of proceeding to Delhi to make the position worse but to make it better?

I was proceeding to Delhi to help the authorities.

There are just one or two things that I would like to ask you about. I do not believe in quoting speeches, Mr. Gandhi, I have some reports before me and I cannot read through the whole, but I will read a few lines from your speeches at Ahmedabad on the 13th April.

On the 13th or 14th?

On the 14th. You were speaking in Gujarati and it is a speech¹ which you began by saying that what had happened in Ahmedabad during the past 4 or 5 days had disgraced the city. What you appeared to have said according to this report is, “he told them that these disturbances had done no good to Ahmedabad, that they had done considerable harm to the passive resistance. If after his arrest people had preserved peace, the Rowlatt Bill would have been cancelled or on the verge of being cancelled. It would not be a matter of wonder now if there was delay in the cancellation of the Bill. When he got free on Friday, he intended to start again for Delhi on Sunday to try and get himself re-arrested as the cause of passive resistance would have been greatly strengthened. Now instead of going to Delhi he had to carry on passive resistance against themselves.” Was that simply a passing thought in your mind or had you in a

¹ *Vide* “Speech at Mass Meeting, Ahmedabad”, 14-4-1919

cooler moment formed the determination really to go back to get yourself re-arrested?

I had done that. I had told Mr. Griffith, the Commissioner of Police, that it was my intention to do so unless I found something serious.

Do you mean Mr. Jeffries?

Mr. Griffith, the Commissioner of Police in Bombay. I mentioned that fact to Mr. Pratt also.

I have not heard of him yet. He is new to us. Now let us take it that you had been unjustly turned back from Delhi, but what was the object of going back to get yourself re-arrested?

As a satyagrahi having once been arrested and set free, it is our duty to seek re-arrest and seek imprisonment again and again. That was the object and nothing else.

I do not know ~ of course you know better than I do ~ it is not the object of a satyagrahi to go and get himself imprisoned always, is it?

No, it is not always.

What is the particular reason from your point of view to get yourself re-arrested?

To invite self-suffering. If I embark upon a campaign of civil breach that is the only way by which I can make good that campaign.

Was it your idea that if you went back to Delhi and you were arrested, that that would inflame the country or parts of it and have a greater effect in stopping the Rowlatt Bill?

Not at all. If that was so, I would have proceeded straight, without the slightest hesitation or consideration. Here I just want to supplement my information by saying that, at that time, I had no idea to what had occurred in Amritsar or elsewhere.

The events at Amritsar occurred on the 10th¹ which was when you were travelling back in the train. At what time did you actually arrive back in Bombay?

On the 11th.

At that time I take it that there were urgent messages for you to come to Ahmedabad?

Yes.

Did they meet you immediately on your arrival at home?

¹ There were acts of mob violence involving arson, looting and murder of some Europeans.

No. I was not met by any friend so far as I am aware.

Did you get a message to come to Ahmedabad the moment you arrived in Bombay?

I got the message the next day. I arrived on the 11th. I got the message on the 12th.

Your facilities for keeping abreast of what was happening all over the country during those days were very bad, and you were not fully posted up with what was happening?

No.

That point about going back to Delhi I put it to you again, because it was only a few days after you had been arrested and turned back. What I understood you to say was for the first time when you went to Delhi it was not part of your object to get into collision with the police but you went there to make the position better?

Yes.

I don't think I have before me in an authoritative form the facts as to the action you took to bring to an end the practice of what is called civil disobedience. I think you did feel yourself compelled to advise the temporary suspension of civil disobedience, and according to the document before me, that was done about the 18th April?

Yes.

And that was done after you got back from Ahmedabad, and you addressed a letter to the Secretaries of the Sabha in which you said that "it is not without sorrow that 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 movement that impels me to suggest suspension. I am sorry that when I embarked upon a mass movement, I understand the forces of evil, and I must now pause and consider how best to meet the situation."¹ Now, you seem to have stated there very frankly that, when on the 23rd of February you embarked upon satyagraha and civil disobedience as a mass movement, you had underrated the forces of evil, and I suppose that the experiences through which India had passed during the intervening period led you to think that it was doing more harm than good in that form?

Yes.

After that date, the 18th April, I think from time to time you were requested for instructions whether it was going to be restarted again; was it ever in fact restarted again?

¹ *Vide* "Press Statement on Suspension of Civil Disobedience", 18-4-1919.

No.

You have kept it in suspension since that date?

And then a notice was issued that it will be started, I think, on the 1st of August or the 1st of July. I forgot now the exact month, when I saw there was a fair control over the situation, but yielding to the better knowledge and the better information of the Government of India, it was Lord Chelmsford's desire conveyed to me through His Excellency the Governor of Bombay and supplemented by the advice of the Governor of Bombay also, I felt that, in order to make good my claim as a satyagrahi, I should yield and I yielded.

I think there is a letter over your signature in which you put the matter thus: "As long as we practise truth and ask others to do so, satyagraha can never be said to have ceased. And if all practise truth, and refrain from violence to person and property, we would immediately get what we want. But when all are not prepared to do so, when satyagrahis are only a handful, then we have to devise other methods deducible from satyagraha. One such method is *civil disobedience*. I have already explained the reason why this civil disobedience has been for the time being suspended. As long as we know that there is every likelihood, bordering on certainty, of rioting and violence following civil disobedience, so long disobedience of laws cannot be regarded as civil disobedience, but it is disobedience that is thoughtless, uncivil and devoid of truth."¹ And for those reasons you suspended it after experience had shown you that the line between civil disobedience and other disobedience was more difficult to draw for other people than you had thought?

Yes.

I want to ask you, Mr. Gandhi. You have been taking an interest in politics all over India, and I want you to speak, so far as you can, for the whole of India as regards this point. Looking back upon what happened in the Punjab and Delhi and other places, do you think that, by a misinterpretation of the principles of satyagraha, there has been a tendency all over India in April and May of last year to have an undue sympathy with lawlessness and an inadequate perception of the necessity of obedience to law?

So far as I have been able to gauge the public feeling, I do not think that would be a correct statement.

Do you feel guilty yourself of having done anything to damage the law-abiding instinct of the Indian people by the satyagraha movement?

¹ Vide "Satyagraha Leaflet No. 12", 2-5-1919.

I feel guilty of having temporarily damaged that instinct in some people. I do feel that. But I do not feel for one moment that there has been a spirit of lawlessness amongst the people as a whole.

Of course in some parts of India there was greater reason than in others for being in a state of excitement. The Punjab is an instance, and there are other instances which I need not mention, but I understand it, or rather put it, that where people got more excited, there they were more liable to misinterpret what you wanted?

I think where the people did not understand the doctrine there they were liable to misinterpret it. I found to my most agreeable surprise that, for the first time people from the Punjab came to me voluntarily and said, "Oh, if only we had understood the doctrine, how differently we would have acted."

And it is the case, is it not, that before you started this particular movement in the third week of February, a campaign had been going on for a substantial time in which the disobedience of law had played a prominent part in the papers all over India?

Oh, yes, certainly.

Your view was to appoint a committee which should decide what laws to disobey . . . ?

This is so, and we often discussed it at our meetings, and I made it as plain as it was possible for me to do so.

Your intention was to have a committee in Bombay both for Bombay and Ahmedabad?

That is all.

And, of course, your intention was that this civil disobedience should be practised in parts of India where they would have such sabhas. Did you intend that each place should have its own sabha to prescribe particular laws to be disobeyed?

That was done, but I think it was only nominally done, because the sabhas, in each place where it was actually done, appointed me as the President, because they felt, and very naturally too, they felt in that respect they should be guided by me. There was a local committee formed in Madras and they made me President, and I rather like the idea, and that was the same thing in the United Provinces, so that we should have the same policy all over.

Did you contemplate that different laws should be prescribed for different areas for the purposes of being broken?

I contemplated that if the necessity arose, but not otherwise.

I see in your speeches that your movement is referred to sometimes by the phrase “civil disobedience” which comes apparently from Thoreau, and sometimes by the phrase, which is more familiar to an Englishman, “passive resistance”. Now if an order comes to a man from Government or from anybody else, and if his conscience says that it is not right, it may be up to him simply to do nothing if not to obey, but civil disobedience goes further than that. Does it not?

Certainly.

First of all, civil disobedience as a propaganda was a means, as you put it speaking of South Africa, of bending the Government to the will of the people?

Certainly.

Secondly, the disobedience may be active as well as passive, but still be civil according to your satyagraha doctrine?

Yes.

And thirdly, the Committee may fail to prescribe the law to be broken which is against one’s conscience or prescribe a law which is not against one’s conscience to be broken?

Certainly.

Those differences as I understood you to say you perceived from your former propaganda and this is your way of putting the passive resistance doctrine into force?

That is why I have not called it a passive doctrine, because there is nothing passive about this thing. It is active, but not in the physical sense.

For instance, if there is a law which says that you must not publish a newspaper unless you register it, and you publish it, is it not passive resistance?

It is active and intensely active.

In the same way you go and get yourself arrested when you are told not to go to Delhi and that would be active resistance?

Certainly.

What I want to know is whether you appreciate the fact, as it appears to me is the case, the civil disobedience as understood by you and what is called passive resistance are really two very different things?

I accept that. There is a fundamental distinction.

You said it was an extension of the domestic law on the political field, that what is repugnant to one’s conscience he has a right to refuse?

That is true.

By Sir C.H. Setalvad:

You were asked about the Rowlatt Bills and you were told that the Rowlatt Act

that was passed really re-enacted the provisions of the Defence of India Act to a certain extent. The Defence of India Act provisions were submitted to merely as an emergency for the period of the War, but that would not justify keeping all those provisions after the War was over. That was one of the objections to the Bill?

Yes.

Then it was pointed out that the extension of the Rowlatt Act as passed to any particular province or locality could only be if the Government of India extended it. Have you found that similar extensions under other Acts that were made were based on what the people considered to be very insufficient grounds?

Yes.

And the main objection to the Rowlatt Bills was not this, but that it attempted to place a considerable power in the hands of the executive uncontrolled by the judiciary?

Yes.

And also the manner in which the Act was passed in the Legislative Council in the teeth of all combined non-official opposition and that too on the eve of a substantial measure of self-government being granted created the greatest resentment throughout the country?

Yes.

With regard to your satyagraha doctrine, as far as I am able to understand it, it involves a pursuit of truth?

Yes.

And in the pursuit of truth to invite suffering on oneself and not to cause violence to anybody else?

Yes.

That I understand is the main principle underlying?

That is so.

Now in that doctrine, who is to determine the truth? That individual himself?

Yes, that individual himself.

So each one that adopts this doctrine has to determine for himself what is the truth that he will pursue?

Most decidedly.

And in doing that different individuals will take very different views as to what is the truth to be pursued?

Certainly.

It might, on that footing, cause considerable confusion?

I won't accept that. It need not lead to any confusion if you accept the proposition that a man is honestly in search after truth and that he will never inflict violence upon him who holds to truth. Then there is no possibility of confusion.

A man may honestly strive after truth, but however honestly a man may strive, his notions of truth will be quite different from the notions of truth of some other people or his intellectual equipment may be of such a character that his conclusion as regards truth may be entirely opposite to the conclusion of somebody else?

That was precisely the reason why in answer to Lord Hunter I suggested that non-violence was the necessary corollary to the acceptance of satyagraha doctrine.

I quite see that non-violence is a common factor to all but what truth a particular person should pursue, on that there will be immense difference of opinion?

Certainly.

You recognise, I suppose, Mr. Gandhi, that in order properly to follow in the right spirit in which you conceive the doctrine of satyagraha, pursuit after truth, in the manner you describe, the person must be equipped with high moral and intellectual equipment?

Certainly, a man who wants to pursue truth independently has to be equipped with high moral and intellectual equipment.

Now do you expect that standard of moral and intellectual equipment in the ordinary man?

It is not necessary for me to have that standard from all who accept the thing. If, for instance, A has evolved a conception of truth which B, C and 50 others accepted implicitly from him, then, I need not expect from them that high standard which I would expect from A, but the others will follow that. They will know that they are not to inflict any violence, and you create a large body.

It comes to this, that the person or persons with high moral and intellectual equipment that I have spoken of would come to a particular conclusion. Then, a large number of other people have to blindly follow him?

Not blindly, I would not say blindly, but I would not expect the same standard of intellectual or moral equipment from them as I would expect from A.

I thought you agreed with me that, in order to practice in the right spirit your doctrine of satyagraha, a person should be fitted with high moral and intellectual equipment, but you say it is not necessary to exact that standard from all people because all that they need do is to follow what a person of that high intellectual and

moral equipment has decided?

You may put it that way if you wish to. But all I wish to urge is that each individual, unless he wants to carry on his pursuit independently, does not need to do so. I simply say that if one man conceives a plan of life, it is not necessary for all the others, before they can follow that, to have the same intellectual and moral equipment. If you have appreciated that from what I have said, I have nothing more to say.

I take it that your scheme, as you conceive it, involves the determination of what is the right path and the true path by people who are capable of high intellectual and moral equipment and a large number of other people following them without themselves being able to arrive at similar conclusions by reason of their lower moral and intellectual equipment?

I cannot subscribe to that, because I have not said that I do not say that they are not to exercise their judgment, but I simply say that, in order that they may exercise their judgment, the same mental and moral equipment is not necessary.

Because they are to accept the judgment of people who are capable of exercising better judgment and equipped with better moral and intellectual standard?

Naturally, but I think that is in human nature, but I exact nothing more than I would exact from an ordinary human being.

I will put it in another way. The success of your propaganda must depend upon a large number of people accepting the conclusion of people in whom they have faith and who are fortunate enough to have that high moral and intellectual equipment. If everybody without that moral and intellectual equipment begins to think out for himself what is the right path, you will end in confusion. So the success of your scheme implies and must involve this, that a certain number of people endowed with that high moral and intellectual equipment will pursue the truth and determine what it is, then, a large number not so endowed will accept their conclusion and follow them?

I do not accept that as a natural conclusion, that the success of the movement depends upon that. In satyagraha the success of the movement depends upon the existence of one full satyagrahi. One satyagrahi can achieve success in the manner and in the sense that in the plan of violence numbers of people cannot do.

The first part of it, I understood, Mr. Gandhi, is that it is a doctrine of pursuit of truth in the sense that you have suggested and it can only be rightly worked out by a person fitted with high moral and intellectual equipment which the ordinary masses do not possess?

Of making an independent search, that is how I would like to put it.

Therefore, so far as they are concerned, they have to accept the conclusions of people who are capable of doing it?

Not without sufficiently exercising their judgment.

They can only exercise such judgment as they have?

Certainly.

And as you have said, the real pursuit of truth in the manner you have described requires such high moral and intellectual equipment that it is beyond the ordinary individual?

That is true with reference to any original thing.

I am not pointing this as a reproach against the movement. I am only understanding the position.

Perhaps, I am reading actually more in your words than I am entitled to.

You need not view my questions with undue suspicion?

It is not suspicion, Sir Chimanlal, but I simply do not want the Committee or you, for that matter, to misunderstand my position. That is all.

I understand you to say, Mr. Gandhi, you do not consider yourself a perfect satyagrahi yet?

No.

If that is so, Mr. Gandhi, it is almost impossible for ordinary people to ever hope to be that?

I do not by any means consider myself to be an extraordinary man.

You may not consider yourself, but looking to your life and your habits the people know that you are an extraordinary man and can pursue a doctrine such as the satyagraha perfectly. But are there not many people for whom it is almost impossible to hope to pursue it correctly?

They perhaps in that case would not have understood the scope of satyagraha at all. It would mean that they had felt quite disgusted. Now, take for instance, the 40,000 Indians in South Africa who are totally uncultured and illiterate, and these people never come to that conclusion.

I may be wrong. But when you speak of the 40,000 in South Africa, I think they simply followed your lead ?

Yes, followed my lead after having examined the position. If I take you through the streets of South Africa, and should you have the time to do it, you will find that your countrymen were capable of doing it because they did not follow me blindly.

True, but there in South Africa you had a broad simple issue?

Yes.

And it was an issue with regard to which the sympathy of the civilized world was with the people who were following satyagraha and that very much differentiates the situation from the situation that you have here?

Not on the concrete instance of satyagrahi control. I have had to consolidate more information here on my side than I had in South Africa. They were divided in two forces of hostile camps there.

That may be, but still you had a clean-out issue?

So also here.

Here you say you had on this particular occasion the Rowlatt Bill agitation, but once you start this doctrine of satyagraha and introduce it into political campaigns and activities in a country like India, situated as we are, it is not one clean-out issue that we arrive at. There would be varied and complicated situations to which you would have to apply this doctrine?

I do not apply the doctrine to every situation in life. I simply present satyagraha as an instrument of infinitely greater power and infinitely purer than violence.

Then I take it, you will agree that it is not a doctrine that you would apply to every grievance or every situation that may arise?

Most certainly not. Not if only because of the automatic limits of the doctrine imposed, because everyone is not ready to suffer. Everyone is ready to strike a blow if he would receive one in return.

You say that an ordinary man is quite ready to strike a blow, so your doctrine involves eschewing that altogether and, on the contrary, the suffering ones go on suffering. Now, does not that require very extraordinary control over ordinary human passions?

Not to my experience. It does not really require that extraordinary control for sufferings that you imagine. Every mother suffers and she is not exceptionally gifted with any great virtue.

Now, take a case in ordinary life. If you get a blow and you determine to suffer it according to your doctrine, surely that does require extraordinary control over ordinary human passions?

Then, your countrymen have got that extraordinary control.

Do you think they have exercised it or exhibited it in all these places?

Yes, they have exhibited that in a very large measure.

Take Ahmedabad. Do you think they exhibited that control over their passions when on hearing of your arrest they burst forth and committed all these atrocities which you clearly denounced? Do you think they exhibited this self-control and self-restraint?

All I say is that throughout India where you find these isolated instances, you find innumerable instances where the people exercise the most exemplary self-restraint and hence we have earned the title of the "mild Hindu".

I daresay many people did not take part in these disturbances and in that sense it is self-restraint. But you see the point is how, on hearing of your arrest, which was the first provocation to them, they burst into ebullitions, and these atrocities in Ahmedabad followed almost at once.

To me it just shows that even we have not gone far enough I moved 7 lakhs of people in Kaira, they are high-spirited people, and yet they acted with the greatest self-restraint in the face of very grave provocation at the time of the Kaira trouble, which was not for one day but continued for six months.

So you consider these many manifestations of violence in different parts as merely an accidental or a passing phase which is not likely to recur?

I do not say so, but it will certainly be rare and rarer still from a clear conception that the country has now got of satyagraha. I have no doubt in my mind about it.

Do you think that the country has now realized the high ideals that you have placed before them?

Not in its full sense, but the country has sufficiently realized the high ideal to enable a man like myself to try it again and, I would not hesitate to try it again if a situation warranting such control faced me, but as I have said, it is not every day that you want to break laws.

Do you feel sure that if you started it again, similar disturbances would not result in any place?

It is very difficult to say beforehand when such a situation faces me, but I do feel sure that the country is all the purer and better for having gone through the fire of satyagraha.

Now, as I understand you from your statement, the satyagraha doctrine is used in the political sphere to oppose unjust laws?

Yes.

And that is to be done by inviting penalties under that law, by breaking that law. And you say your doctrine inculcates this with regard to such laws in connection with which the rendering of obedience be a dishonour, and you go so far as to say that in order to register your protest against any such law one would be entitled to withdraw co-operation altogether from the State?

I have not said that there, i.e., “to withdraw co-operation”. But I would accept that proposition also when a situation may be reached in which case it would be a proper thing to withdraw complete co-operation from the State.

Now ordinarily I take it that your doctrine is co-operation with Government?

Yes.

I mean to say, in the very interest of the country for its ordered development, for which there ought to be co-operation?

Yes.

And there ought to be an elimination as far as possible of any race hatred or race feeling or bitterness of that kind?

Yes.

Tested in this way, when your doctrine says with regard to any particular law or laws to invite suffering and go to jail by breaking them, you hope thereby ultimately to excite the sympathy of the people in authority and to make them see the correct view of it?

I should eliminate the hope. That hope is not a necessary ingredient.

If I remember, I think, in your statement you mention it?

When I place the doctrine before the people I place that also before them, but it is not an essential part of the doctrine. The essential part is not to accept and obey a law to obey which is a dishonour, therefore, it becomes a necessity of the situation for us to do that, but that by itself is the register of a protest by honest action, which brings about the sympathy of the world and the repeal of that legislation. It is one of the conditions of that act. A man may say, “No, the whole world will rise against me”, but he must still make good his protest.

It is true the result may also be that, though it may not be the strict ideal of satyagraha. According to you one should not do it for achieving that result, but the hope may be that, if you can get a number of people going to jail and suffering, then, the authorities may be moved by sympathy and may realize the correct point of view as you consider it. Now, if that is done on any particular occasion and if several

people went to jail in this way and suffered, will it not also create to a certain extent a feeling of hatred against the Government in the minds of people who would naturally feel that they were so helpless before this Government that the only thing they could do was to go to jail. Would it not naturally create, in these circumstances, although you may restrain yourself and not proceed to violence, in your mind, a certain feeling against the authority with regard to whom you have to take this action of inviting suffering on yourself?

It is totally contrary to my 30 years' experience. I myself, and all those who have been associated with me, have not by reason of suffering been filled, at least, with any greater ill will than is professed to be, but I know of scores of instances in which they have got rid of the ill will, because this is a doctrine in which you get rid of that kind of passion and ill will in the quickest manner possible. See what is happening today in South Africa after the close of such a bitter struggle causing the suffering of innocent men. The Governors and the Indians have gone on the best of terms and even when they were labouring under very serious disabilities at the time of the War, the Indians offered their services absolutely voluntarily and there you had no recruitment or anything of that kind. It was all optional, and those who cared to go did so and they served under the very gentle men who, in their opinion, had subjected them to the greatest hardship; and General Smuts, when he returned, was the recipient of an address from the people who voluntarily voted that address to him, and whom he had, in their estimation, oppressed during the passive resistance struggle.

Then when the Rowlatt Bills were passed, you decided to present the satyagraha doctrine to the country?

Yes.

And you wanted the masses to be satyagrahis in that sense?

To take part in the movement without pledging themselves to the satyagraha vow.

True, they may or may not take the vow, but you wanted them to be satyagrahis in spirit, to follow the doctrines of the satyagraha movement?

That part of the movement not devoted to civil disobedience, that is to say, I would warn them and invite them to take part in meetings to be organized, but I would not invite them to take part in the civil breach of the laws, and I would not make them to force others who do not wish to take part.

You never intended that the masses should take part in the civil disobedience

part of the movement?

Unless they definitely took the pledge. I would then take the masses also with me.

But you did want them to follow the satyagraha doctrine?

Certainly. You may perhaps recall I framed another statement of pledge to be signed by all after this violence which omitted mention of civil resistance but simply mentioned the following of truth at all costs and asking others also to do that. I omitted from that even the taking of self-suffering.

By whom was this statement to be signed?

It was a pledge to be signed by a large number of people who are not in my circle and who are not civil resisters.

Your idea is this that the masses or a large number of people should not be asked to subscribe to civil disobedience?

I do not say that. I simply say that, in opposition of the violent movement, I issued another pledge which was intended to be signed by everybody who cared to do so, which simply bound him to observe the truth in all his dealings and not to inflict violence, i.e., to omit civil disobedience and, therefore, the inviting of suffering.

Because you considered civil disobedience in consequence of the suffering following on that, to be not quite suited to the ordinary masses?

No. I had suspended the movement at the time and yet I wanted to place something before the country. Naturally, a leader would sometimes emphasize one part of his propaganda and sometimes another. At this time when I saw that the civil disobedience part was misunderstood by the people, I suspended that, but I wanted to emphasize the principle a part of it the non-violence part of it, and so I eliminated civil disobedience, not because it was unsuited to the masses, but because it was unsuited to the season, in other words, it was not in season to preach it.

Because of your experience of the occurrences that took place in April, you came to the conclusion that civil disobedience propaganda was unsuited to the occasion?

For that season, I have not come to any such conclusion as you postulate.

I do not suggest that but you came to the conclusion that looking to the circumstances then existing satyagraha was unsuited?

Yes.

And therefore you suspended it?

Yes.

And you came to that conclusion because the events showed you that the people had not really understood what you meant by civil [dis]obedience?

Yes.

And they had thereby misled themselves?

Yes.

When you first decided about civil disobedience I suppose it was in connection with the Rowlatt Act?

No, when the pledge was first signed, the whole thing was contemplated at the very first sitting in Ahmedabad at the Ashram.

The disobedience of the Rowlatt Act as well as other laws?

Yes.

You see, I just want to correct my impression.

Yes, many have really thought that the other laws came in after. That is not so.

If I remember aright, Mrs. Besant first took the vow?

Well, there are two versions to it. She took the vow and she did not. I was told that she had really taken the vow in *toto* less the Committee clause. She did not want to be dominated by a committee. As you have now seen it was a question of limitation, but she misunderstood that.

Was it not like this, viz., that she pointed out that it was not possible to disobey the Rowlatt Act, unless you brought yourself under the provisions of the Act by becoming a seditionist or an anarchist?

I remember to have read it in the papers, but that was previous to the telegram and conversation of hers, so far as I recollect.

She did point that out?

Of course, there she misread the law, but she did say that.

What I want to be clear about is whether it was on her pointing out what I have stated that the determination was arrived at to disobey other laws?

Not at all. It was some days at least after the pledge was published that Mrs. Besant wrote what you have stated. Mrs. Besant knew nothing of the pledge then at the time it was signed at Ahmedabad.

I simply want to know whether my recollection is correct. She pointed out that the very nature of the Act did not lend itself to such disobedience, but as regards

disobedience of any other laws, she refused to join that because she said that it would lead to chaos?

Yes, I know she advanced that argument and she refuted the movement so far as it related to the disobedience of other laws, but I do not know on what grounds ultimately she refused to join the movement.

The ground was put forward by her in her paper?

Certainly, she wrote an article to that effect in her *New India*.

That is, that disobedience of laws in that manner must inevitably lead to chaos?

Yes.

Now with regard to civil disobedience of various laws, was the idea underlying it thus to a certain extent, that if you disobeyed various laws the result would be to embarrass the Government or to make ordered Government impossible, that Government would be obliged to yield to the demand of the people with regard to the Rowlatt Bill and, thus, would be effected what you yourself described as bending the Government to the will of the people? Was that the idea underlying it?

It is not embarrassment of the Government, but the idea is the exercise of your right to withdraw your co-operation from Government that has forfeited all confidence and esteem, and it will all depend upon the measure of forfeiture of confidence.

Take this particular case we are dealing with ≈ the Rowlatt Act. By the passing of the Rowlatt Act, did you and your co-workers come to the conclusion that in doing that the Government had so acted that they had forfeited their confidence and, therefore, all claim for co-operation?

Oh, no. Not at all.

I want to be clear.

The determining consideration was that the Rowlatt Act itself would not lend itself to active disobedience from moment to moment and, therefore, if we want to impress ourselves upon the Government, we must stick to some other channel and we did so by actively breaking other laws which did not involve moral turpitude.

Now, if you actually break other laws, would you grant that it would make, in a certain measure, ordered Government impossible?

I would not say that. Ordered Government would not be impossible in the case of totally inoffensive people. Naturally we have to assume that condition to be in existence with the people.

The laws that you determined to be disobeyed were laws that were obeyed by

you and other people all these years?

Yes.

When they were enacted, they were not considered by you to be so outrageous that you should not obey them. Then, determining now to disobey the laws which you had all these years obeyed, would it not look as if meant to make Government impossible?

It would, if it covered a wide area. I would make Government impossible if I found that Government had taken leave of its senses entirely.

On that 10th April, Mr. Gandhi, you were not in Ahmedabad?

No.

You were on your way to Bombay.

On my way back to Bombay.

When did you arrive in Bombay?

On the 11th.

On the 9th you were arrested at Palwal and you sent a message?

Before I was arrested I had dictated the message¹.

Are you aware that on the 10th in Ahmedabad a meeting was held where your message was read?

Yes.

In that message you had exhorted the people not to commit violence?

Yes.

And that message was, I understand, explained to the meeting?

Yes.

That was a very big meeting in Ahmedabad?

So I have heard.

In spite of that exhortation of yours, which was communicated to the people not to commit violence, the mob burst out into violence on the 11th?

Yes.

Doesn't it show, Mr. Gandhi, that it is very difficult to make the ordinary masses, as they are, grasp this theory of no violence and suffering on oneself?

I admit the difficulty of it certainly.

It is very difficult for them to practise that, i.e., no violence and suffering on

¹ This was annexed to "Statement to Disorders Inquiry Committee", 5-1-1920. For the text of the message, *vide* "Message to Countrymen", 9-4-1919.

oneself?

After having been used to methods of violence, one does find it difficult to exercise self-restraint.

In the circumstances, as they are at present, it is very difficult to practise abstinence from violence in that manner?

Certainly.

The other part is easy for them to grasp, viz. that they are to oppose certain legislation or to oppose Government in enforcing that legislation. That is a thing which the ordinary mind very easily grasps?

I think you are right; but I do not think that I have found it easy to explain to the people and make them understand that it was very difficult to oppose unjust laws. On the contrary, it has cost me considerable energy and industry before I have been able to drive the truth home.

What I mean is if you tell the people that the Rowlatt Act is an unjust Act, or some other Act is an unjust Act, and we must oppose that, that is a suggestion which the ordinary mind will easily grasp and follow?

Certainly.

Coupled with that, if you tell them that they should oppose that but abstain from violence, that part is very difficult, as they are constituted at present to grasp and follow?

Certainly.

Then you arrived in Ahmedabad on the 12th?

On the 13th.

You explained to the President what you meant by the statement you are reported to have made that this was organized by educated people. You have told us that you meant by that that there was no general conspiracy, but it was organized on the 10th, and that the people who organized it were people who could read and write. You do not mean the better educated classes had any hand in it?

No.

When you say that this was organized by some one, have you any evidence in support of that statement?

Yes; I have evidence in support of that statement.

I think you are not prepared to place that either before the authorities or before this Committee?

I am not prepared to give the names of the informants.

I do not want the names of the informants. But the informants must have given

you certain facts or certain materials which led you to conclude that this was organized on the 10th. Have you any objection to place those materials before the Committee?

I do not know what you mean by material, but I have no objection to describing the nature of the things that were done on the 10th or whenever the thing was suggested to the crowds as to how they should act in the matter. There were some people who suggested to them the burning of the *chowkies*¹ and some people suggested how to do it.

Let us go step by step. As regards such information as you are prepared to give about the organization of the 10th, was there any meeting held on the 10th where they were told to do this?

I have no evidence of any meeting held in any house or anything of that kind, but I have evidence of people who were themselves told what to do.

Was that on the 10th?

I am not able to tax my memory to that extent, but if I said to Mr. Chatfield it was on the 10th, it is the 10th.

I want to be quite clear about this. We have been told that on the 11th people on the spot were told to do various things. That is different from their being told deliberately on the night previous to do certain things?

Yes. I understand the distinction. As to the 11th, it is also equally true.

Let us first take the evening of the 10th. Have you got any information in proof of your statement?

I have.

On the 10th some people, whoever they were, went about telling people to work out a programme, which they had thought out. Is that so?

Perhaps I would not put it so strongly, I would put it this way, because this is what was impressed upon my mind at the time. I was told that during that night there were people who said, "You are fools, this is what you should do and this is how you should do the thing." What the whole conversation was I am unable to reproduce today, because I took no notes. On the whole the conversation which was described to me came to this that it was suggested to those who were about them that this is what they should do.

¹ Police posts

Did individuals go about on the night of the 10th for this purpose?

I would not even put it so strongly as that, because I have no evidence, but they seized the opportunity which offered itself to them.

The opportunity was on the 10th?

Supposing I was in my shop for instance and I saw people gathering round me, naturally on a day like that there would be a discussion and there would be crowds of people discussing as to how these things should be done or what was to be done. Somebody would say, "Don't you know what should be done? This is how things have been done and you ought to do this." I want to say, also that there was no destruction of life suggested by anybody so far as I know, but there was certainly destruction of property suggested.

Then this must have been done during the day on the 10th and the night of the 10th?

I do not know about the day on the 10th. I do know about the evening of the 10th but I have more abundant and clear proof about the 11th.

We are coming to the 11th presently. Let us confine attention to the 10th now. On the evening of the 10th, say it happened in this way, that people congregated somewhere near shops or in some other place and somebody told them, "Now, this is how you ought to proceed." That would be only when people by accident came there and when a man got an opportunity. Such an accident in that manner would not occur ordinarily in the evening or the night. It may happen during the day?

I do not know.

If it happened in the evening or on the night, it must be more organized in that people deliberately went about telling people what to do?

I would not be surprised if that were also true that some people might have deliberately gone about from place to place. I can certainly imagine the possibility of such a thing, but I have not got evidence to the effect that some people actually went about from place to place, but I have with me unimpeachable testimony that some people actually incited the people to this kind of violence.

On the 10th?

Yes.

You are the best judge of what you call unimpeachable evidence. Is it any evidence on which ordinary human beings in ordinary life can base their conclusions?

I think so. I have not employed any extraordinary method of reasoning before I accepted it. On the contrary I think that I would act with the greatest caution before I would accept any such testimony.

Were the people who gave you the information people who actually heard that or saw that done or did they hear it from somebody?

I have the testimony of those deluded people who were told this thing, and I have the testimony of some who did know also.

People who heard this being said?

Who were told themselves to do the thing and I have the testimony of some who themselves did it also.

Was this on a large scale or in an isolated manner?

It is difficult to say whether it was on a large scale. In a way I am prepared to say that it was on a large scale. Certainly there were isolated cases. These men did not busy themselves to that extent, that they made it a point to go about from end to end, but they certainly seized the opportunity of the temper of the people and put this idea into their minds. That is the real meaning of what I am saying.

What you say is really that the people burst out on your arrest on the 10th?

Yes.

They had no plan before that at all?

They had no plan before that.

Some persons saw that the crowds were excited in that manner and they took hold of that opportunity and misled them or diverted them into these actions?

I have not the shadow of a doubt about that.

And for that you say you have got direct evidence?

I have direct evidence.

Of people who saw that being done or who themselves had done it?

Yes.

I take it that your principles forbid you from giving that information to the authorities or to the Committee?

I could not give the names of the people who have done so, just as if I was acting as counsel for these people. My principles and law also would forbid that, and I occupy with them a position unfortunately more sacred than that of a counsel. I had people coming to me who wanted to surrender the swords that they had got from the Swami Narayan Temple, but unfortunately they had not the courage and the pluck to do so.

You have evidence before you that on the 11th some people led the mobs or suggested to them what to do?

I have no evidence as to people leading the mobs, but I have evidence again equally strong, perhaps stronger than the evidence with reference to the 10th, that youngsters and youths rebuked those who were idle and who would not go and assist in the work of destruction.

You have also definite information as to who those people were?

I cannot say that I have definite information, but I have had the names. I do not know them; I may have seen them, but I would not be able to identify them, that is to say, the people who said so. I do not know that at this distance of time I could even identify my informants.

You cannot identify your informants?

I cannot. One man was not saying this to me. For instance, a party from a village came to me and I said, "Hullo, this is what you have done and that is how you have understood my mission." They begged pardon of me. This is what happened on the morning of the 14th. They said they were exceedingly sorry but I would not find them doing the same thing again. I asked them to describe how they did it; then they described. If you ask me to identify them, I would not be able to do so, because I do not know them by names; I have not seen them either for any length of time, whereas I can identify some of my informants certainly.

The informants with regard to the 10th, you can identify?

With regard to the 11th, more clearly, but I think I can identify some with reference to the 10th also.

You say that some villagers came to you?

Quite a number.

And you rebuked them for having acted in that manner?

I simply took them to task. I asked them, "Why didn't you interfere? Why did you allow these things to happen under your very nose?"

Then they said that they were instigated or were asked by others?

No. They said, "Prem." That was the exact word. They said, "Our love for you made us do this thing." Then I asked them to describe how they did it; then they described.

So far as you have described, it only comes to this, that they said they had done it and nobody asked them to do it?

I have given you three illustrations. One, of those men who knew the thing, but who were not themselves told to do the thing, another party who saw these things being done, the inciting and the act, whilst they themselves were mere spectators, and the third class of people who themselves were actors but not the incitors. I have not got any testimony or any confession from the instigators themselves.

There may not be confession by the instigators. But if you rebuked certain people for having done certain things, they would naturally shoulder responsibility on somebody else by saying, "True, I did it, but somebody else asked me to do it."

They may do that, but I think I should be able to discriminate between that and a true thing.

You formed your own conclusions?

That is all I can say.

You still adhere to them?

I do and as I am gaining experience, day after day, it confirms me in that conclusion.

I understood that with regard to the Kaira disturbances and the derailments, there also you had certain information?

Yes.

Was that in your view an organized movement?

It was not organized, and it was done certainly by a definite party of people some of whom were really drunkards. They went to the station. Whether they went to the station with that intention or not, I have no clear evidence but having reached the station they said, "Let us do this thing."

It was not organized in the sense that the people of the town were behind it?

No; on the contrary, it is my conviction that, if the people in the town had come to know of any such thing, they would have gone and turned these men away. I may be mistaken, but that is my view and my view is based on the testimony of those for whom I entertain a very high regard. I do not think they will willingly deceive me.

About those people who were reported to you as having taken part in the derailment, they have never been prosecuted?

Whether they have been prosecuted or some others I do not know, because I do not know the names.

Then when these disturbances occurred, Mr. Gandhi, you suspended your satyagraha propaganda, so far as civil disobedience was concerned. That was on the 18th April?

Yes.

When you issued that notice, you realized, I think, that civil disobedience as a mass movement under the existing circumstances was not advisable?

Under those circumstances, it was not opportune at the time. I could not restrain the violence of the mob.

In the circumstances then existing you realized that it was not advisable that this movement should proceed as a mass movement?

Yes.

Then at that stage you merely suspended and you notified, if I remember correctly, that you proposed to resume it some time in July?

On the 1st of July.

Have you got the notice that you issued on that occasion?

I have, but I do not have it in my possession just now. But Mr. Justice Rankin had it.

Then you thought in two months people will come up to the standard and Government military arrangements would be complete?

I said that. That is the letter.

Then you suspended it till July in the hope that before that time, the masses would be educated as regards the correct principles of satyagraha and there would be no danger then to resume civil disobedience movement?

That is correct as a partial statement. What I felt was that if I suspended the thing for two months, I shall be able to overtake the misinterpretation and misunderstanding about it, and I shall be able to make the position much more clear than I had done or had been able to do before the people and Government.

I will come to the Government in a minute. I want to understand first this. When you suspended it you believed that the people had not fully understood your propaganda or creed and that they were not yet fit to exercise satyagraha, and certainly its offshoot of civil disobedience in the real manner in which you desired and you believed that they would be fit to do so within two months?

I did not believe they would be fit to do so within two months.

I want the actual expression used.

(Reads) "I am sorry that when I embarked upon a mass movement, I under-rated 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 Viramgam, I am convinced that satyagraha had nothing to do with the

violence of the mob, and that many swarmed round the banner of mischief largely because of their affection for Anasuyabai 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 Viramgam 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 satyagrahis has acted as a check, ever so light, upon the previously existing lawless elements. As regards the 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 indentured Indians had struck work.¹ This was a satyagraha strike and, therefore, entirely peaceful and voluntary. Whilst the strike was going on, the strike of the European miners and railway employees, etc., was declared.”

Take that portion where you refer to the reason for suspending it for two months.

I am coming to that.

“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 the 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 and 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 the 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.

¹ This was in October 1913.

“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* the 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 Herculean 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 the Government effective co-operation in restoring order, and by preaching and practice to gain adherence to the fundamental principles mentioned above.”¹

“ ‘When is satyagraha going to be resumed,’ is the question many have asked me. There are two answers. One is that satyagraha has not at all ceased as long as we practise truth and ask others to do so, so long satyagraha can never be said to have ceased. And if all practise truth and refrain from violence to person and property, we would get all we want. When all are not prepared to do so, we have to devise other methods. One such method is civil disobedience. I have already explained the reason why this civil disobedience has been for the time being suspended. As long as we know that there is every likelihood bordering on certainty to rioting and violence following civil disobedience, so long disobedience of laws cannot be regarded as civil disobedience but is disobedience that is thoughtless, uncivil and devoid of truth. Satyagrahis may never commit such disobedience. My confidence in satyagrahis has led me to say that we shall be fitted to resume civil disobedience in about two months if the Rowlatt legislation is not withdrawn in the meantime. We may resume by the beginning of July next. In provisionally fixing this period, I am guided by the following considerations: One of them is that we shall have by that time spread our message throughout the country, namely, that during the tenure of civil disobedience, no one under the cover of

¹ Vide “Press Statement on Suspension of Civil Disobedience”, 18-4-1919

Satyagraha, under a pretence to help it, should resort to violence, and it may be hoped that the people, convinced that the true interests of the country will be served by acting in accordance with the message of peace, will materially contribute towards India's progress, but it is possible that India may not understand satyagraha to this extent. In that case, there is one more way to help the non-recurrence of violence. Though the condition upon which it is based is humiliating, it is open to a satyagrahi to avail himself of this advantage. Now it becomes their duty to resume satyagraha under such conditions. The military dispositions that are now going on will ensure non-recurrence of violence. The recent outbreaks were so sudden that the Government were not prepared to cope with them; but the Government arrangements are likely to be effected in two months and breach of public peace will be well-nigh impossible, and therefore conscious or unconscious of the past, the satyagrahi, under that state of things, may without fear of any disturbance commit civil disobedience and thereby demonstrate that not violence but satyagraha alone can help us to secure justice.”¹

Then you hoped that within two months' time people would be fitted for the proper civil disobedience campaign. Has that hope been fulfilled?

Personally I consider that the hope would have been fulfilled if I had resumed satyagraha at the moment. I made that altogether bold experiment on the 17th October. In fact, it has not been fulfilled. If all people become quite fitted to practise satyagraha doctrines ≈ pardon me, I have not said that in my letter. What I have said is that we shall have the passive help of the people; they will not egg others to violence and will not do violence themselves.

If I heard you correctly, you used the words “fitted in two months, they would practise satyagraha”?

I have described here the sense in which ‘fitted’ is used. Fitted, because the people will have received the message, and they will be passive sympathizers with the movement along with the movement to go forward.

In the first part, you explained that people did not realize the real inwardness of your creed and therefore civil disobedience got associated with violence, and therefore you came to the conclusion that it was imperative in the interests of the country, of law and order, that it should be suspended?

¹ *Vide* “Satyagraha Leaflet No. 12”, 2-5-1919

Questions have been asked when it is going to be resumed. Then you say you would be able to resume it on the 1st July. In giving the reasons, you say "within that time people would become fitted".

By receiving the message of satyagraha.

You mean by that time people would realize the real inwardness of satyagraha and would be able to practise civil disobedience.

I won't expect the people to realize the inwardness of satyagraha but I would expect the people to realize that it is better for them to join the movement again, at least to refrain from disturbing the movement.

That is far different from saying "that I expect the people to be fitted, etc."

That is the meaning conveyed by the word 'fitted'. I would ask you to accept my interpretation of it. I think you will find it here; if not that is the interpretation.

Then you go on to express the apprehension that people may not get so fitted in the manner you have explained now, in which event also there will be no harm in restarting civil disobedience because the military dispositions by that time would have been so completely organized that any violence would be effectively dealt with; and therefore you advocate it, the restarting of civil disobedience, even if people did not quite get fitted in the sense you mean?

Certainly.

Just see what that means. The military dispositions should be kept in all parts of the country or certainly in some parts of the country in order that some people may have the pleasure of breaking certain laws and violence may not result? Does it not involve that?

Not the interpretation warranted by this letter. I have not meant that. I simply say that I see the dispositions going on and I have every right to seize the opportunity.

If you will kindly read it again. You give two reasons, two circumstances on which you hope to start the movement again on the 1st of July. One is your hope that people would get fitted and therefore the chance of violence would be avoided. Secondly, even if they were not so fit and even if they were as before prone to go to violence, still the military dispositions now taking place in the country would be so complete within the two months that, even if people not fitted in that manner resorted in the old way to violence, there would be no great harm done to law and order because the military dispositions were there?

That is totally different from my wishing the military dispositions in order.

That is the meaning of what you say. I did not say you wished?

Then you are correct.

Whether you wish it or not, you say in fact, the military dispositions would be so completed in two months that you can then, even though the people were not quite fitted, without apprehension of disorder, restart civil disobedience because no great harm or violence will be done as the military is there to cope with it.

Certainly I meant that.

I ask you to follow me, and to see what that means. That involves that assuming that the people have not got so fitted within the two months, Government must maintain these military disposition in various parts of the country in order that some people who have taken the vow - only some people - could have the pleasure of breaking some laws. Going further, it involves that in order that these few people who have taken this vow might be able to break the laws, certain laws, without any serious consequences to society, these military dispositions must be maintained at a considerable cost which must be paid for by the large masses of innocent people who have nothing to do with that. It must result in that?

That will be the result if the man who pretended to be a satyagrahi had really said good-bye to his senses. It could not otherwise result.

You yourself apprehended that it is possible that within two months men cannot be got so fitted as to avoid violence. Even then passive civil disobedience will be started, or ought to be started, on the 1st July, because, even though people may be minded to do violence, they will be prevented from doing so because of the effective military dispositions?

Quite right. I am taking advantage there of a circumstance that is happening before me irrespective of what I may do. But I think it will obviate the necessity of asking questions on this score if I am making the position clear. As a satyagrahi I would never say I would not be guilty of doing any such thing, that in order that I may go with a handful of men breaking laws, the Government may impose a military force on the country. Then I would understand that the atmosphere had not been prepared for the reception of the doctrine and I must not do so.

I take it so far then you modified what you said?

I did so. I did not start the campaign as I had expected to on the 1st July, much to the disappointment of my co-workers who were with me in this letter of the 2nd May, only because the Governor-General and the Governor of Bombay felt that I had not sufficient data before me and this was how it was put to me: "Do you want India to be an

armed camp?" I said, "No". "Then if you do not want India to be an armed camp, won't you suspend the satyagraha?" On this I suspended [it].

That shows that you on the representation that were made to you, modified the position you took up in this manifesto?

Certainly I postponed the time.

You would start civil disobedience only when you are satisfied that the people have got so fitted that it would not result in violence?

Or otherwise some other circumstance presents itself to me which has fulfilled the propagation of that doctrine.

But that you would not start if the people do not become fitted, and if violence could only be prevented by military organisation?

Military organization got for the purpose.

You say with regard to the events in Ahmedabad on the 10th and 11th, that the action of the mob was no doubt unjustifiable and indefensible, but you speak of an unpardonable error of judgment on the part of the Government. Would you specify the acts of Government you characterize in that way?

I said that it was an unpardonable error of judgment on the part of the Government in having arrested me. That is what I am referring to. I am not thinking of any errors committed here. I have heard about cause being given to the mob by those two gentlemen I forgot their names I did not consider that in any way justified the mob in taking the law into their own hands.

You do not attribute any error of judgment to the actual measures taken in Ahmedabad?

I won't go so far as to say that. I am not prepared to say that there was an error of judgment. I have not troubled myself to find out what was true. Having made up my mind to consider that not even any excess by the people is pardonable, it was no part of my duty to put the thing in the scales. I am not prepared to say whether there was an error or no error.

I understand you to complain of the method of compensation, of recoveries made for the destruction of property?

From the labourers.

Do I understand you to say that the levy was made about the time of the Moharram, somewhere in September or October?

Yes.

Is it a fact that the labourers then on work whose eight days' wages were

confiscated, a good number of them, were people who had not been in Ahmedabad in April at all?

Absolutely new men who had come from the villages later and who did not belong to the city of Ahmedabad and who were not in the city of Ahmedabad when these events occurred, and who newly joined the mills, came from other places outside Ahmedabad.

And you consider that very wrong \approx that these wages should be confiscated for events which occurred at that time?

Not only that, I want to add to the fact, which I can prove even today, that a large number of men, when this kind of campaign went on, simply went out of Ahmedabad, taking no part. They are also made to pay.

With regard to this it can be said that the residents of Ahmedabad, those who belonged to the mill population, are responsible for the excess though individually they might not be, but with regard to those who came afterwards there was no semblance of excuse of that kind. That is your complaint? What is the other complaint with regard to the mill labourers?

The other complaint is that the manner of collection was so wholly bad, as also the amount. I think it was the distribution *per capita*. The mill labourers could ill afford to pay a week's wage. That was how it was calculated. I saw no calculation.

I do not follow you.

That it was a week's wages in each case. It was first of all not fixing the amount I am speaking under correction. It was *per capita* of the whole city of Ahmedabad. That was bad, that a labourer should pay individually precisely the same as the mill-owner himself. Have I made myself understood?

If I understand you aright, it is the incidence of the amount that you talk of, that the labourers as the richer classes had to pay the same amount? Is that really so? In addition to this, the income-tax people have been made to pay?

Yes; I am speaking under correction, but my impression as it was then left on mind was that. I am quite prepared to study the thing and submit my reason on the score. But all I wanted to submit before the Committee was, that the fine imposed on the labourers was excessive and as you have pointed out was exacted from many of those here who were not here at the time and the time chosen for exacting the fine was most inopportune. And there I wish to say that the authorities are not to blame for selecting that time. They did not select that time, because it was Moharram time; it accidentally happened

to be so. It was too late for them to make any alteration, but whatever it was, it was difficult for the labourers to understand that it was not deliberately chosen. So the time was inopportune and to take away a week's wage from the labourers was not a proper thing.

It was very heavy?

I did feel it.

Do you object to the exemptions as they were given?

I won't say anything about exemptions. I am not prepared to dispute the discretion vested in the authorities with reference to that. I am not prepared to say I have not seen any such glaring injustice in that. It would perhaps not be quite fair if I do not put my testimony to the handsomest manner in which the present Collector of Ahmedabad had dealt with anything that has gone before him and wherever he has committed errors of judgment that have appeared to me to be errors, they have been partly explained, and so it goes against my course to complain even of this tax upon the labourers, but as it so happened unfortunately, it was their misfortune; but he in the most gentlemanly manner possible took the whole of the blame, if it was blameworthy, on his shoulders. This was what he said: "It is my act; I must take the sole responsibility." But I, as a citizen, am here to say that, having definite information from the responsible men, he thought that that was the only manner in which he can make the collection from the labourers and that would be the proper sum to exact from.

By the Hon'ble Pandit Jagat Narayan:

You have been asked certain questions about the Rowlatt legislation. Will you permit me to ask one or two more? You have said that you had no objection to the Government putting down anarchical crime. It is the duty of the Government to do so. Then you were asked what were your objections to the Rowlatt Bill and you have given certain reasons. I would like to know whether Rowlatt Bill No. II did not create a new crime at all or was only a procedure?

The Rowlatt Bill No. I did create a new crime. No. II concerns itself with the trial of anarchical crimes. That is how I heard it put. As a matter of fact, these anarchical crimes could have been punished by the ordinary law of the land and they were so punished. It was only during the 3 years of the War that by special legislation the Defence of India Act was passed.

And you thought that during the time of the War, though the whole nation showed its loyalty, it had been passed. When after the War was finished this procedure might be adopted for normal times. So, practically, your objection was not to the

punishment of anarchical crimes but it was that the fundamental principles of justice as administered in every civilized country were departed from in this legislation.

With regard to the second point, you have mentioned to the Committee, and I have also gathered from your speeches, that during the last eight or ten years they had also similar safeguards.

Then as regards Bill No. II. What is your position?

I have certainly regarded the safeguards provided in this Rowlatt Bill to be not merely illusory but as dangerous traps. That is my impression of the safeguards provided for in the Rowlatt Act. Really I feel that it makes the executive still more responsible because it deludes itself into the belief that they are safeguarding the subjects whereas there are really no safeguards. That is my opinion.

As you are the fountain-head of the satyagraha movement I will ask you one or two more questions. I will deal only with the political aspect of the satyagraha movement. You will agree with me that every political movement for its success depends upon the number of its followers?

Every political movement.

I am only dealing here with the political aspect of the satyagraha movement.

Depends for its success on the number of its followers, yes.

Therefore [for] that portion of the satyagraha movement which dealt with political matters, the natural idea would be to get as many followers as possible?

Yes.

And the underlying idea of having a large number of followers is that, if a certain thing be done not by one person or two persons but be done by a large number of persons, the Government will be attracted?

I won't agree with you there.

I will take the example of a strike. Do I understand you as saying that, supposing only one or two persons strike, will that have any effect? Or for the purpose of having an effective result is it not necessary for a large number of people to strike?

I do not subscribe to that doctrine. When you are engaged in a political movement which is based on the strictest principles of morality, any single isolated good act has its consequence, no matter whether it is done by the humblest or the highest; that is my deliberate conviction.

I do not dispute that. You have stated here that your idea was to accomplish everything by spiritual force, or soul-force; that was the underlying idea. But in order to achieve any political object, it is necessary to have the force of numbers?

That is to say if you will ask me to say 'yes' to a non-moral political movement, yes, but not to a movement which is emphatically moral and goes on to the political platform because it must.

So far as the moral aspect of it is concerned, I understand that follows the truth. Assuming this, you would depend for the success of your movement on a very large following? If the soul-force of one man accomplishes a thing in two months, probably the soul-force of 10,000 persons would accomplish it in ten days?

You cannot have an arithmetical calculation for a force like that. It is not like the question of an ordinary soldier, that if one man can shoot ten, then ten men will be able to shoot 100.

Anyhow 100 men, if they are of the same quality, will be able to shoot more than ten.

Imagine that ten satyagrahis with the same power behind them are working, then certainly they will be able to produce better results than one.

Having regard to the constitution of our Government here or in England, I think you will agree with me that there is no use fighting shy of the word "embarrassment" because the word has been used and you said so?

Not at all.

You will agree with me that any agitation, the most loyal and constitutional agitation, if it is against something done by authority, is bound to embarrass the authorities. Therefore in your satyagraha agitation, it may be that you are fighting with soul-force, but one consequence is that you do embarrass the Government and you do not fight shy of that?

It is no question of fighting shy; when I was trying to dispute the use of the word embarrassment I meant that that was not the intention. I think the intention is a definite ingredient in determining the value of the embarrassment.

You do not say that any political agitation should not embarrass the Government?

No, I do not say that for one moment.

But it must be conducted, according to you, with truth and no violence?

But I would like to emphasize the distinction that ordinary political agitation starts with the definite intention of embarrassing the Government. The satyagraha agitation never starts with the intention of embarrassing anybody, but if embarrassment is the result, it faces it.

Therefore the embarrassment would be the result either of soul-force or the result of numbers, is it not so?

What I say is a satyagrahi would not shirk that issue, but would never want to embarrass.

But taking that example of a strike. I have not much experience of strikes, but I have a little. Do you think any strike has ever succeeded in which one or two persons who are against mill-owners say they will not work? Has that ever succeeded?

Oh yes, I can show you scores of instances, and I think any mill-owner will come here and say that, if the head man who controls a department strikes, it is quite enough to bend the mill-owner.

There again there is that force of numbers behind his back. I quite understand that, if a Gandhi strikes and goes to jail, it may cause a stir in the whole country, but supposing a common man, even a man who is not going to have recourse to violence, a man who is going to follow truth, a common man, says he will not pay taxes, a poor man, and he goes to jail, do you mean to say the Viceroy, the Governor-General or the King-Emperor would hear of what had happened?

I can certainly lay my hands on many a Viceroy of India who, if he found that there was a man whom he would value purely for his strictest morality, honesty and truth, would not sacrifice that man, and if that man struck he would consider that he would rather have a million men strike than that one man.

You will agree with that hardly one in a million will be such a man as will come to the notice of the Viceroy or the King-Emperor?

I do not know that. I think a man who is strictly moral and who is working on a field which is touched by a Viceroy, would certainly make his impression, as did, I think Keshub Chunder Sen when Lord William Bentinck was Viceroy.

You are again talking of the highest men India has produced?

I cannot help that. It must be the desire of every citizen that India should multiply top men.

SIR C.H. SETALVAD: Panditji forgets that Mr. Gandhi by fasting for three days brought the mill-owners to their knees.

I am sorry, I am humiliated by the fact of my having brought the mill-owners down by my fast.¹

A man who is loved like you or a person like Anasuyaben, supposing they are arrested again, do you mean to say that during the last four or five months you have so much prepared the people of Ahmedabad and Bombay that if they hear of your arrest, there will be no unrest?

¹ Vide "Address to Ashram Inmates", 18-3-1918.

There will be unrest enough. I think both Anasuyaben and I would be seriously disappointed if there was no unrest, but that unrest would take a different shape altogether.

That is your opinion, that that unrest would take the form of mourning and fasting and would not take the form of violence?

I am not able to say that with confidence, but I really do expect that we have very nearly reached that stage.

And certainly I think you will agree with me that, having regard to the percentage of education so far as India is concerned, it is very difficult to expect that illiterate men who love you will be able to control their passions and look upon things in that philosophic light?

Not at all, it is not that class of education which you have in mind which I need for the propagation of satyagraha.

In course of time you may prepare them for that; I am talking of the present time.

I would not say the propagation of the satyagraha doctrine is more difficult here because of our illiteracy. Illiteracy I hold to be deplorable in common with all our countrymen, but I do not consider that illiteracy is a bar to the propagation of satyagraha. If I fear any danger, I fear that danger from the half-lettered men.

I will give up the word illiterate. Do you say it is very easy to control a city which contains more than 300,000 inhabitants and Bombay city which contains more than 1,200,000 inhabitants? Supposing all these people were to revere and love you and respect you, will they stand and look upon your arrest from a philosophical point of view?

I have admitted the difficulty of the task, but I dispute the impossibility of it, nor do I consider it is so difficult that it is well-nigh impossible. I consider that it is difficult but it is not at all insurmountable.

Then I take it that hartal is not an essential part of the satyagraha movement at all?

It is no integral part of it.

And, therefore, so far as hartal is concerned, it is not necessary for the propagation of the satyagraha movement to order a hartal every second day or every month?

Not at all.

And having regard to the experience that we have had, it is probable that the satyagraha movement will continue without a hartal?

If it is necessary. I have contemplated a hartal and, in order that I might try it in connection with Mr. Horniman, I ordered it and in connection with the Khilafat movement, and on both occasions we were wholly successful, although there was a hartal on an extensive scale and of its type absolutely complete in so many places in India.

I may be wrong in my facts, but am I right in supposing that the success of your movement in Africa depended on large bodies of persons going to jail?

Yes, or rather because they did not use any violence.

And at the same time very large numbers of them went to jail?

Certainly.

You did not get what you wanted because a handful of them went to jail?

Well, when we had got what we wanted, there were not that large number of men in jail as you imagine. I do not dispute the point that the largeness of the number of people going to jail had its due effect. Of course, the South African statesmen can speak with better authority, but my own impression is that it was the correctness of the movement which really gained adherents in the highest ranks of society in South Africa. We were after all a handful who would have been blotted out of existence if we had deviated by a hair's breadth from the correct path.

I do not know if you agree with me that the largeness of the number was a great factor in the success?

I would say it had its due weight.

Now with regard to one other matter you have touched upon, I want to make it clear, because I find you have mentioned that fact in one of your Madras speeches. One of your objects in starting the satyagraha movement was that you found in India there was an extremist class, a certain class bent upon violence and anarchy, and your object was to give this class of persons a better platform to work on, a more spiritual and more moral platform?

Certainly.

A question was put to you by Sir C.H. Setalvad, and as I don't agree with him, I want to have your opinion. Supposing individuals be prepared to disobey any law according to their own lights, I do not understand how that can possibly cause any embarrassment to anybody. Supposing I live in a municipality and I find a tax that has been imposed is not a good tax and if in the following of that truth I am required to go to jail, I do not think I require any moral training. If a man is required to go to jail according to the dictates of his conscience, he does not require any moral training. I think he is the best possible man for being a citizen. Do you agree with me

that the mere fact of different individuals breaking different laws in different parts and going to jail cannot possibly embarrass Government unless and until it is a mass movement?

That is so.

It would not create any hopeless position at all?

No, certainly, but I won't say that it would create a hopeless situation if there was a mass movement.

What I mean to say is that I do not see any difficulty; I think that is the highest principle that can be inculcated and I think, if I have judged your speeches aright, that one of the underlying ideas of the satyagraha movement was that you found that one of the besetting sins of the present-day Indians is that, owing to their long slavery, they cannot stand up for the right, and they servilely do things which are against their own conscience and I have seen it stated you wanted them to become more straightforward and more moral. You make a difference between a straightforward man and a man who only for the pleasure of breaking laws breaks them?

I think that is obvious.

I think that is your principle?

I would draw a sharp distinction between lawlessness and assertiveness.

You have been accused of inconsistency and I will put that before you and I want your explanation. It appears that you made a statement to the officials that you did not want to drag the mill-hands into this movement?

Yes.

And at the same time, in one of your speeches, you have said the mill-hands should come to your meetings, but they should first obtain the permission of the mill-owners, and from this the inference is drawn that here is Mr. Gandhi who in one breath says he does not want to drag the mill-hands into this movement and in the next breath he incites them to come to his meetings and become satyagrahis?

I should like to see the passages. I can recall two occasions. There was an occasion when I said I did not want the mill-hands to join this movement at all.

And on the second occasion you said they should not come to the meetings until they got permission?

True, and as a matter of fact, between these two positions I see no inconsistency whatsoever, because I was anxious that the mill-hands should not come to us holus-bolus; I said no mill-hand. The instructions given to the secretaries of the Satyagraha Sabha were that

they were not to take in a single mill-hand on the satyagraha pledge unless he was seen by me or better still, by Anasuyaben because she would know, she would guarantee that that man understood the position, and he would be able to do so.

Then there is another matter about your helping the authorities with evidence. Your objection is to disclose the names?

That is so.

And you had no other objection in helping the authorities for the procuring of evidence. I find here, as a matter of fact, that you went to certain people who were in jail?

I did.

And you exhorted them to confess their guilt?

Not only that, I very nearly succeeded but for two mishaps. I would have completely succeeded in getting every one of the wire-cutters to make a confession. But I saw them together with Mr. Ker. It was nearly 11 o'clock at night, and his assistant was also present, and the men said if they were sent under escort or somehow among the people, they would get the real men, and if some of them themselves had done the thing, they would say so.

And, therefore, you did propose that they should make a clean breast of it and help the authorities?

I went much further than that in trying to do that. I wanted to go to Nadiad to finish the work, but an equally important matter in connection with helping the authorities engaged me and kept me in Bombay. Meanwhile, some proceedings were taken here, and a third attempt was made when I really did not succeed because of the sections under which they were tried. The men were so frightened that they would not listen to me when I suggested that they should make a confession. Of course I did not see them directly then, but Mr. Vallabhbhai Patel, a co-worker of mine, tried. He took the message from me, he saw the men in person but he did not succeed.

I think you will agree with me that if respect for law is diminished in the mass mind, that would be a hopeless position, however good, bad or indifferent the laws may be?

I won't say that respect for law and order means respect for such law and order that promotes the well-being of a nation; but that presupposes discrimination on the part of the people. People will become lawless; they have become lawless for ages past. In that

question what I had to address myself to was whether they should continue to become lawless in the manner in which they have been, that is, either surreptitiously breaking a law and if arrested putting up any kind of defence, or resorting to secret violence or open violence, none of which things can possibly promote the well-being of a community.

My point is, having regard to the circumstances, a sort of sanctity attaches to the laws of the Government of the time being?

Not in my estimation.

I do not mean that philosophers look upon things in this way?

I look upon it as a practical man.

That is not the best check on the masses?

Not a blind adherence to laws, no check whatsoever. It is because either they blindly adhere or they blindly commit violence. Either event is undesirable.

So long as every individual is not fit to judge for himself, he would have to follow somebody?

Certainly, he would have to follow somebody. The masses will have to choose their leaders most decidedly.

Supposing your own ministers pass any law, would it be open to anybody and everybody to break them?

Will it be open to the masses? I think it will be more open to the masses when India has her own ministers, because whilst English ministers have at least the benefit of ignorance on their side, unintentionally, our own ministers will have absolutely no such excuse.

Is not the remedy to turn those ministers out and not to break the laws?

I have known in most democratic countries ministers who have made themselves irremovable somehow or other. In that event what is a poor respectable minority to do? That minority will certainly bring down the tallest minister by offering stubborn civil resistance, and such a position I do anticipate happening in India also.

I am troubling you but I do not understand. Supposing your own minister, your own representative Government, passes a law, that is a guarantee that it is a good law, and do you mean to say that under your satyagraha principles it is open to any body of men to preach the breaking of those laws and to break those laws? The remedy is to turn out those ministers?

A satyagrahi would exhaust all means possible, but I simply gave you a concrete instance of a minister under a democracy having made himself practically irremovable because he would not listen to those who have got the voice of conscience in them. What are those people who have got that voice within them then, to do; although it is their own domestic affair of their Government, even so it would be not only open but it would be the duty of a body of satyagrahis to offer civil disobedience, but when they can turn out the minister, naturally let them do so. If I could have turned out Lord Chelmsford, I would have said, "Lord Chelmsford, you go if you do not remove the Rowlatt Act," and I would have got some other Viceroy from England.

I hope you are not going to give evidence in Bombay.

The Committee has two functions here, I do not know. I have no evidence to give in Bombay.

I wanted to ask you one thing about Bombay which you witnessed yourself.

Certainly everything about Bombay, or if the Committee wishes to travel outside Bombay, I am at the Committee's disposal.

I know as a matter of fact you are not keeping very good health?

I am not keeping very good health just now.

During the last two or three years?

During the last two years.

And at different times you were in so indifferent health that you were not able to read even your address?

Yes.

And you asked other people to read your address?

Yes.

And you were not shamming?

I hope so.

You were at Bombay when some of these things were going on at Bombay?

Yes, I was there.

And you wanted to address a meeting?

Yes.

On what date?

On the 6th I addressed several meetings.

Any subsequent to that?

I addressed a meeting on the 11th on my return from Delhi.

And you got the sanction of the authorities there?

Oh, yes.

But the military or the police were in possession of the streets and you could not pass without a permit being obtained?

No, I do not think the military or the police were in possession of the streets.

The streets through which you had a pass?

No, the crowd gathered at Chowpati.

I am talking of Pydhownie.

Oh, yes, they were there.

And when your motor passed that street you had the sanction of the authorities to pass?

No, I did not receive any sanction. I simply went there as there was danger of violence breaking out. Messages came to me immediately I reached my house and I sent some friends informing the crowd that I was free and that did not answer, and I think Mr. Hansraj came and asked me to go there, otherwise the crowd would not be pacified.

Did you succeed in pacifying the crowd?

I think the crowd was pacified enough.

If it be said the attempt was futile?

I do not think it would be correct to say my attempt to control the crowd was futile. The crowd was insistent on passing the street; their passage was prevented by the military or the police whosoever these officials were, and I was in front in the car with Anasuyaben, and I was reasoning with the people who were within the reach of my voice asking them to go by the lane that the officials had pointed out, and they were turning. Meanwhile, the police had ceased resisting and a portion of the crowd was making way in the direction also because the police had ceased to resist, but I do not mean to imply therefore that the police had ceased to resist because they wanted to, but I think they felt the pressure of the crowd so much that they ceased to resist, when suddenly there was a dash from the cavalry or the horsemen.

Here it is said that Mr. Gandhi was held up, the crowd was extremely angry, and the police officer, seeing the cavalry in possession, used his discretion and allowed him to pass?

Allowed me to pass? I do not know what they did; I certainly passed. The motor did not stop for a single minute.

And when the cavalry saw the excited crowd, they charged on the crowd?

They charged upon the crowd but they charged at the point I have mentioned.

Did you complain of this charge to anybody?

Yes.

In your opinion was that charge justifiable?

My own opinion as an onlooker is, they could have avoided the charge. It was not necessary for them to make the charge because the crowd was turning in the other direction.

Even your life was in danger and you had to leave your motor-car?

No.

Here it is said: "It is interesting to note that while Gandhi has regularly adopted the pose of the interesting invalid when addressing meetings, the officer in command of the armed police reports that he showed wonderful agility and nimbleness in escaping from his car when the cavalry were charging."

Anyhow, that is untrue.

You have deposed to the evidence of which you were in possession about this organization on the evening of the 10th, and also about the firing that took place under the Martial Law orders, and you said that, in your opinion, certain innocent persons were wounded or shot down. May I take it that according to you both these facts are equally reliable?

I think so.

You also believe that evidence in the same way as you believe the evidence with regard to the conspiracy and organization?

I do believe so.

You make no difference between the two sets of circumstances?

No.

By Sardar Sahibzada Sultan Ahmed Khan:

I want to ask you a few questions, Mr. Gandhi. Now going back for a moment to the Rowlatt legislation, you are no doubt aware that, before the War, there were a great many anarchical crimes in India?

I would not subscribe to the statement that there were a great many anarchical crimes in India.

There were at any rate dacoities and murders in Bengal by people who were not afraid of Government. There was a bomb thrown on the Viceroy at Delhi?

Certainly.

There were a great many trials held in Bengal?

Certainly.

And it was due to these occurrences and to keep law and order a Commission was appointed consisting of three eminent judges presided over by Mr. Justice Rowlatt?

Yes.

They went into the question very carefully and after a very careful investigation of the whole case, they submitted a report to the Government, and in that report, I understand, they made certain recommendations for a certain kind of legislation. I heard you to say that you did not agree with the conclusions of that report?

I said that.

What are your grounds for not agreeing with that legislation?

Because the facts that have been marshalled in the Rowlatt Committee's report did not irresistibly lead me to the conclusion that any such legislation was at all necessary. On the contrary, upon those facts I would have written a report totally contrary to the Rowlatt report. That was the impression left on my mind.

But you do not deny that, so far as the information in the hands of the Government was concerned, it is a fact that serious crime was happening in the country?

No more serious than in any other country, and certainly there is no serious crime in India. This anarchy proper has been confined to Bengal. You have had an outburst here and there, but after all Bengal is not India.

Anarchy and crime prevailed very largely in Bengal?

I would not underrate the significance of it. It was there and serious enough to warrant strong Government measures. I do not deny that at all. But at the time the Rowlatt Committee framed its report and took evidence, I venture to submit that the material before that Committee did not warrant the conclusions. I may be totally wrong in that, but the Rowlatt Committee's report is tainted with one very serious defect, in that it is evidence which was taken practically in secret and it was all official evidence.

Assuming for argument's sake that the facts as marshalled by the Rowlatt Committee did not warrant the report which they made, you say that the conditions in Bengal were such as made the adoption of such strong measures necessary, and you

admit, independent of the report, such strong measures were necessary?

I admit that.

What measures would you suggest that Government should have adopted to meet the situation?

But the Government have actually adopted measures which I do not approve of entirely. I simply say that the Government would be entitled, and it would be its duty, to adopt strong measures to root out crime of that nature. In answer to the question what measures should be adopted by the Government, I can only say, not the Rowlatt Act of course, it is not for me to suggest that measures Government should adopt ≈ but if I were to point out what measures Government should adopt, then all the measures that I would be capable of suggesting would be of a reformatory character and not of a repressive character, whereas the Government measures were all of a repressive character.

You will surely agree that, in the existing state of human nature, Government who are responsible for keeping law and order are compelled, however much it may be against their wishes, to adopt repressive legislation?

Certainly. Therefore I can only say, constituted as I am, that I am prepared to examine any measures that the Government may submit and criticize. But it is not possible for me to say what measures Government should adopt because my mind would immediately work at reforming the criminal and not at punishing the criminal. If I had to frame a legislative measure, it would be of that character, but I would not deny the right of a Government to adopt repressive measures also.

When you admit the right of Government to adopt strong measures and you criticize the particular measures that Government have adopted, surely I am entitled to ask what repressive legislation in your opinion Government should have undertaken to meet the circumstances?

It is very difficult for me to answer that. I can only give a negative answer, certainly not the Rowlatt Act, and I would give my reasons for it. The Viceroy has got sufficient powers independently of the Rowlatt legislation not to warrant his disfiguring the statute-book with an enactment of such nature. Anybody reading such a law, if he had never lived in India and had opened the statute-book and read the Rowlatt legislation, the irresistible conclusion that would be left on his mind would be that India must be a country simply infested with anarchy. I do not for one moment believe that India is a country which is infested with anarchy. Therefore, I believe that the powers the

Viceroy has got are absolutely ample in order to stamp out anarchy, and if the Viceroy does not use those powers and takes other powers, I think he is wrong. He has got powers of emergency legislation, and I think that that is the proper thing to do.

By ordinances you mean?

Yes, and I think he would be justified in doing so, and I shall give my reasons for it, because I have discussed it thoroughly and given many an anxious night to the thing as to why it was that a man with the cool head of Lord Chelmsford had run into the trap. He has got this emergency legislation power; he could use those powers and he could use those powers without the slightest hesitation and need not go to the legislature. He takes a responsible step and he should justify his step subsequently to the legislature or to the country or to the public opinion such as it is today in the country and not anticipate events and put a law on the ordinary statute-book of the country. I think that there the executive went much further than was warranted by the facts.

I have not had the benefit of reading the Rowlatt Act, but I suppose it is merely an enabling statute, i.e., by passing it the Government of India have not necessarily brought it into operation. It can only be brought into operation if the Governor-General-in-Council thinks it necessary?

Except that part of it.

The Governor-General certifies that the law has to be extended to a certain area, but don't think that it is a sufficient safeguard?

I do not think for one moment that it is so, knowing so well as I do the manner in which these sanctions are given. The origin of the sanction makes it really a tainted sanction. The origin would be through a humble police officer, or not even an officer, but a humble policeman. He goes and tells his superior, 'Oh, such and such things are happening here.' Now the police goes into the thing deeply, he would examine the things through the spectacles of the policeman who gave him the information. Then after that the original taint in it travels upward till at last it goes to the Viceroy. With all this ceremonial sanctity of an investigation which is so tainted, I say it is wrong, and therefore the Viceroy should not have taken the power ordinarily to declare those things. If he wants to make himself responsible, then let him be the author of the legislation, and not the legislature.

Do I understand you correctly that in such important matters, because a thing

has originated from a policeman, that will be taken up by all the officials above him right through to the Viceroy without they themselves minutely scrutinizing the thing based on the light of their own experience and knowledge whether the representation is worth giving attention to or not?

I do not say that it is not possible to manage things in any other manner. In a Government constituted as ours is, that is the only possible step to take, but knowing that, I would not arm the executive with powers so deadly in connection with a crime which is not endemic in India. If anarchy had become endemic throughout the length and breadth of India, I would not probably have said much against the Rowlatt legislation; then I would condescend to examine the details. Today I would not condescend to examine the legislation and even to talk of it because I consider that the principle itself is at bottom unsound. In ordinary affairs I can understand it, but not when it is a matter of simply dealing with a whole community because that is what the powers mean; anybody may be commanded and called upon to lodge security.

You know that during the War under the Defence of India Act there were a great many people who were interned as a necessary measure of safety and that after signing the peace, I suppose *ipso facto*, after a lapse of six months those people must come out. Then the question would certainly arise as to how the Government should deal with people of a dangerous character. Would you not approve of the Government having a certain weapon in their hands to deal with the situation that might be created any moment?

I respectfully contend that the Government have such a weapon. They have it already in the powers granted to the Viceroy to pass ordinances. The Defence of India Act cannot really be used, in my humble opinion, as a stepping-stone to legislation of the Rowlatt Act type in times of peace. It was pre-eminently a war measure, and what you would allow in war time you would certainly not allow in times of peace.

But the legislation is merely an enabling measure and it is also limited to three years?

I understand that, but I cannot contemplate with equanimity a whole people being condemned even for three years.

Now I want to know what was the object of starting the satyagraha movement? Was it started with a view to bring about a better political condition or as a means to oppose the immoral legislation which is not approved of by the country. What was the necessity for it?

The necessity lay in the intense desire to have that legislation repealed. If you fail to get redress through the ordinary channels of petition and so on, you must examine whether there are other ways open to you extraordinary, still not unconstitutional, and I found that this was the only way to combat the mischief and the evil.

Could you not do it by constitutional means?

I fail to discover any other less¹ effective constitutional means. It has been suggested to me by a very great friend that I should have at least promoted a petition and awaited an answer to the petition to the House of Commons before embarking upon it. I beg to differ from him, and I still hold that while it was open to me to do it constitutionally, it would have been totally ineffective. I could not have secured a repeal of the Rowlatt Act by those means.

Why?

Because of my political experience. A petition after its having gone through all the stages in India, I have not known to have succeeded.

Therefore you think that the only means open to you was the satyagraha movement?

The only other honourable means open to me was that. Certainly.

If I heard you correctly you said you feared half literacy more than illiteracy. Did I hear you correctly?

That was quite right.

I would like to know the reasons for holding that view?

Because I have noticed travelling throughout India that youths with ill-digested education are far more irresponsible and thoughtless than the illiterate masses. I think that the illiterate masses are much better balanced than the half-educated youths of the country, and I believe that if the latter could be reclaimed from the error into which they have today fallen the problem before India could become infinitely simpler than it is today.

Whom would you call half-educated men?

Take a boy who has passed to the High School and has a little knowledge of English, a still less knowledge of English history. He reads newspapers which he only half understands and feeds on his own predilections instead of checking them. Such a man is far more

¹ This should perhaps be "more".

dangerous to the peace and well-being of India than the totally illiterate masses.

How would you meet the situation?

I have been trying to meet the situation, and I flatter myself with the belief that I have attained success which I had not anticipated in that direction.

In what way?

Because even such men, when you appeal to them, tax your patience more than illiterate people, but if you are patient enough with them, they are certainly amenable to reason and control also.

Do I understand you correctly to say that those people who go through High Schools are patient enough to receive further teaching but that they tax your patience when you try to put them on the right path?

I think the very foundation of the educational system today in India is so unsound that it does not tend to make a man balanced after he has even finished his education. As a matter of fact we have not so many highly educated Indians as to be able to form universal conclusions, and so I do not dread to lay down any definite conclusions about that, because I have got sufficient data, a large number of men to work with and work upon, and so I have come to the conclusion that our educational system is rotten to the core and requires overhauling.

I want to know the big defects of that educational system.

The one defect is, that there is no real moral or religious education in the schools. The second defect is that, seeing that the medium of instruction is English which places such a strain upon the intellectual resources of the youths who are reviving the education, they really do not assimilate the noblest ideas that are imparted to them through the schools. They have got nothing but parrot's training, the very best of them.

What would you substitute? In your view the medium of instruction should be the vernacular and religious teaching should be introduced?

I think these two defects must be remedied and then there is the personal element; the personal touch on the part of the teachers is also lacking. A better class of teachers with much better traditions than are in vogue today is required. These three things will certainly bring about the needful change.

Do I understand it correctly that the satyagraha movement is concerned

principally or mainly with the inculcation of truth and high morality without regard to the number of people who will follow it?

Certainly, that is the idea.

The essence of the thing is in itself, apart from the number?

It does not matter whether there are two members or one member.

Has this movement also spread to the Punjab?

I think it has spread to the Punjab as a leaven. I cannot lay my hands upon any who has signed the satyagraha pledge, but I have come to the conclusion that the Punjab is just as capable of receiving and responding to the doctrine as any other part of India, if not perhaps more so; but there I may be mistaken, but certainly the Punjab is just as receptive as any other part of India.

By Mr. Kemp, Counsel to the Government of Bombay:

I am not trying your patience, Mr. Gandhi, by asking many questions about the satyagraha movement. I do not mean by that I am convinced at all by what you have said. Now I am afraid that on the view you take of the Rowlatt Committee's recommendations, we do not see eye to eye. There are two points which I must ask you to explain. One is this: you say that the Martial Law order of the 12th was absolutely unjustifiable. With regard to that, do you know the circumstances under which it was brought about?

I was not here on the 12th but I heard about it.

Yes, you were not here on the 12th, but you came here on the 13th. On the night of the 12th, you may take it from me, this is what happened. The person who was in charge of the military command decided, taking all things into consideration, that things could not go on very well. The mobs could not be held in hand, anywhere else riots might break out, and he and his men then available would not be able to cope with them properly. He therefore passed orders which in the result were successful. What have you to say first with regard to that?

I would not like to say anything, because as I said, when I spoke about it as an outsider it did not appeal to me, the necessity of it did not appeal to me, and certainly not the terms of the orders that were issued.

As an outsider, you mean?

As an outsider, as a non-military man; naturally I would concede a great deal to the authorities who have got to deal with the situation.

Supposing you and I were there on the spot in charge of the military, would

you consider that order justifiable?

I consider it fair enough giving my opinion for what it is worth, always with the caution that I concede that the military would be the better judges of the situation, but if I may be permitted to give my judgement after examining the circumstances and the facts; I say these facts do not warrant the orders that were issued.

By these facts, do you mean the facts that you have elicited from information as against the facts which were present in the military commander's mind?

I do not say that against the facts, but from what I have now heard and also from what little I have read, it leads me to the conclusion that certainly on those facts if I had any military training I would not issue those orders.

I see we do not see eye to eye there also?

I am afraid, not there.

There is only one other point. Mr. Gandhi, with regard to the instances of indiscriminate and wanton firing on the 12th under this order.

I have not used all those adjectives, but I simply said.

I think what you said was that a number of innocent people were fired upon?

That I said.

You base that on what?

On the evidence of those people who came to me hot from the thing.

Who were wounded?

I say wounded people also. I went over to the hostel, and I saw every one of the wounded people.

Just consider what impulse would there be at the back of these people's minds to make them tell you the truth as regards how their wounds were received. What was there to make these people tell you the absolute truth when you saw them wounded?

When he is speaking to me I would certainly consider that the most natural thing for him would be to tell me the unvarnished truth.

He could gain nothing by saying that he was in the right and he could gain something by saying he was not?

I know there is that point to be considered, but I have not gone in forming my conclusion upon the testimony of those who told me. I had the testimony of those who witnessed the firing, and I think I have a hazy recollection that I brought to the notice of Mr. Pratt one instance.

Do you remember that on the 14th of April you wrote to Mr. Chatfield and said that you had heard that one or two women were killed by the military and some men also? Will you please give me the pure facts, as I am myself anxious to know under what circumstances it had happened, or whether it did happen at all? Mr. Chatfield wrote back asking for any data and if possible for the people to come and tell him all about it.

Yes. I remember it.

Well now, Mr. Chatfield is still in the dark about this.

It was simply because we had not collected sufficient material to place before him and the orders were withdrawn by that time and I did not wish to prosecute it any further.

Could you have given any names of persons who were wounded?

Yes, if I had been so reminded then I could have done that.

But Mr. Chatfield asked you, did he not?

Yes, but when I saw that these orders were withdrawn I did not want to prosecute the thing any further, because I knew that, in a matter of that character there must have been a certain amount of accidents to look to and I did not want to go any further into the matter. Nor did I stay in Ahmedabad for any length of time after that.

On this point of your information, I just want to say to you that the suggestion that you made in various other evidences with regard to such organizations as there were on the 10th, was meant to correspond exactly with what you have told us. But I just like also to point out that the evidence on which you base that is rather different to the evidence on which you base these instances of being wounded without a just cause. For this reason that people who came and told you that they had organized little bits of riots would gain nothing but opprobrium from you. And people who came to you and said they had been wounded under that cause, could not run the risk of any opprobrium from you?

No.

So there is that distinction between the two classes of evidences. I think you based that statement.

It is not for me to value both classes of evidence differently. I mean to say a man would not come to me straight and appreciate a thing and describe the incident differently from what he had actually seen it.

I am afraid we cannot take it any further?

No, but I would really ask you and ask the Committee also not to feel the least of it that I wish to labour this point. I do not really

suggest that it is there placed by way of any complaint, but as I am bound to give my view I have simply given it.

There is this other point that you did not hear anything from the military side. If you knew the circumstances on the military side, then would you be able to find out whether they fired at anybody? A stray bullet might ricochet and go off at right angles and a man standing at right angles may be wounded. But the suggestion that that was the fault of the military is not quite fair, is it?

Not in the manner you put it.

Well, I think that is the manner it has got to be put.

The case I have brought to the notice of the Committee, and on which I have based my conclusion that these orders were obeyed, is that some of these young men actually shot into a party of men, whether 10 or 11 or even under 10, without any notice that would enable the people to understand what they were asked to do.

Well, as I say, you cannot give any instance that has really occurred?

Because I have no desire to labour that point. Otherwise I would come prepared and I have no desire to make a big thing out of a little thing in a large movement in which the Government have covered themselves with nothing but credit. I did not want to magnify that incident nor did I wish to trouble Mr. Chatfield any further about it.

TO PRESIDENT: There is only one point further with regard to this Bombay case. At present there is nobody actually appearing for this case as it was not known whether this was going to be taken and the result is that no one has been instructed to ask Mr. Gandhi questions on it.

PRESIDENT: Mr. Gandhi's evidence so far as it has been given does not amount to a great deal.

MR. KEMP: The only point he contended was that particular charge of cavalry was not justified.

PRESIDENT: I did not hear whether there were any casualties in that case?

There is no suggestion of casualties in that case. In the course of the demonstrations one or two men were trampled and that is natural if there was a charge of that character. I do not think there were any deaths and the injuries sustained even by the men who were trampled were by no means serious so far as I understood it. After the whole event had finished I went to Mr. Griffith's to protest against the cavalry being sent. And he really demurred to my using the word 'cavalry', but not being a military man I did not know what it was.

By Mr. Jivanlal V. Desai, Counsel to the Gujarat Sabha, Ahmedabad:

Mahatma Gandhiji, you left Bombay on the 8th of April?

Yes, in the evening.

When was the order served on you?

In the evening at 9 between Palwal and Muttra. That was the first order.

Not to enter the province of Punjab or Delhi, I think?

I forget which it was, I think it was Delhi.

Subsequent to that a second order was served upon you at the next station?

Two more orders at the next station.

At about what time?

Probably at half-past seven or 8 or even 9. It was between that time.

Then you dictated a message?

Yes, before reaching Palwal, after the first order was served and after knowing that I was to be arrested at Palwal.

And the gentleman who took down this message is a graduate in Arts and Law?¹

Yes.

There was no mistake in the message taken [down] by him?

No, because I had read the message.

You simply exhorted your Ashram people to hold that day as a day of rejoicing?

Not only they but everybody.

You did not want the Ashram people or passengers to observe the hartal? It seems that the words "with redoubled zeal" had been mentioned therein and had been interpreted in a different way?

There is nothing in my statement with regard to the hartal. But if you want to examine my mental condition, I did not want to say at that time that I wanted the hartal or not.

Could your message be construed in the light that people were to observe the hartal and to go about the streets creating mischief?

Most decidedly not.

Do you know that the message was never construed by the Ashram people or

¹ The reference is to Mahadev Desai.

by the Satyagraha Sabha as such?

So I was told. Mr. Vallabhbhai Patel told me emphatically that he told the people that they were not to have the hartal.

Now you were brought back to Bombay on the 11th?

Yes.

The train was stopped at Marine Lines station?

It was accidentally stopped and then I suggested to Mr. Bowring that I should get down at Marine Lines station in order to avoid any demonstration at Colaba.

And nobody in Bombay knew that you were going by that train?

No.

When you reached Marine Lines station were there no people to meet you there?

Naturally none.

And casually you got into a passing victoria?

No. A friend was passing by and he saw me and gave me a lift.

And you wanted to avoid all demonstration in Bombay as far as you could?

Yes.

And when you traced the disturbances you went to pacify the people?

Certainly.

When did you hear of the incidents at Ahmedabad, on the morning of the 12th?

I think for the first time on the morning of the 12th. A friend came and said that something had happened there. No, if I now recollect, I heard something from Mr. Griffith himself because he was discussing the situation with me and he said, "Do not know what is happening in Ahmedabad, but he could not give me the details because the wires were cut. But he did let me have an inkling that there was something amiss in Ahmedabad.

As soon as you heard that you were wanted there you came down?

Yes, by the first available train.

Were there any citizens to meet you at the station?

I do not think there were any friends. Mr. Boyd¹ was there and some other officer whose name I do not know.

Then from the station, you went to Mr. Ambalal's house?

¹ R.R. Boyd, Superintendent of Police, Ahmedabad

To the Commissioner straight.

And you stopped with him for about two hours, I suppose?

Probably.

And from Mr. Pratt you went to Ambalal's?

Yes, I think I went to him for a few minutes.

Were you accompanied by any military officers when you were coming back from there?

Yes, purely for my protection.

Because of the existence of Martial Law?

Because of the pickets that might challenge me.

You found everything quiet on the 13th?

Yes.

You wanted to hold a meeting on that day?

Yes.

And you had instructed Mr. Vallabhbhai Patel and others to organize a meeting if possible?

Yes.

But it could not be organized because of the existence of Martial Law?

Not purely. There were difficulties. It was suggested that there were such difficulties that we might not get a large gathering and without a large gathering I could not deliver my message.

So you directed them to arrange the meeting for the next day?

Yes.

And you did not know then that Martial Law would be withdrawn?

Certainly, I did not know.

On the 13th you gave instructions to Messrs Vallabhbhai Patel and others to show to the people a particular path of going to the Ashram to avoid the military pickets and to come by side-streets?

Yes.

At what time did you go to the Ashram on that day?

I think I must have reached there at 2 o'clock on the 13th.

Then among other non-official people, you met Messrs Vallabhbhai Patel and others?

Yes.

When you joined the meeting did any other people see you till you saw Mr. Vallabhbhai Patel?

No.

When did you deliver your speech?

Some time during the night.

Did you have many callers from the time you went to the Ashram?

Not on the 13th.

I think the statement that you made in your speech on the 13th is more or less an impression created upon your mind?

I think the speech puts it like that.

From the fact that certain particular wires were cut, and buildings burnt, it was the impression in your mind that there was some sort of organized attempt?

Yes.

Were there any particular statements made to you by any of the rioters?

I would not say they were made to me by any of the rioters on the 13th, but some endorsement of the view that I suggested was certainly forthcoming at that time. I said to myself, "This is what appears to have happened," and I discussed with those friends who called there and instead of disputing the proposition, they said, "Yes".

Was that an impression or was it knowledge?

I did not cross-examine them so as to know whether they were speaking out of their impression or knowledge. I would not be able to say that, but they certainly endorsed the views I expressed.

That may have been merely an impression also?

Yes.

You had a sort of conference on the morning of the 14th at the district court house with Mr. Pratt and Mr. Chatfield and the Officer Commanding. And it was resolved that what was known as Martial Law was to be withdrawn?

I was told that it would be.

And as a result of that only, the meeting in the Ashram in the afternoon was so well attended?

No, not because the orders were withdrawn.

Now you noticed that on the 6th the crowds that were going to your Ashram were very orderly?

I think absolutely orderly, and I think I saw the Rev. Mr. Gillespie there?

Yes. And your speech was read out by Mr. Vallabhbhai Patel because you were not in a fit condition of health?

My voice could not reach the audience at that time.

When did you have an interview with Mr. Chatfield? Was it before or after the meeting?

Before that on the 13th and on the 14th in the morning at about 9 o' clock.

When did you have an interview with Mr. Guider?

He honoured me with a visit some day after the meeting.

Your conversation at that honourable interview was all *bona fide*. There was no shamming on your part.

Certainly none on my part nor any on his part.

Mr. Guider says in his report of what happened at that interview that "the impression he gave me was that though he was prepared to denounce the rioters for his own benefit, that is to say, to swell the ranks of his followers, he had no intention of denouncing them to the authorities".

Well, I can only say that Mr. Guider has done (though unintentionally perhaps) violence to me.

THE PRESIDENT: That is, to your satyagraha doctrine?

Yes.

MR. DESAI: You told him that there were certain persons in the crowd inviting them actually to take part?

Doing what?

Certain men among the leaders who were the instigators of the riots or present among them.

But I have a distinct recollection that I told Mr. Guider that the leaders were there trying to restrain the mob. That is my impression.

After this meeting of the 14th you addressed several other meetings through your *Devas* in the streets?

Yes.

And you wrote out your speeches and got them read by several of the audience in the city and that had a pacifying effect on the minds of the people?

Yes.

And that was from the 11th till again the meetings were prohibited?

Yes.

And what we might call the so-called educated people of Ahmedabad, did they take any active part in the propaganda work?

Some of them.

Now you have been for a fairly long time in Ahmedabad, for 5 years. What is your estimate about the educated people of Ahmedabad? Do they take part in such riotous movements, burning buildings and cutting wires at Ahmedabad?

I have not found them to be doing that.

Of course, they might be intent upon menacing Government by making speeches and criticizing the Rowlatt Bill and such legislations. Apart from that you found them to be a quiet sort of people?

Yes.

Now you know there was some trouble between the mill-hands and mill-owners in 1918?

I suppose it was in 1918.

And large crowds of these mill-hands used to assemble day after day and you used to preach to them sermons, and Anasuya Bai and others did likewise.

Yes.

During all these days thousands of mill-hands met and they were very orderly even till the very last when the question of wages was a disquieting factor. They took part in large processions through the city and the crowds were always very orderly, and the mill-hands were well behaved and orderly?

Certainly. I found them so.

Now did you tell Mr. Chatfield or give him any reason to think that you told him that the Home Rule League either in Ahmedabad or up-country had made any organizations for these troubles on the 11th?

I do not think that I did say so. I should be very much surprised indeed if he did say so.

You have come into contact with the Home Rule League agitation in the provinces?

Yes.

There is also a constant agitation among the people?

Yes.

Do you know that the satyagraha movement against the Rowlatt Act had a rather pacifying effect on the people?

It is my deliberate conviction that but for satyagraha, India would have witnessed scenes perhaps more terrible than it has passed through.

Evidence before Disorders Inquiry Committee Vol. II, pp. 107-32

160. LETTER TO THE PRESS¹

SABARMATI,
January 10, 1920

TO
THE EDITOR
THE [BOMBAY] CHRONICLE
[BOMBAY]
SIR,

Mr. Andrews cabling from Mombasa says :

Full draft proposed ordinance menacing Indian political freedom reads thus:

“Firstly, the Bill may be cited as Removal of Undesirables Ordinance, 1919.

“Secondly, any person within East African Protectorate not being a native, who from information officially received is deemed by Governor-in-Council undesirable, may be ordered by Governor to remove himself from the Protectorate before the date prescribed in such order.

“Thirdly, any person contravening such order shall be liable on conviction to a fine up to Rs. 1,500 or to imprisonment of either description not exceeding six months or both together. Such conviction shall not affect Governor’s power to issue further order under preceding section against same person.”

Legislative Council meets January 19th. This ordinance entirely lacks safeguards against political misuse. Economic Commission’s volume of evidence contains no valid substantiation of Indian moral depravity. Our vindication of Indian character has carried conviction but European determination to follow south African policy still gravely serious.

Hardly any comment is necessary on this cablegram. There is a dead set against the Indian settler in East Africa. The proposed ordinance is, in my humble opinion, most mischievous in character and leaves every Indian at the mercy of an executive subservient to the interested European agitator against the Indian. The unscrupulous nature of the agitation is manifest from the utterly false charges flung about moral depravity against the Indian settler. I regard the proposed ordinance as the first definite legal step towards the reduction of the Indian to complete servility. He has dared to claim an equal status with the recently arrived European settler. He has dared to dispute the

¹ This was released to the Press generally and was published in *Young India*, 14-1-1920.

haughty position taken up by his European rival in trade. The latter has therefore captured the executive. The East African position admits of no compromise such as was possible and perhaps necessary in South Africa where the condition was totally different from the East African condition. The Indian adds the right of priority to the ordinary natural right to live on terms of equality with every other kind of settler in East Africa. And I venture to hope that his claim will be universally supported in India for the preservation of his full political and municipal status, and that the Government of India will exercise to the full its undoubted right and perform the duty of protecting the British Indian settler in East Africa.

Yours, etc.,

M. K. GANDHI

The Bombay Chronicle, 12-1-1920

161. THE CONGRESS

The last Congress having been held there, Amritsar became a place of pilgrimage. Thousands of people came to Amritsar solely because the Congress was held there, and the first thing they did on arrival was to visit Jallianwala Bagh. Hundreds of people who came to see me told me in reply to my questions: "Directly on our arrival, we visited Jallianwala Bagh." Many applied to their foreheads the dust of the place, as if it were sacred ash; many took away with them some earth made holy by the blood of innocent people. In this way everyone, from south, east and west, felt sanctified by paying homage to their dead brethren and believed that their purpose in coming to attend the Congress had been fulfilled.

In Amritsar, it usually rains in December. As the city is on a low level, the water collects on the ground when there is rain. As the rain started just with the commencement of the Congress session, there was much inconvenience.

The Congress *pandal*¹ and the tents for accommodating people were in Acheson Park, which, being on a low level, was flooded with water and it was a job putting up the visitors. The residents of Amritsar, however, treated the visitors as their own people. The Hindi

¹ Temporary canopied structure

word for this, *apanaya*¹ is a very apt one. If we render it into Gujarati, we should say *apanayya*. Those who could accommodate any of them in their homes, did so and treated them hospitably, and thus it seemed as if the delegates and the spectators had arrived on a condolence visit. This hospitality, besides, was no mere manners but was sincerely felt. There was no limit to the generosity of the residents.

This is one side of the picture, the beautiful one. Its other side was the expense of Rs. 22,000 incurred for putting up a *pandal* for the Congress and the tents. This expense was not unavoidable and I do not believe, either, that after all this expenditure, we gave anything special to the people. I think we can go on well enough without a *pandal*. If we hold the meeting in the open air instead of in a *pandal*, many more people can be accommodated and the expense will be less. The *pandal* protects us from the heat, but this in December is not severe. Moreover, one can protect oneself against the heat at less expense than required in putting up a *pandal*. I mentioned rain but that also is no excuse for it was because of the rain that the Congress session had to be postponed by a day. Erecting a roof for protection against rain would have cost still more.

And the same thing about the tents. Instead of incurring expense on them, arrangements for accommodation could have been made with the citizens from the very outset. But we cannot change the habit which we have formed from the beginning [of the congress] and so the Congress, though it is such a big national gathering, has not yet fully entered the life of the people. The fair in Amritsar on the first day of every *Vaishakh*² attracts many more people than the number attending the Congress, and yet they are all accommodated; no special arrangements have to be made for them and no heavy expenditure has to be incurred in advance. Such is our age-old way. It ensures grand results with little effort. With modern ways of working, we produce a small result after a big effort.

But why complain in this way when describing a happy occasion, someone may ask. I complain simply with the idea that, in future, we may make better arrangements. These thoughts have occurred to others as well and, in consequence, the All-India Congress has even appointed a Committee for the purpose. Its tasks are as under :

¹ Accepted as one of themselves

² Month in Indian calendar, roughly corresponding to April-May

1. To examine the Congress constitution and consider necessary changes in it.

2. To examine and consider the financial transactions of the different departments of the congress.

3. To make suggestions for the next year's session of the Congress.

Mr. Kelkar, Mr. Rangaswami Ayyangar, Mr. I.B. Sen, the Hon'ble Mr. Vithalbhai Patel and I have been appointed on this committee and it has been asked to submit its report before June 30.

I have yet another complaint to make. The speeches of the chairman of the Reception Committee and the congress President are generally so lengthy that it would be an infliction to read them out to anyone on any occasion; but it is nothing less than torture to read out long speeches to 15,000 persons. The speeches are bound to be lengthy. It is but natural that a detailed discussion of several topics should fill pages. What is the way out, then? I think both these speeches should be printed in Hindustani (in both Urdu and Devnagari script), in English and in the regional language of the province where the Congress is to be held and copies supplied to the delegates and the audience at the entrance gate. Later, both could read out, in half an hour, the main part of their speeches or explain their substance.

The speeches themselves were thought-provoking. That of Swami Shradhdhanandji was touched with his religious zeal. How can we hate the English? They gave us Andrews, Hume, Wedderburn and others. In this way, they have shown their goodwill for us. There was bitterness in Pandit Motilal's speech. He has seen the suffering of the Punjab, and has suffered in his soul. He let this be seen in his speech. Since the Swamiji's speech was in Hindi, people followed it very attentively, though some were bored towards the end. As Motilal's speech was read out in English, people were not prepared to hear him at all. It was all noise in the beginning but, thanks to Pandit Malaviya's persuasion, quiet was restored somewhat. Much of the speech had to be omitted in the reading.

RESOLUTIONS

The Congress resolutions were of great importance. The first offered thanks to the Emperor. There was discussion enough even on that resolution, but in the end it was passed. The liberal spirit noticeable in the Emperor's Proclamation was absent in the earlier

Proclamation. It is no small gain, we can see, that those who had been rotting [in jail] merely because of suspicion have been released. There may have been injustice in throwing them into jail, but doubtless there was generosity in releasing them. It was our duty, therefore, to express our thanks for this.

The most important resolution, however, was the one in which we admitted and condemned our lapses. It was a little difficult to understand the unwillingness to pass this. That in Ahmedabad, Viramgam, Amritsar, Gujranwala and Kasur, our own people set fire to buildings, killed people, burnt down bridges, removed rail tracks and cut wires needs no proof. Maybe there is truth in what some people say, that the C.I.D. instigated the mobs, that it had a hand in it; even then, the fact remains that some of us played into their hands and did unforgivable things. We must denounce these. The individual or nation that refuses to see his or its lapses or fears to admit them can never progress. So long as we refuse to see the evil around us, we do not acquire the strength to fight it and the evil goes deep. Moreover, we have no right whatsoever either to notice or condemn other people's faults so long as we do not roundly denounce our own. We cannot be purified unless we feel sorry for having set Government buildings on fire and atone for it; until then we have no right to condemn General Dyer's terrible crime and, if we fail to admit our faults, we dare not demand the dismissal of Sir Michael O'Dwyer and the recall of Lord Chelmsford.

It is also asked whether we should not take into account the nature of the provocation to the people. The answer to this is that, even so, we are bound to denounce our misdeeds such as setting fire to buildings and killing innocent people. That man alone wins who, whatever the cause, refuses to be provoked and such a one alone may be said to be a law-abiding man. The nation which does not know how to obey laws has no right to protest against injustice. The Government arrested me and the people were enraged; well, what did they gain by burning down police stations? How did they profit by setting fire to the students' examination *pandal*? The loss is obvious enough. We had to pay the fine, many went to jail, and many suffered the agonies of suspense. Personally, I am convinced that, had we not committed the mistakes we did on April 10, we would have made great advances by now and the Rowlatt Act would have long since been repealed. The

innocent persons, almost one thousand of them, who were killed at Jallianwala Bagh would not have been killed and other innocent persons would not have had to suffer in prison. Looking at the matter from any angle we choose, we can come to only one conclusion. It is that we were in duty bound to condemn the violence and arson committed by our people. If we tolerate such misdeeds when we become fully independent, we would show ourselves to be barbarians.

The third important resolution related to the Reforms Act. The differences on this resolution were so strong that the Congress came to the point of putting it to the vote in the open session. Without going into the whole story, it will be enough to understand the differences which had remained unresolved. There were three clauses in the resolution moved by Mr. Das. One of them stated that we were fit for swaraj this very day; the second that the Reforms were inadequate, unsatisfactory and disappointing, and the third that the Parliament should grant full independence as early as possible. The Hon'ble Pandit Malaviya, Mr. Jinnah and I felt that the nation would not know what it was to do if we said no more than this. If in fact we want to avail ourselves of the Reforms, they could not be described as disappointing; if we want to do so, we should frankly admit it. Likewise, if we admit that Mr. Montagu worked hard for India to secure the Reforms which have been granted, we ought to thank him. I saw that everyone wanted to work the Reforms. We should, therefore, admit this fact and delete the word "disappointing", and we should also thank Mr. Montagu. Ultimately, the adjective "disappointing" was retained and the amendment suggested by me, worded suitably so as to be acceptable to both sides, was passed unanimously. But prior to that, the preparations for the taking of votes were a great thing, a credit to the people of India. Including the spectators, there were no less than 15,000 men in the *pandal* and there was not even enough room to move about. Among all these people, there were as many who were not entitled to vote as those who were. Counting of votes, in these circumstances, would generally be considered impossible. This was the first time, therefore, in the 34 years of the life of the Congress, that excellent arrangements were made to do the counting after keeping out the spectators and the representatives of peasants. For practically five hours, speeches by people holding different opinions went on.

Meanwhile, all the parties came to the conclusion that it would be better to have a compromise and dispense with the taking of votes. Consultations began. Ultimately a compromise was reached and a resolution, thanking Mr. Montagu and advising the people to work the Reforms, was passed without a vote.

The wording of the resolution which Mr. Das's party agreed upon was not quite to my liking. Retaining the word "disappointing" was also a little hard; nevertheless, where the essence was maintained, I thought it advisable not to create divisions and Panditji, Mr. Jinnah and others agreed with me. Thus, the amendment was passed in a form acceptable to both the parties. Had the congress not accepted this amendment, it would have been, in my humble opinion, a matter of shame for us. Indeed, a person like me would have had nothing to say if we did not want to work the Reforms or had the courage to reject them. When it was agreed, however, that they should be worked, not to say this in public and not to thank the gentlemen who had been instrumental in our getting them seemed to me dishonest, and it also seemed disgraceful not to respond to sentiments expressed in the Emperor's Proclamation. To think of withholding co-operation with the officers because of fear is a sign of weakness. It bespeaks manliness to co-operate with them and trust them on all matters which advance the country's interests. Thus, from every point of view, we can say that the amendment accepted by the Congress is a good one and I am sure that, if we use all the provisions of the Reforms wisely and secure appropriate improvements in them, we should achieve full swaraj in no more than a few years.

Apart from this, resolutions were passed about Lord Chelmsford and other officers. It seems to me that it would have been better if the resolutions on Lord Chelmsford and Sir Michael O'Dwyer had been postponed till after the Congress Sub-committee's report was published. However, we have the right, on strong grounds, to demand the removal of any officer from his post and, therefore, though I believe that these two resolutions were passed prematurely, now that they have been passed there is no need to comment on them further. However, the speeches on the resolution for the recall of Lord Chelmsford were shameful and deserve condemnation. To regard Lord Chelmsford unfit for his post is one thing; but it is quite another to insult him and to use discourteous and unmannerly language about

the Emperor's representative. We shall lower ourselves in the estimation of others thereby and such language, if it became common among the people, would be a blot on the virtues of humanity, courtesy and magnanimity which still remain ours. I just do not believe that the nation can gain anything through exaggeration. Exaggeration is a particularly bad species of falsehood; even if the nation can advance through untruthfulness, it would be better for us to refuse to advance in such a manner because, ultimately, such advance will bring about our fall.

Besides these, the other resolutions which were passed to give a lead to the nation should be considered excellent. The Congress welcomed the current movement for swadeshi and has given a place in its programme to hand-spinning and hand-weaving. The All-India Congress Committee was requested to investigate the conditions of the peasants and a resolution was passed to support the Muslims on the Khilafat issue: similar other useful resolutions which were passed will help us forward and, if the nation implements them, good results cannot but follow. The country must be proud that Jallianwala Bagh has passed into its possession. The price of the Bagh will come to almost five lakhs of rupees and five lakhs more will be needed to erect a memorial column which, without expressing ill will or hostility to anyone, will remind us of the sacrifices, through death, of the innocent; will be a symbol of the people's grief and promote Hindu-Muslim unity, and thus convert the heap of refuse which today goes under the name of a garden into a garden indeed.¹ It is my hope that readers of *Navajivan* will play their part in this task and contribute to making the Jallianwala Bagh a place of pilgrimage for the Hindus, Muslims and people of all other religions, fully worthy of India.

[From Gujarati]

Navajivan, 11-1-1920

¹ A 45-foot high national memorial, depicting the "Flame of Liberty", now marks the site of the tragedy.

162. CHILD MORTALITY

We wish to draw the particular attention of readers to Mr. Kanchanlal Khandwala's letter about the relative figures of child mortality. In New Zealand, 51 children out of one thousand die in a year. In Bombay 320 and in the United Provinces 352. Whatever way we look at these figures, they make us shudder. There are quite strong reasons for this state of affairs but the causes are such as can be remedied and so deserve attention. Besides, the unfavourable factors continue to increase in number. Some of these factors are as follows:

(1) Climate, (2) diet, (3) child-marriage and ill-matched unions, (4) self-indulgence, (5) ignorance about sanitation and, now, (6) excessively high prices.

Of all these factors, the Government can be held responsible at present for the last one only; the reason for our making this distinction is that, for our innumerable ailments and shortcomings we blame the Government. It has become a habit with us to argue that, if we get swaraj, all our maladies, even the heavy rate of child mortality, will vanish instantly. It is true in a general way that starvation, which is becoming more widespread in the country, will probably decrease after we get swaraj. Even then, many of our ailments will persist, despite swaraj, if we do not adopt remedial measures. One such ailment is our present subject.

We cannot change climate of the country. New Zealand is among the countries with the best climate. Relatively, the climate in India is generally believed to be enervating. It is difficult to develop a good constitution in intense heat. It is the general experience that moist air is even more injurious than heat. Even so, God has given man such strength that, by and large, he succeeds in overcoming such obstacles. To a greater or less extent, all of us do. To the extent that the climate is among the unfavourable factors which militate against reduction in the rate of child mortality, we can take suitable measures to counteract the harmfulness of the climate. Our poverty is the greatest obstacle in this. Our ignorance about how children should be brought up is another obstacle of like magnitude.

The child does not always get the food it needs. The requirements of infant diet are easy to understand. The child should be brought up on mother's milk and, when it is no longer available, it

should get cow's milk. Instead, the child is switched on to cooked food even before it has cut teeth. It is fed on cereals even before its stomach is ready for them. Consequently, the child is attacked by diseases, grows weak and often dies an untimely death. Our poverty and ignorance are the main reasons for the unsuitable food [of our children].

An even more important reason than the two mentioned above is child-marriage and ill-matched unions. A girl of fifteen can never be fit for delivery. A child born of such a girl is deficient in vitality. Our children are so sickly that bringing them up becomes a veritable job indeed, with the result that many children die within a year of their birth. Along with child-marriage, we should hold ill-matched unions responsible for the deaths of a great many infants. It is not at all surprising that the children of men who marry when they are no longer fit for marriage do not survive.

It is also certain that excessive indulgence increases the rate of infant mortality. People in the West limit births, not with any religious idea, to be sure, but for reasons of health and for fear of having to bring up too many children. For us, such fear is not enough of a check on self-indulgence. However, we in India lay great claim to being more religious in our lives than people in the West, and yet we ignore the restraints imposed by religion. Hence it is that many parents, regardless of both dharma and worldly considerations, remain steeped in carnal pleasures and bring forth children regardless of circumstances. In the result, whether we want them or not, diseased children are born and die in their infancy.

The fifth reason is our colossal ignorance of the rules of health. Neither the mother nor the father knows anything about them. People who have knowledge are disinclined to profit by it or lack the means of doing so. The result is the same; infant deaths keep increasing. Often, an ignorant midwife becomes the cause of an infant's death. She has no notion of how a woman in confinement should be looked after. She does not make the mother observe even simple rules. Hence, from its very birth the infant is looked after miserably and succumbs. If it survives the first two months the mother, as ignorant as the midwife, brings it up as well as she knows how to and, though she may not kill it, harms its health all right.

The last reason is the excessively high prices, ever soaring higher. Because of the high prices, milk and ghee have become scarce. Where people need wheat in their diet, they do not get it either. Consequently, the mother's milk continues to deteriorate in quality day by day and, when it stops altogether, the baby has to go without good milk, or a sufficient quantity of it, though the mother may well be aware of its needs. During the cold days, sufficient clothing is not available. The comforts in the house are also inadequate. Thus, there are so many adverse circumstances that it is difficult to bring down the terrific rate of child mortality pointed out by Mr. Khandwala.

Even so, remedial measures must be taken. They are easy enough. If the education of the people is put on a sound footing, they will easily acquire some general knowledge about child care. Meanwhile, small booklets explaining rules of child care may be written in very simple language and circulated, and parents may be educated through lectures. Everyone can, with a little effort, save himself from moist air to some extent. The moisture within and round about the house can be removed by our own efforts. It should not be impossible to buy milk for the children, even by economizing in other matters, if need be. More than anything else, milk is a perfect food. Every man should exercise self-control in the matter of sex and have children only when he is fit for the purpose and capable of looking after them. Knowing, at least, that to bring forth children in such difficult times is a terrible violence, one needs to control one's desire. It is not at all difficult to understand the rules of sound health. The high cost of living is an evil for which, we believe, a remedy will somehow be found. If the people's income increases, the high prices would be easy to bear. We have no doubt, then, that either the prices will come down or people's income will increase. Our duty, all the same, is to take steps to bring down the prices. This, however, is quite a separate problem and a big one. We shall consider it some other time. We hope that every reader who is a public worker will take all the steps he can to reduce the rate of mortality among infants.

[From Gujarati]

Navajivan 11-1-1920

163. LETTER TO JUSTICE RANKIN

[SABARMATI ASHRAM,]
January 11, 1920

DEAR JUSTICE RANKIN,

Here are the extracts¹ I promised regarding my declarations in connection with civil disobedience. I regret to say that I have not been able to trace Swami Shraddhanandji's telegrams or his letters received just after the 30th March. If you consider them to be very material evidence in connection with any point I suppose you could get copies of the telegrams through the Telegraph Department and possibly a copy of Dr. Satyapal's letter through the C.I.D. in the Punjab. The Superintendent who took me to Bombay from Sawai Madhopur told me that he had seen Dr. Satyapal's letter to me.

Yours sincerely,

From a photostat of the pencilled draft in Mahadev Desai's hand:
S. N. 6988

164. LETTER TO SECRETARY, DISORDERS INQUIRY COMMITTEE

ASHRAM,
January 11, 1920

DEAR MR. WILLIAMSON,

It is my diffidence which has deterred me up to now from inviting Lord Hunter, other members of the Committee and the whole staff to visit the Ashram. Pandit Jagatnarayan and Sahebjada Sultan Ahmed Khan paid me the honour of a visit and I felt that in spite of my diffidence I should say to Lord Hunter and the other members of the Committee how pleased I would be to show them over the Ashram ground and tell them what it is. I know how hard pressed all of you are for time. Therefore I trust no one will feel bound to accept my invitation.² Will you please read this to Lord Hunter and the others for whom this is meant? No appointment need be made. I shall be at the

¹ These are not available.

² The Committee members visited the Ashram the next day.

Ashram up to half past two tomorrow, Monday. I have to keep an appointment at 3 o'clock in the city.

Yours sincerely,

From a photostat of the pencilled draft in Mahadev Desai's hand: S. N. 6988

*165. LETTER TO SECRETARY, DISORDERS
INQUIRY COMMITTEE*

ASHRAM,
January 11, 1920

DEAR MR. WILLIAMSON,

I must confess to you that the extract read to me by Pandit Jagatnarayan referring to myself in connection with the little occurrence in Bombay has not yet ceased to worry me.¹ I simply wish to say that if Lord Hunter wishes to examine me in Bombay on the events there, I would gladly run down to Bombay to give evidence.² I am certainly anxious to answer all allegations against me or the cause I have the honour to represent so that the latter may not suffer for want of effort on my part.

Yours sincerely,

From a photostat of the pencilled draft in Mahadev Desai's hand:
S. N. 6988

¹ In the course of Gandhiji's examination by the Committee on January 9, Pandit Jagat Narayan had confronted Gandhiji with an official report of what had happened on April 11 when Gandhiji was pacifying an angry crowd in Pydhonie, a Bombay locality. The report had stated *inter alia*: "It is interesting to note that while Gandhi has regularly adopted the pose of the interesting invalid when addressing meetings, the officer in command of the armed police reports that he showed wonderful agility and nimbleness in escaping from his car when the cavalry were charging." Gandhiji had stated that this was untrue.

² The Committee did not examine Gandhiji in Bombay where it met on January

166. LETTER TO REGISTRAR, HIGH COURT, BOMBAY

[SABARMATI,]

January 11, 1920

DEAR SIR,

With reference to your letter of the 8th inst., in the circumstances mentioned by you, I shall endeavour to appear before the Court on the 28th February.¹ Will you kindly set the rule down for hearing on that date? I take it that the Publisher, Mr. Mahadeo Desai, will be dealt with at the same time.

Yours faithfully,

From the pencilled draft in Gandhiji's hand : S.N. 7128 (d)

167. SPEECH AT ARYA SAMAJ MEETING, AHMEDABAD

[January 12, 1920]

I am sorry that I could not attend this function on all the days. When my old teacher insisted on my coming, I could not but yield to his pressure but I asked him, at the same time, not to detain me for more than half an hour at the meeting, as I keep busy the whole day trying to finish some work which I have taken upon myself. I have often attended functions of this Samaj and moreover, I have recently returned from a pilgrimage to the land of the Arya Samaj. On this occasion, I should tell you frankly the views I have formed about the Arya Samaj; then, I would have attended this meeting to some purpose.

I am not quite sure, but I think I said on the occasion of the first function of the Arya Samaj² that Swami Dayanand Saraswati can be placed among the most prominent teachers of all the modern religious

¹ The case came up for hearing on March 3.

² *Vide* "Speech at Arya Samaj Annual Celebrations, Surat", 2-1-1916 to "Speech at Surat Reception", 3-1-1916.

sects in India. This has been my conviction and it has grown stronger with experience. I know that, very likely, my words will not be fully understood by those here since the Arya Samaj is not as strong elsewhere as it is in the Punjab in the north. But, what with the various writings, sermons and speeches which I had the opportunity of studying while in South Africa, I can tell you this truth from my own experience. I shall tell you what experience has led me to believe.

I have especially observed two defects in the present Arya Samaj movement. One of them is *asahishnuta*; in English it is described as intolerance. I do not go to the length of saying that this is found in the Arya Samaj alone, but certain it is that the Arya Samaj has allowed itself to be carried away by the prevailing wind.

Propagating religion in a spirit of intolerance defeats its own purpose. The religion so propagated cannot endure for long. It is for dharma to counteract any trend which may do even the smallest harm to the people. I have never seen any good coming out of intolerance. Propagation of religion in such spirit is only an imitation of missionaries and takes the same form as their activities, with the result that propagation comes to be the be-all and end-all of dharma. This idea of propagation obtains among Muslims and Christians and intolerance has entered the Arya Samaj because it has adopted the same method.

Sir Alfred Lyall writes in the book of his that real dharma spreads so silently that the people do not even know that it does. At present the Arya Samaj is just one of the many religious sects. If it is asked how religion can spread so silently, Nature gives the answer.

Look at the wonder of Nature. Think of a tree. Can you observe its growth? You find your limbs growing without your ever bothering about them. Religion spreads in just the same manner.

Real dharma has no place for intolerance. The excellences of such religion we shall not find elsewhere. No other religion has succeeded in keeping away from violence, remaining immune against it, as well as Hinduism has. Hatred is alien to its very spirit. Hinduism, too, has relied on the sword and has taken to fighting, but in other religions, these things have been carried to extremes.

The other defect which I observed in the Samaj is lack of restraint on the tongue. These days the tongue is in greater use than

the sword and, the way it is used, the wound it inflicts is more painful than that by a sword. I have often noticed in the sermons that the Samajists exercise no control over their tongue. Let everyone realize that we can never deny the truth.

Think and reflect over the temper of the *rishis* and *munis*. You will see that they preached the truth with the utmost gentleness, without ever getting excited and with the purest feelings in their hearts. Even when, sometimes, they said unpalatable things, their words had sweetness and truth in them. The Samajists would do well to give up the method of propagation which obtains among Christians. It is not worth copying.

I have not said this by way of criticism, but in a friendly spirit. I have expressed my opinion and no more.

[From Gujarati]

Gujarati, 25-1-1920

168. LETTER TO ADA WEST

January 13, 1920

MY DEAR DEVI,

I have your letter. Each time I see your handwriting, I feel like being with you and just at the present moment, when I have a lot of children on hand, I feel your absence more keenly than ever, but I know that I cannot have you with me in my Indian work. I cannot understand your complaint about the absence of any letter from me¹. I wrote to you the other day from Lahore. I have been sending you my letters c/o. Mr. Rustomji. Do you know that you never put down your address at the top and therefore I am at sea as to directing your letters. I hope you will make it a point to see Mr. Andrews when he reaches Natal. He is coming to a very difficult task this time. The people of South Africa have become more selfish than they were before the War. They do order to find a solution for the difficulties of

¹ The original has 'you', evidently a slip.

a married life that I have prescribed the rule in the Ashram and the rule which without prescribing I advised in Phoenix for willing people. As I write this, the striking example of Miss Hobhouse¹ occurs to me. She could never have performed the Herculean task that she did in South Africa had she been burdened with the cares of married life. I shall still hope that you will share in my conclusion by an unbroken experience extending over a period of nearly 40 years that one need not change one's faith in order to appreciate the beauties of another and that one becomes better and stronger in one's faith for appreciating beauties of another's faith. My Hinduism does not debar me from taking what is best in Christianity nor does it blind me to the imperfections in practice. You will now understand the strength of the remark that Miss F[aering] should be able to live her own Christian life without the slightest hindrance in the Ashram. I do expect you whenever you find the time to pay us another visit and I hope that Miss F[aering]'s description of the beautiful surroundings in which we are living has but whetted your desire to visit us. I shall esteem it a privilege if you will give me your own impressions of Miss F[aering] both regarding her physique and her mentality. She is such a self-denying girl that I really sometimes do not know what she does want. You will perhaps also be able to give me your confidence in this matter.

With kindest regards and best wishes for a happy new year,

Yours sincerely,

From a photostat of the handwritten copy : S. N. 7027

¹ Emily Hobhouse

169. LETTER TO ANNE MARIE PETERSEN

January 13, 1920

DEAR MISS PETERSEN,

I was delighted to hear from you after a long absence. As soon as I heard that you wanted Miss Faering to join you during Xmas, I had no hesitation in saying that she should respond to your wish. I can thoroughly appreciate the Christian sentiment that friends and relations should gather together and have sweet communion during the Xmas season. I must confess to you that Miss Faering's presence in the Ashram is uplifting for us all. She is such a good-natured loving girl with all the loftiest aspirations that anyone can be capable of. We are all looking forward to meeting her again. I only wish that she will be able to keep her health here and become a better and a stronger Christian for her presence at the Ashram. As I have so often told her, her living at the Ashram can be justified only if she not only retains undiminished her Christianity but that, in the environment of the Ashram, it becomes purer and more ref[ined] than ever before. I consider myself a Hindu of Hindus. I believe that I have a fine perception of the truth of Hinduism and the priceless lesson I have learnt from it is that I should not wish that others may become Hindus but that they become best specimens in their own faith. I hold an unfortified day cast in your lot with me here. Let not the Indian summer frighten you. I can easily arrange for you to pass the two hottest months of the year in a cool place. There are many such in India. They are not inaccessible.

From a photostat of a handwritten copy : S. N. 7052

170. LETTER TO SIR GEORGE BARNES

January 13, 1920

DEAR SIR GEORGE BARNES,

I enclose herewith a cablegram¹ I have received from South Africa. You will perhaps easily understand reference to the Krugersdorp Case². It means that the partial protection that was attempted to be secured by the new Act has been undone by the latest judgment. The judgment is under appeal, that assuming that the appeal also is decided against us the verdict cannot be accepted. Courts of law provide no remedy where the law itself is defective. This was forcibly illustrated when a High Court judgment³ upset the South African practice which recognized Indians' marriages as lawful and you know that the legislation of 1914⁴ remedied the mischief created by the judgment in question and I trust that you will see to it and instruct Sir Benjamin Roberston that the right of Indians to hold landed property by forming corporations otherwise is not in any way interfered with.

The second point raised in the cablegram is in connection with the Commission that is now sitting to consider the proposed extension *of the power of the Municipalities*. It does seem strange that one should ever have to dread extension of popular power, but here where the power is sought in order to crush the very life of the unrepresented people, any further extension of such power is really a crime. I hope therefore that Sir Benjamin Robertson will see that any law that may be passed to extend the existing power of the municipalities of South Africa will duly safe guard the rights of Indians who are totally unrepresented in the municipalities of the Transvaal and the [Orange] Free State and only partially at the Cape and Natal.

The East African question is, you may have noticed, becoming more and more troublesome. I enclose herewith a letter I have

¹ This is not available.

² *Krugersdorp Municipality. v. Dadoo Ltd.*; vide "Letter to the Press", before 25-1-1920.

³ The reference is to the Searle Judgment of March 14, 1913; vide Appendix "Text of the Searle Judgment", 21-6-1913.

⁴ Indians' Relief Act, 1914; vide Appendix "The Indians Relief Act", 1914.

addressed to the Press.¹ You may have seen it. Will you not, if it is at all possible, give me something for publication on it as you so kindly did regarding South Africa? I hope, you received my telegram in reply to yours. Will you kindly give my regards to Lady Barnes, Miss Barnes.

Wishing you all a happy new year,

Yours, sincerely,

From a photostat of a handwritten copy : S. N. 7053

171. LETTER TO C.P. RAMASWAMI AIYER

January 13, 1920

DEAR MR. RAMASWAMI,

I thank you for your letter². I entirely agree with you that the amendment³ finally carried was not what it might have been, but is it not the essence of compromise that it satisfies neither party. It exacts a surrender of something each holds dear and yet not an integral part of any principle. My amendment⁴ was certainly graceful and did fair justice to Mr. Montagu's great services. Mr. Pal's on the other hand was offensive owing to the use of the expression using the reforms. The amendment agreed to by all struck the middle course and I felt that it was enough, and only just enough, to give a lead to the country. I have not had the time to read your article in the *Madras*

¹ *Vide* "Letter to the Press", 10-1-1920.

² This was dated January 7

³ The reference is to the amendment to the Reforms Resolution adopted in the annual session of the Indian National Congress. C.P. Ramaswami Aiyer had observed in his letter: "... but for your influence, the Congress would have taken a more violent and irresponsible turn than it had actually done. But I must say that I am very grieved that you accepted an amendment which actually makes the proposition itself nugatory. Can any of us honestly say that enough had not been given for enabling us to demonstrate our capacity to govern ourselves and is it possible to say that what has been granted would have been impossible but for the pertinacious advocacy under very trying circumstances of Mr. Montagu to whom a left-handed compliment has been paid and of Lord Sinha whom it is the fashion to slight?"

⁴ *Vide* "Speech on Reforms Resolution at Amritsar Congress", 1-1-1920.

*Mail.*¹ I shall read it and hope to write to you in due course.

Yours sincerely,

From the handwritten draft in pencil : S. N. 7034 a

172. LETTER TO LUCHMAYA

MAURITIUS²

January 13, 1920

DEAR MR. LUCHMAYA,

I have your letter. I hope to be in Bombay on the 16th. Will you be able to see me at Mr. Revashankar's bungalow? I have gone through Mr. Wilberforce's letter but I shall learn from you the position more fully. I shall be so busy in Bombay that I would like you not to take up much time. You will pardon my saying this, but I am doing so in order that you may collect your thoughts and so arrange them that you may be able to tell me all you wish in a few minutes' time.

From a photostat of a handwritten copy : S. N. 7051

173. IS BOYCOTT SWADESHI?

Mr. Baptista³ has addressed himself to showing that boycott is not only the same as swadeshi in effect but is superior to it. His reasons for saying so are that, whilst it fully serves the purpose of swadeshi in that it stimulates the use of home-made articles, it produces an effect upon the British merchant and manufacturer by touching his pocket. Mr. Baptista adds that my opposition to boycott being purely a spiritual conception, is not understood by the British people, whereas they have always recognized boycott as a perfectly constitutional and legitimate weapon which they understand. To say that boycott is the same as swadeshi even in effect is not to understand either. Swadeshi is an eternal principle whose neglect has brought

¹ The reference is to the article "The Parties of the Future" which Aiyer had requested Gandhiji to glance over.

² This, in Gandhiji's hand, indicates the file in which the letter was to be placed.

³ Joseph Baptista; nationalist leader who was associated with the Home Rule Movement

untold grief to mankind. It means production and distribution of articles manufactured in one's own country. In its narrow and present form it means the saving of sixty crore rupees annually through the instrumentality of the peasant population. It therefore also means giving 72 p.c. of the population a much-needed supplementary industry. Swadeshi is a constructive programme. Boycott, on the other hand, is a temporary makeshift resorted to in order to compel the hands of the British people by deliberately making an attempt to inflict a monetary loss upon them. Boycott, therefore, operates as an undue influence brought in to secure one's purpose. It may indirectly result, but not unless it is persistent and prolonged, in greater manufacture at home, but it certainly means the introduction of another disturbing factor, for, boycott does not mean exclusion of all foreign goods. It means exclusion of British goods only. It, therefore, involves greater encouragement of other foreign agencies, as for instance, Japanese and American. I certainly do not contemplate with equanimity the evergrowing influence of Japan upon Indian trade and commerce. Boycott to be effective has to be fairly universal whereas the observance of swadeshi by a single person is so much to the national good. One can make boycott successful only by an appeal to angry passions. It may therefore result in unintended consequences and may even lead to a permanent estrangement between parties. Mr. Baptista, however, denies that appeal to angry passions is a necessary consequence of boycott especially if some one like me were to manage the movement. I venture to challenge the position. A man suffering from an injustice is exposed to the temptations of having his worst passions roused on the slightest pretext. By asking him to boycott British goods you inculcate the idea of punishing the wrongdoer. And punishment necessarily evokes anger.

Mr. Zahoor Ahmed who has also written to combat my position says that withdrawal of co-operation is the same in essence as boycott, only it is far less effective because it is almost impossible of execution. Now, if I am serving co-operating with a wrongdoer, I am participating in the wrong. Therefore withdrawal of co-operation becomes a duty when a wrong is serious. And even if one man ceases to co-operate it is effective to that extent because of the performance of his duty by even one man. But since boycott is a punishment and as no punishment can be a duty, boycott unless it produces its effect is wasted energy. And boycott by half a dozen persons is like hitting an elephant with a straw.

I admit, however, that my fundamental opposition to boycott is based on a spiritual conception. But that is to say that I am endeavouring to extend the spiritual law to the political world. I deny however that the British people will not understand it. I had no difficulty in making the Europeans of South Africa understand and appreciate it. Nor, in order to render it effective, is it necessary to follow the spiritual conception of a spiritual act. My contention is that an act purely spiritual is the simplest to understand and the easiest to execute. Spirituality is nothing if it is not eminently practical. It is not difficult to understand that we must wash our hands when they are dirty. It is equally simple to do so, yet it is essentially a spiritual practice. *Mens sana in corpore sano* is a doctrine of the soul. And even if we accept the necessity of cleaning dirty hands without a spiritual conception of cleanliness, so may we accept the practical failure of boycott and the practical necessity under definite conditions of non-co-operation without waiting to understand their spiritual basis.

Is boycott, then, practical? Mr. Baptista has approved of boycott of the British goods. I hold that if the highest and permanent good of the country cannot be sufficient incentive to our merchants for supporting swadeshi to the exclusion of foreign goods an appeal to the merchants that, in order to bring justice from the British people, they shall temporarily stop their custom, will, I venture to submit, fall flat. Boycott after the event is of no consequence. Boycott to influence the result must be instant action. The area of boycott is too large for any organization that can be brought into being at a moment's notice. And I can see no difficulty about British manufacturers introducing their wares into India through Japan or America even as Germany years ago introduced into India her goods through England.

I swear by swadeshi because it is an evolutionary process gaining strength as it goes forward. Any organization can serve it. It is independent of the justice or the injustice of the rulers or the British people. It is its own reward. "There is no waste of energy; no failure, even a little practice of this dharma saves one from a great danger." Swadeshi and boycott are, therefore, not the same but are at the opposite poles.

Young India, 14-1-1920

174. THE REFORMS RESOLUTION IN THE CONGRESS

The divergence of views on the Reforms Resolution, summarized in one of our notes¹, is not to be wondered at. Compromises never give complete satisfaction to all parties. In their very nature they must just fall short of that and yet be acceptable to all. In our opinion the country did get the lead through the Congress that it was possible to give it. The Congress must, if it is to serve the country, more and more tend to represent not one view but many, and that not merely in the Subjects Committee, but on the open platform. There is no denying the fact there are several parties in the country. Extremist and Moderate do not cover all parties. There are, for instance, in the Extremist camp Mr. Kasturi Ranga Iyengar's, Mr. Das', and Lokamanya Tilak's parties. No doubt they sailed under the Extremist flag. But as differences become accentured, as they must be in course of time, each group will begin to assert itself. The Hon'ble Pandit Malaviyaji represents a body of opinion distinct from the Extremist. Similarly in the Moderate camp there are undoubtedly divisions, which as time goes on will become sharper, rather than otherwise, and with a proper constitution there is no reason why the Congress should not represent a resultant of all these different views thrashed out with calmness and becoming dignity on the Congress an open and reasoned discussion took place before the delegates, on a matter of the greatest importance to the country, and for the first time were those elaborate preparations made in order to ascertain by their votes the decision of the Congress. That in itself, in our opinion, was something worth attaining. But there was more than this. No doubt it was open to either party to push the matter to a division. We cannot accept Mrs. Besant's view that L[okamanya] Tilak had told his followers to vote for Mr. Gandhi's amendment if he had held out, and even if Mrs. Besant's information is correct, it would hardly have been proper for Mr. Gandhi to have pushed the matters to such an extreme. His amendment alone brought forth Mr. Pal's. The latter was a purely tactical move. Had the audience been called upon merely to decide between the original proposition, i.e., without co-operation and thanks, and Mr. Gandhi's, with thanks, a division would have been a duty. But

¹ These have not been reproduced here. For a detailed discussion on the subject, however, *vide* "The Congress", 11-1-1920.

Mr. Pal's amendment came as a feeler and also was an earnest of the extremist groups to conciliate an opposing amendment, so long as they could consistently do so. Mr. Pal's amendment could not be accepted because of the offensive word 'use' in it. Naturally therefore a third amendment providing a middle course had to be framed, and comfort lies not merely in the fact of the compromise but in the fact that all were anxious to avoid an open division. Surely, for the country it means that the Congress desires to co-operate with the authorities in so far as that co-operation can hasten the advent of the responsible government, and to thank Mr. Montagu for his valuable labours on the Reforms. We would certainly have liked it better if the graceful language of the original amendment had been accepted, if thanks had been expressed in warmer terms and extended to Lord Sinha. But it would have been wrong to divide the house after the principle of co-operation and thanks were granted by the three leaders. We are unable to associate ourselves with the suggestion that L. Tilak in accepting the amendment wanted to use Messrs Malaviya and Gandhi as his tools, and if they allowed themselves to be so used, it would not be the Lokamanya who would be to blame, but Messrs Malaviya and Gandhi would be clearly held blameworthy for their simplicity. For as party formation progresses, we suppose it would be considered quite the proper thing for party leaders to use others as tools so long as there are any to be used. Care will therefore have to be taken rather to purify our politics, than, for fear of being used as tools, to hesitate to take the right course. L. Tilak represents a definite school of thought of which he makes no secret. He considers that everything is fair in politics. We have joined issue with him in that conception of political life. We consider that political life of the country will become thoroughly corrupt if we import Western tactics and methods. We believe that nothing but the strictest adherence to honesty, fairplay and charity can advance the true interests of the country. But we refuse, because of the essential difference just pointed out, to believe that, in accepting the amendment, L. Tilak was guided by any motive other than that of meeting his opponents' views so far as it was possible. On the whole, therefore, in our opinion, the analysis given by *The Times of India* is the only true analysis of the position ultimately arrived at under the compromise.

Young India, 14-1-1920

175. TELEGRAM TO MATHURADAS TRIKUMJI

AHMEDABAD,
January 14, 1920

MATHURADAS
247 BAZAR GATE
BOMBAY

GOING DELHI TOMORROW RAJPUTANA LINE. JOINS THERE.

BAPU

From the original: Pyarelal Papers. Nehru Memorial Museum and Library.
Courtesy: Beladevi Nayyar and Dr. Sushila Nayyar

176. LETTER TO RABINDRANATH TAGORE

THE ASHRAM,
SABARMATI,
January 14, 1920

DEAR GURUDEV,

I had no idea up to today that the Gujarat Literary Conference had not met at the time it was expected to. The chief organiser Dr. Hari Prasad, however, tells me that, as one of the reasons for your inability to attend was the shortness of notice given to you, it was decided to postpone the holding of the Conference to Easter. It could be done without violating any canon of propriety as the Conference is not an annual fixture meeting at an appointed time. I know that you would come if your health and other considerations make it possible for you to accept the invitation and I sincerely hope that the capital of Gujarat will have the honour of receiving you during Easter.¹

Yours sincerely,

M. K. GANDHI

From a photostat of the handwritten original signed by Gandhiji: G.N. 4926

¹ Tagore addressed the Conference on April 2.

177. LETTER TO SYED HUSSEN IMAM

[SABARMATI ASHRAM,
Before *January 15, 1920*]¹

DEAR SYED HUSSEN IMAM,

B. Shri Krishna Singh, a Vakil from Monghyr, and a railway employee from J. W. S.² of the E. I. R. have been here to see me in connection with a strike of the workmen of the locomotive department that has gone [on] now for the last 10 days. I should love to go to Monghyr and study the situation locally. But it is impossible in view of the necessity of my going to the Punjab at once to complete my work there. The demands of the men seem to me to be reasonable. Can you not help them? I am writing to Rajendra Babu also.

Yours sincerely,

From a handwritten draft in pencil : S. N. 7024

178. LETTER TO ESTHER FAERING

DELHI,
[On or after *January 16, 1920*]³

MY DEAR CHILD,

I was sorry to leave the Ashram as soon as you came. I wanted so to have a long chat with you and to comfort you if you were anxious about anything. I felt more sorry when Devdas told me you had not enough to cover yourself [with]. I hope you asked what you wanted or that someone anticipated your wants.

You know the changes that have been made regarding cooking. Bhujarjee will be out of the kitchen. I would like you to help Ba in the kitchen. But you shall not do so if it costs over-much patience. Ba has not an even temper. She is not always sweet. And she can be petty. At the present moment she is weak in body too. You will therefore have to summon to your aid all your Christian charity to be able to return largeness against pettiness. And we are truly large only when

¹ The letter appears to have been written some time before Gandhiji left Ahmedabad on January 15.

² Jamalpur Railway Workshop

³ Gandhiji left Ahmedabad on January 15, and reached Delhi the next day. This letter appears to have been written soon after.

we are that joyfully. I have known friends being generous in a miserable spirit. Their generosity has become a kind of martyrdom. To rejoice in suffering, to pity the person who slights you and to love him all the more for his weakness is real charity. But we may not be able to reach that stage. Then, we should not experiment. And so, my dear Esther, if you find Mrs. Gandhi trying your nerves, you must avoid the close association I am suggesting to you.¹ On no account shall I have you to lose your inward peace and joy. I want you so to order your life that the Ashram gives you greater joy, greater happiness and finer preception of truth. I want you to be a greater Christian for being in the Ashram. You were with me the whole of yesterday and during the night. I shall pray that you may be healthier in mind, body and spirit so as to be a better instrument of His service.

And I want you to befriend Deepak. He is another big experiment. Mahadev will tell you who he is. I have not the time for writing more.

You may share this letter with Mahadev if you wish to. This has come to me in answer to prayer. Early this morning I wanted to send you a word of cheer. I feel for poor Mahadev just the same. He has an unequal burden to carry and thank God he has a most sensitive conscience that is unforgiving towards him. But he is fretful. He has not that abundant experience of the divine in him and so he worries. Help him please and derive help from him.

Write to me of your experience of your Madras visit and tell me how you felt there.

With deep love.

Yours,

BAPU

From a photostat of the handwritten original in N.A.I.; also *My Dear Child*, pp. 39-40

¹ Replying on January 20, Esther Faering wrote that it was difficult to please Ba, who would always look upon her as a stranger and that she herself found it difficult to cross the barriers that seemed to exist between them.

179. THE HUNTER COMMITTEE

This Committee has completed its work in regard to Ahmedabad. The evidence placed before it goes to prove that the first mistake was made by the people and not by the Government. We should ignore the fact of

Mr. Gandhi's arrest, for, when the Government arrests a person who happens to be popular among the people if the belief comes to prevail that on no account can the Government arrest such a person, the work of Government just cannot be carried on. True, the Government should have valid reason for arresting the person. It is also true that, before making the arrest the Government must have made adequate arrangements to preserve order. Even so, because the Government arrests a particular person, the people do not get the right to start killing and burning. Besides, the police had not done anything in Ahmedabad on April 11 which could provide the people with even the semblance of an excuse for doing what they did.

Thus, the evidence goes to prove that, in killing and setting buildings on fire, the people erred grievously and harmed Ahmedabad.

We also hear it said that the Government released Mr. Gandhi only because of the riots. A look at the dates will show that this is not true, since, when Mr. Gandhi was released, there had been no violence in Ahmedabad. He was released in the afternoon of April 11. The decision to set him free in Bombay was made on the evening of the 10th. Nothing had happened in Ahmedabad up to that time.

We know, however, that much harm was done because of the violence and arson. Many people have had to go to jail; a large fine has been imposed on Ahmedabad and the city has had reason to feel ashamed.

It would be somewhat brazen-faced to criticize or denounce the Government for the steps it took to quell the riots. Compared to the Punjab, the Government here has been so forbearing that it would not be right on our part to condemn its minor lapses; even so, when we are examining the question from all points of views, we are bound to point out the lapses too.

There was no need for Martial Law and for the order issued under it. It resulted in the death of innocent people. An unjust and one-sided order of fine on Nadiad and Barejadi was issued. These

were evident mistakes by the Government. The Hunter Committee is to some extent the means of getting them rectified.

The discussion on satyagraha between the members of the Committee on the one hand and Mr. Gandhi on the other is noteworthy. We shall, therefore, try to reproduce it, as faithfully as possible. The discussion brings out effectively that satyagraha is a remedy for violence and a means of safeguarding the rights of the people.

[From Gujarati]

Navajivan, 18-1-1920

180. LETTER TO AZMATULLAH KHAN

[DELHI,

*January 18, 1920]*¹

DEAR CAPTAIN AZMATULLAH KHAN,

I have not forgotten the promise² made by me. I have gone through the papers³, and I am ready to give my award⁴. My reading of the papers goes against you, and as I am otherwise unassisted, I would like you to say anything you wish to convince me to the contrary. And as soon as I receive your reply, I shall be prepared to deliver my award unless a reference to the other party becomes necessary by reason of anything you say. I am in Allahabad on the 20th. I leave Allahabad on the 21st. I reach Lahore on the 23rd and remain there for some time. My Allahabad address is : C/o The Honourable Pundit Motilal Nehru. My Lahore address is Mozang Road.

Yours sincerely,

From a photostat of the handwritten draft: S. N. 7056

¹ The date is derived from the acknowledgement by the addressee.

² In his letter of January 15, Azmatullah Khan had written to Gandhiji : "The time for the matter promised by you is approaching and I am sure you would have given notice to the opposite party."

³ These concerned a dispute between Capt. Azmatullah Khan and the Patan Pinjrapole; *vide* "Letter to Motichand & Devidas, Solicitors", 26-1-1920.

⁴ This was dispatched on January 26; *vide* "Letter to Azmatullah Khan". For the text of the award, *vide* "An Award", 26-1-1920.

181. LETTER TO J. L. MAFFEY

DELHI,

January 18, 1920

J. L. MAFFEY, ESQ., C.I.E.

PRIVATE SECRETARY TO

HIS EXCELLENCY THE VICEROY

I have come here in connection with the Khilafat Deputation and to form part of the deputation that is to wait on His Excellency tomorrow. I had now read the Statement¹ to be submitted to His Excellency before I was invited. I did not like the manner of presentation of the case. It is vague and in general terms, whereas at a critical moment like this, the statement should have been dignified, brief, precise, as unargumentative as possible, confining itself merely to bare facts and presenting the case from the highest platform and not from the platform of diplomacy. But I observe that it is now too late to redraw the whole statement and to take up any more of His Excellency's time. I therefore suggested that there should be at least an accurate statement of what is about the least that will satisfy Moslem sentiment. They have now drawn up an addendum which is incorporated in the statement. I venture to trust that His Excellency will have no objection to the addendum. I enclose herewith copy of the statement with the addition. I am sorry that it is written in a slovenly manner. I hope to send you a reprint in the course of the day but, in order to save time, I am sending you meanwhile what I have.

I hope that you are keeping well.

I was distressed to read in the papers that Lady Chelmsford was ailing in Calcutta. I trust she is completely recovered.²

N.A.I.: Home, Political: February 1920: No. 413-416A

¹ *Vide* Appendix "Khilafat Deputation's Address to Viceroy", 19-1-1920.

² To this letter Maffey replied as follows: "Your letter of 18th instant received. Things are much too far advanced for any addition to the address to be now possible. If I may say so I do not agree with your severe criticisms of the address prepared by the Khilafat Conference. It covers the ground very fully and I think they have exercised a wise discretion in excluding a presentation of claims on such an occasion."

182. NOTE ON TALKS'S LETTER¹

[DELHI,

After January 18, 1920]

I naturally feel the greatest diffidence about joining issue with the Lokamanya in matters involving questions of interpretation of religious work. But there are things in or about which instinct transcends even interpretation. For me there is no conflict between the two texts quoted by the Lokamanya. The Buddhist text lays down an eternal principle. The text from the *Bhagavad Gita* shows to me how the principle of conquering hate by love, untruth by truth, can and must be applied. If it be true that God metes out the same measure to us that we mete out to others, it follows that if we would escape condign punishment, we may not return anger but gentleness even against anger. And this is the law not for the unworldly but essentially for the worldly. With deference to the Lokamanya, I venture to say that it betrays mental laziness to think that the world is not for sadhus. The epitome of all religions is to promote *purushartha*, and *purushartha* is nothing but a desperate attempt to become sadhu, i.e., to become a gentleman in every sense of the term.

Finally, when I wrote the sentence about 'everything being fair in politics' according to the Lokamanya's creed, I had in mind his oft-repeated quotation ' शठं प्रति शठयम् ².

To me it enunciates bad law. And I shall not despair of the Lokamanya with all his acumen agreeably surprising India one day with a philosophical dissertation proving the falsity of the doctrine. In

¹ This was in reply to the following letter dated Poona, January 18, 1920, from Lokamanya Tilak: "I am sorry to see that in your article on 'Reforms Resolution' in the last issue, you have represented me as holding that I considered 'everything fair in politics'. I write this to you to say that my view is not correctly represented therein. Politics is a game of worldly people and not of sadhus, and instead of the maxim अक्रोधेन जिने क्रोध as preached by Buddha, I prefer to rely on the maxim of Shri Krishna ये यथा मां प्रपद्यते तांस्तथैव भजाम्यहम् . That explains the whole difference and also the meaning of my phrase 'responsive co-operation'. Both methods are equally honest and righteous but the one is more suited to this world than the other. Any further explanation about the difference will be found in my *Gita Rahasya*." For the article referred to, vide "The Reforms Resolution in the Congress", 14-1-1920.

² Wickedness unto the wicked

any case I pit the experience of a third of a century against the doctrine underlying ' शर्त प्रति सत्यम्'. The true law is , शर्त प्रति शाठ्यम् ~¹ .

M. K. GANDHI

Young India, 28-1-1920

183. AN APPEAL TO MADRAS

I use the word Madras here in its popular sense, meaning the people of the whole of the Madras Presidency, speaking all the Dravidian languages.

I observe that Mrs. Besant was disappointed that the proceedings of the Congress were conducted mainly in Hindustani, and she has therefore come to the amazing conclusion that it became a Provincial rather than a National Assembly. I entertain a very high regard for Mrs. Besant and her services to India. No one has popularised the idea of Home Rule for India with so much success as she. The best of us, much younger in age, are unable to approach her in her industry, zeal and organising ability, all devoted to the service of India. She has devoted the best part of her mature life to the service of India and she has deservedly attained popularity in India second perhaps only to that of Lokamanya Tilak. But, for the present moment her views being unacceptable to a large body of educated Indians, she has become somewhat unpopular, and it grieves me to have to dissent publicly from her view about Hindustani making the Congress provincial. In my humble opinion it is a grave error of judgement, and duty compels me to draw attention to it. I have attended all the Congress sessions but one since 1915. I have studied them specially in order to study the utility of Hindustani compared to English for the conduct of its proceedings. I have spoken to hundreds of delegates and thousands of visitors and I have perhaps covered a larger area and seen a much larger number of people, literate and illiterate, than any public man, not excluding Mrs. Besant and Lokamanya Tilak, and I have come to the deliberate conclusion that no language except Hindustani a resultant of Hindi and Urdu can possibly become a national medium for exchange of ideas or for the conduct of national proceedings. It is also my deliberate opinion based upon extensive experience that the nation has very materially suffered by reason of the proceedings of the Congress having been conducted almost

¹ Truth even unto the wicked

entirely in English except during the last two years. I further wish to state as a fact that, barring the presidency of Madras everywhere else the majority of the visitors and delegates to the National Congress have always been able to understand more Hindustani than English. The astounding result therefore has been that the Congress has been national throughout all these long years only as a spectacle but never for its real educative value. In any other country in the world, an assembly of this character that has become progressively popular from year to year would have, during thirty-four years of life, given a political education that would have entered every home because the people would have had various questions thrashed out before them in their own language. Whatever therefore the shortcomings of the last Congress, it has certainly been more fully national than any of its predecessors, by reason of the majority of the delegates and visitors having understood the proceedings. If the audience was weary of Mrs. Besant, it was not because it was indifferent or disrespectful to her but because it could not follow her speech, interesting and able though it was. And as national consciousness develops and as the appetite for political knowledge and education grows, as it must, it will become more and more difficult, and rightly so, for a speaker, no matter how able and popular, to command the attention of a popular audience if he spoke in English. I therefore appeal to the people of Madras Presidency to recognize the national necessity for public men to learn Hindustani. Audiences outside Madras can more or less understand Hindustani without difficulty. Dayananda Saraswati enthralled audiences outside Northern India with his Hindustani eloquence and could be understood by even the common people without difficulty. That means that out of a population of three hundred and fifteen millions only over thirty-eight millions composing the Madras Presidency cannot follow a Hindustani speaker. I have deducted the Mohammedan population for it is common knowledge that the majority of the Mohammedans of Madras Presidency understand Hindustani. The question therefore is: what is the duty of the thirty-eight million inhabitants of that Presidency? Should India for their sake learn English? Or should they for the sake of two hundred seventy-seven million inhabitants of India learn Hindustani? The late Justice Krishnaswami, with his unerring instinct, recognized Hindustani as the only possible medium of expression between the different parts of India. I am not aware that the proposition is seriously challenged by anybody at the present

moment. It is not possible for thousands of people to make English their common tongue, and it would be highly undesirable even if it were possible, for the simple reason that the higher and technical knowledge being acquired through English cannot percolate to the masses, as it would if it became current among the upper classes through any of the vernaculars. It is easier, for instance, to translate the writings of Sir J.C. Bose from Bengalee into Gujarati than it is to translate Huxley from English into Gujarati. And what does the proposition that the Madrasis should learn Hindustani for the sake of the rest of India amount to? It simply means that those public workers in Madras who want to work outside India and who want to take part in national assemblies outside the Madras Presidency should devote an hour a day for one year to learning Hindustani. Such an effort would enable several thousand Madrasis to pick up sufficient Hindustani to enable them to follow at least the drift of the Congress proceedings at the end of a year's study. They have got in several parts of the Presidency Hindi Prachar Offices where Hindustani is taught free of charge to all who wish to learn.

I appeal to Mrs. Besant, who is already devoting *New India* from time to time to the cause of Hindustani learning, to support my appeal.

Young India, 21-1-1920

184. SPEECH AT MEERUT MEETING¹

January 22, 1920

After expressing his gratitude to the citizens of Meerut and the volunteers for the hearty reception they had accorded to him, he said that of all the problems that faced India to-day that of the Khilafat was the most important, for it was the problem of our Muslim brethren. His English and Hindu friends had been asking him why a staunch Hindu like him interested himself so keenly in the Khilafat question. His answer to them all was that he and his Hindu brothers wanted to maintain peace and love with the 7 crores of Mussalmans in India. Until the Khilafat question was settled according to Muslim ideas of justice, there could be no peace in India. The Government might succeed in suppressing discontent for a time, but men, whose

¹ Gandhiji was presented with addresses by the Khilafat Committee and the citizens of Meerut at a public meeting. Khan Bahadur Sheikh Wahid-uddin presided. Gandhiji spoke in Hindi.

feelings were seriously hurt, could not live in peace for ever.

He wanted to say to his Muslim brothers that there was no means more effective to settle the question than satyagraha. They could never settle the Khilafat question by physical force. But they could themselves see the great chances of success if they adopted satyagraha. If the men in South Africa had taken up arms to defend themselves, they could have been killed by those very arms. But they stood firmly on patience.

Apart from the problem of Khilafat, the question of India's freedom was always bound up with the adoption of swadeshi. India's slavery dated from the day she gave up use of her indigenous articles. The East India Company never aimed at conquest. Its objects were purely commercial. But they were caught in the net. They used the goods manufactured in Lancashire and Manchester. If they wanted to make India free, they could not do so by the reforms, they could not do so by taking any rules or regulations from England, but they could do so by using swadeshi goods.

As to the question of Hindu-Muslim unity, he exhorted the audience to remember that they could never achieve real unity by false pretensions and pleasant words. They could deceive men but they could not deceive God. If the Hindus cajoled the Muslims to spare the cow or the Muslims coaxed the Hindus to take up the cause of the Khilafat, they could both be disappointed. These were passing things. So far as their respective religions allowed, they ought to be ready to sacrifice their very lives for each other's sakes.

Before concluding, he again expressed his thanks to his brothers and sisters of Meerut.

The Tribune, 12-2-1920

185. INTERVIEW TO S.W. CLEMES

[MEERUT,

January 22, 1920]

Mr. Gandhi, what can nations of the West do in furthering the all-round development of the East, and particularly of India? Mr. Gandhi answered the question indirectly:

India is just now in the state of unlearning. She has learned a lot that is useless and unprofitable. From my observation of the West, and particularly of your own country, I have learned two outstanding facts: First, cleanliness; second, energy. I am fully convinced that my people cannot advance spiritually, until they clean up. Your people are wonderfully energetic. To a large extent, it has been energy after

things material. If Indian people could have that same amount of energy, rightly directed, they would receive a great blessing.

Mr. Gandhi, will you kindly tell me how Christianity can best help India, in view of the spirit of nationalism that is abroad? He replied:

What we need, most of all, is *sympathy*. When I was down in Africa, I found this illustration. I had to dig some artesian wells. In order to search the pure flowing streams, I had to dig deep. Many of the people who come out here to study my people only scratch the surface. If they would dig deep by means of sympathy, they would find a stream of life there, pure and clear.

And will you kindly tell me, Mr. Gandhi, what book or person has influenced you the most? He frankly confessed that he was not an omnivorous reader, but rather a careful selector of the very best. The order in which he spoke of the books was as follows: The Bible, Ruskin, Tolstoi. Speaking of the Bible, he said:

There have been many times when I did not know which way to turn. But I have gone to the Bible, and particularly the New Testament, and have drawn strength from its message.

I was anxious to know how our Meerut Graduates' Association, composed of the finest of the educated men in the city, could further the city's welfare. In reply to the question, he gave me his one word.

Scavenger, I employ that word in all its meaning. If the members would get out and lend a helping hand to clean up the city, literally and morally, they would be doing a great work.

Young India, 25-2-1920

186. LETTER TO MAGANLAL GANDHI¹

LAHORE,

Tuesday [After January 23, 1920]

CHI. MAGANLAL,

How could I manage to write to you? All the same, I look for letters from you. Let me know how matters stand there with regard to spinning and weaving. Did you promise to send Kantilal for Sarladevi? Can he be spared? If he can be, send him to teach the boys. Ask Deepak to write to Sarladevi.

Blessings from

BAPU

From the Gujarati original in Gandhiji's hand: C.W. 5779. Courtesy: Radhabehn Choudhri

187. LETTER TO MAGANLAL GANDHI

[LAHORE,

After January 23, 1920]

CHI. MAGANLAL,

I always feel that you, at any rate, should not fall ill. When you do, though, I will submit to the inevitable. One may fall ill even through anxiety not to do so. When the body is debilitated beyond a certain point, it does not recover completely. I certainly wish that you could spend a few months, four to six, in a place all by yourself. I would be happy if you could force yourself to find this time. Surely, you should be able to place the Ashram on such a footing that you can spare yourself from time to time. However, treat this as the master's advice should be treated.² Do your own will. I want to see you healthy in body, mind and heart.

¹ This and the following letter seem to have been written after the Amritsar Congress. After the session, Gandhiji had returned to Ahmedabad and reached Lahore on January 23. Sarladevi Choudhrani, wife of Pandit Rambhuj Dutt Choudhry, had left her son Deepak, at the Sabarmati Ashram sometime after the Amritsar Congress.

² The Gujarati saying runs: "The master's advice as far as the gate", that is to say, one may acquiesce for the moment and then forget all about it.

Cherish Esther and Deepak. Mahadev, of course, you must be meeting. I hope you are doing everything to keep Ba cheerful. May one write such things to an ailing man? Yes, one can, to a man like you. I imagine you to be a man who can forget his illness in his concern for others. Mathuradas and Devdas are tireless in their service. The latter has gone far ahead. Sarladevi has been showering her love on me in every possible way. Write to her when you get time that she should not worry about Deepak.

Blessings from

BAPU

From the Gujarati original in Gandhiji's hand: C.W. 5781. Courtesy: Radhabehn Choudhri

188. LETTER TO NARAHARI PARIKH

LAHORE,

[After January 23, 1920]¹

BHAISHRI NARAHARI,

Herewith a letter for Deepak. Pass it on to him after reading it. Ask him whether he has understood it. This is only the third time Sarladevi has allowed him to leave her side. Her old mother-in-law is none too happy about it. I cannot say that Panditji² is happy either. But he never objects to anything Sarladevi does. He very much wants that the child should grow up there to be a man of character and learning. We may do all we can to help him to be so. Pay attention to his instruction in Sanskrit and Bengali. If Manindra takes charge of his Bengali, the boy will easily make progress in it. Wouldn't he like to write to Sarladevi in good Bengali? Or, if he prefers, he may write sometimes in Bengali and sometimes in English.

Blessings from

BAPU

From a photostat of the original in Gujarati : S. N. 11885

¹ It appears Gandhiji wrote this letter soon after his arrival in Lahore on January 23.

² Pandit Rambhuj Dutt Choudhri

189. LETTER TO REGISTRAR, HIGH COURT, BOMBAY

LAHORE,
January 24, 1920

SIR,

I beg to acknowledge your letter¹ of the ----- instant.

The 3rd March next will suit me for the hearing of the rule against Mr. Mahadev Desai and myself².

Yours sincerely,

From a photostat of the draft in Gandhiji's hand : S. N. 7063

190. LETTER TO S. ALI HUSAIN

2, MOZANG ROAD,
LAHORE,
January 24, 1920

DEAR MR. HUSAIN,

I was glad to receive your letter³. The information I made use of in the meeting was given to me at Meerut and in the motor by the friends who brought me to Muzaffarnagar. If you dispute their version, I would like you to let me have your own.

Yours sincerely,

From a photostat of the handwritten copy: S. N. 7068

¹ Evidently this was in reply to Gandhiji's letter of January 4.

² On February 27, Gandhiji wrote again to the Registrar and forwarded statements by himself and Mahadev Desai. The hearing of the rule *nisi* was held on March 3, when both the respondents appeared in court in person. The Judges held them guilty of contempt of court but confined themselves "to severely reprimanding the respondents and cautioning them both as to their future conduct."

³ This was dated January 23 and read: "I am sorry to intrude upon your busy time, but as differences have arisen here regarding your last night's speech, I hope you won't mind these few minutes. We would like to know the nature of your information regarding the *Mohhartram* affair and who gave you that information. Was it during your short stay here or at some time previous to this? . . ." The speech referred to is the "Speech at Meerut Meeting", 22-1-1920.

191. LETTER TO ESTHER FAERING

LAHORE,

January 24, 1920

MY DEAR CHILD,

I was delighted to receive your letter on my arrival in Lahore yesterday.

I am glad you have opened out your heart. It is the truest test of friendship and affection. You enable me to help you when you do open out. I had no notion that you had already observed Mrs. Gandhi's pettiness. I simply warned you, as I asked you to come in closer touch with her. As it is, my warning reached you just in time. God will give you wisdom and courage to do the right thing at the right moment. Only remember one thing, never allow your spirit of sacrifice to go to the length of making you sour and disgusted with yourself or your surroundings. This is one of the sorest temptations to which workers are exposed. They go on sacrificing themselves till they become disgusted with everything and everybody for want of response. We sacrifice truly only when we expect no response. It is well worth knowing the root meaning of the word. It means, as you might know, 'to make sacred'. We make neither ourselves nor others sacred when we are irritated or angry. There is often more sacrifice sacred making in a divine smile than in so-called substantial sacrifice. The instances of Mary and Magdalene¹ occur to me as I write these lines. Both were good but the one who simply waited upon her Lord without making any fuss was probably more self-sacrificing than the other. And so may it be with you. Do not overtax your spirit in trying to win over Mrs. Gandhi or anybody else. Immediately you find that you cannot get on with her, you must have a separate kitchen for yourself. You could still serve her but not be so intimate with her. Nothing that you do there should tire out either your spirit or your body.

Do please ask for every convenience you may need whether for food or otherwise. Ask Maganlal or Imam Saheb or anybody who has come nearer you.

¹ This appears to be a slip for "Martha".

Yes, Deepak is all you describe him. I would like you gently to get him to realize his responsibility and concentrate on his studies. Supervise his letter-writing. See that he writes fully and neatly to his mother every day.

My heart is with you in your sorrow. I can understand your desire to be with your brother in Denmark¹. But you have chosen a different path a path that does not admit of exclusive service. May God give you strength for your task.

I agree with you about Mahadev. He is needlessly anxious about his health.² He is prized not for his body but for his spirit. It must be a privilege for friends to nurse him in his illness.

With love,

Yours,

BAPU

From a photostat of the handwritten original in N.A.I.; also *My Dear Child*, pp. 47-9

192. TELEGRAM TO SHAMLAL NEHRU

[LAHORE,

January 24, 1920]

IMPOSSIBLE LEAVE PUNJAB PLEASE APOLOGISE FOR
ME.³

GANDHI

From a photostat of the draft in Gandhiji's hand: S. N. 7440

¹ Esther Faering had written of her brother stricken with tuberculosis.

² Mahadev Desai had told Esther Faering that he felt he had "no right or claim to live in the Ashram when he so often fell ill".

³ This was in reply to the following telegram from Shamlal Nehru: "K.P. Singh Barrister Arrah wishes me forward following message mass meeting Arrah 25th instant request release Shahabad rioters. Your presence solicited strengthen Hindu-Muslim unity. Keen disappointment non attending."

193. LETTER TO THE PRESS¹

[Before January 25, 1920]

The following is the extension of a cable received by me from Mr. Aswat, Chairman of the British Indian Association, Transvaal, regarding the *Krugersdorp Municipality v. Dadoo, Ltd.*, referred to in the memorandum presented to the Union Premier:

The Court has set aside the transfers. It held that the formation of Indian companies for the purpose of acquiring fixed property is illegal. It declared transfers so obtained were *fraudem legis*, saying that legislation cannot be laughed at (Section 130). The Gold Law was intended to prevent indiscriminate mingling of Coloured [persons and] Europeans. Further in the judgment in Potchefstroom, under the Local Ordinance 9, 1912, the magistrate upholds the Council's contention that the Asiatic's presence causes annoyance and detriment to European commerce and on that ground holds Indians as undesirable. Both judgments mean the ruination of the community. Appeals noted. Europeans tendering evidence before the local Government Commission are specialising on the Indian question, urging complete autonomy for municipalities. Make representations to the proper quarters immediately. The Association prays to hold meetings throughout India. New Act 37 gives no protection even to old companies and traders. The position is most precarious. Strenuous action is imperative for the sake of saving the community.

This cablegram cannot fail to disconcert those who have at all studied the South African question, for, as Mr. Aswat says, it is calculated to undo even the little that the new Act was claimed to accomplish. Dadoo, Ltd., is an old-established Indian company in Krugersdorp. It holds extensive landed property in that township, and, the meaning of the cablegram is that the transfers registered in the name of the company of landed properties are illegal, because, as the Court seems to have contended, the transaction was in fraud of the law and that legislation could not be laughed at. I wish to say nothing regarding the propriety of the judgment or the reasoning on which it seems to be based.

Thousands of pounds' worth of landed property is registered in the names of companies in which Indians enjoy a dominating

¹ A Gujarati translation of this appeared in *Navajivan*, 25-1-1920.

position. If the judgment stands, everyone of these companies will become dispossessed of the land they have occupied for years, land which they have acquired openly and under legal advice and which has been registered in the Land Registry Office. With the full knowledge of all the circumstances by the registrars, and only last year, when the new disabling Act was passed by the South African Legislature, we were told that the holding of land in this manner, prior to July 31 last, would not be affected by the legislation, and in justification of the measure, we were told by all the speakers in the Union Assembly that the legislation would protect existing companies and mortgages. The judgment in question comes, therefore, as an eye-opener. I venture to submit that, even if the judgment is sound, it evidently frustrates the intention of the Legislature and deprives Indians of rights they have enjoyed without question for years past. I hold that the impending sin¹ must be averted, even if it is to be done by special legislation, as was done in 1914 in connection with the legal recognition of Indian marriages.

The second point raised in the cablegram refers to a magisterial judgment, and it means that Indians as Indians may be declared as undesirable, not on ground of insanitation or immorality, but because they compete with the European traders to their detriment. If this doctrine were to hold good, not a single Indian can engage in any trade whatever in South Africa².

Sir Benjamin Robertson will presently sail for South Africa. His diplomatic talent and his trusteeship will be taxed to the utmost before he secures, not a full status for the Indians in South Africa, but even a tolerably respectable footing for them to secure, i.e., the right to trade and own landed property without restriction, save such as are common to all as well in theory as in practice. One can only hope that the

¹ The original has "sum", evidently a misprint.

² A Gujarati version of the letter in *Navajivan*, 25-1-1920, has the following additional paragraph: "The third point raised in the cable is about the proposed increase in the powers of municipalities. Ordinarily, everyone would welcome such an increase but, looking to what has happened in the present case, in South Africa and the other Colonies, this increase will mean investing the municipalities with power to persecute the dependent and disenfranchised classes. In the event, the latter will find the increased powers of municipalities not to their benefit but to their detriment. In the Transvaal and the Free State, Indians have no political or municipal franchise. They have a measure of franchise in Natal and the Cape, but not sufficient to enable them to influence the working of municipalities or to have their wishes respected."

Government of India will speak to the Union Government in no uncertain terms on this question, and that the public and the Press will strengthen their hands.

India, 27-2-1920

194. OFF THE RAILS

Letters, loving and not so loving, come pouring in to me; and, since I became editor, their number has increased. I cannot publish many of them; they are not worth publishing. Some, however, are such as may do good if published. I received one such recently and I give it here exactly as it is.¹

The writer of this letter is a hard-working young man. He has patriotism, but, as one with a squint in the eye sees everything out of focus, so this friend, in the bitterness of his heart, sees everything wrong about me. Once he had nothing but love for me; however, what with his bitterness against the British and my attitude to them free from malice, even those actions of mine which he once thought good or about which he used to be neutral seem bad to him. Not only this; he has even found it possible to argue my incapacity from the very actions which I consider to be my best.

This is no exception. I had this experience in South Africa and have it here too. What is it which reduces man to such a state? The answer to this is given in the *Bhagavad Gita*, in the best possible language:

By constantly dwelling on objects, the mind develops attachment, from attachment grows desire, desire brings forth anger, anger clouds one's perception, this obscures memory, from that comes loss of reason and, reason lost, one is utterly destroyed.²

This is a vivid picture of the mental states as they succeed one another. All who dwell on objects of sense do not, however, ultimately end up thus, because all do not lose self-awareness completely.

With the writer of this letter, the object [on which his thought dwells] is his hatred of "bureaucracy". This has roused anger in him

¹ This is not reproduced here. The correspondent had argued that Gandhiji had failed miserably in every cause he had espoused in India and that he was no longer "fit to work in politics".

² *Bhagavad Gita*, II, 62-63

and, in the heat of his anger, he has lost his judgment of good and bad and even forgotten his former words.

I have published this letter to warn people so that they may, if possible, save themselves from this state of mind.

It is not necessary that we should be able to approve of all the actions of a “bureaucracy” or any other “cracy”. I do not like many of its actions, but I do not hate it for that reason. In consequence, I can point out its errors with a precision which, I think, few others show. There must be very few who have fought it as doggedly as I have during these four years. But, not possessed by anger, I have not lost my judgment.

That is exactly the fault this angry friend has seen in me. Let us now examine his letter. All his accusations are half true, and I have described half-truth as falsehood multiplied one and a half times, for it confuses both. The person who states a half-truth is unaware of the incompleteness of his statement and the listener thinks that the half-truth is the whole truth and accepts it as such. It is true that only after the people of Kheda had already paid most of the revenue due from them that the payment was declared to be voluntary, but securing this was only one of the aims of the movement in Kheda. The other result, that the Government had to reverse its stand, was an important one. I think, and so do the thousands of men and women of Kheda, that the awakening among the people and the Government’s admission of defeat in passing the order it did were significant results. Had the correspondent known that self-interest has no place in satyagraha, he would not have blamed me in this particular matter.

That I have started a movement against *varnashrama* is a delusion of the writer’s; that untouchability is a part of *varnashrama* is a half-truth. I have declared again and again that I believe in *varnashrama*. However, I have steadfastly endeavoured to rid *varnashrama* of the taint of untouchability by pointing out that it is sin to refuse to touch *Bhangis* and others, and this is my purest service to Hinduism. That I have hurt the feelings of Hindus is also a half-truth. The attitude behind it is that the feelings of Hindus ought never to be hurt. If following truth hurts people’s feelings, it is one’s dharma to hurt them. How can I or anyone else escape this dharma?

It is a half-truth to say that I started recruiting work in opposition to the stand taken up by Lokamanya Tilak. He was not opposed to this activity of mine; his view was that such efforts would be more successful if equality of rights was conceded. There is, thus,

much difference between the view really held by the Lokamanya and the view attributed to him by this friend. How I, a believer in non-violence, came forward to secure recruits is a question which occurred to many. I have given my reply to it. Without discussing it here, [I need only observe that] from a general point of view my action was much appreciated; to this friend, however, it seems unworthy. The half-truth about the Rowlatt Bills is evident enough. But how can I explain to an angry man that I should not be held responsible for people having been killed, for the misdeeds of those who set fire to buildings?

I do not think it right to comment on the half-truths about Reforms and related matters. I would advise those who are apt to get angry all too quickly to reflect over this letter and I wish that they save themselves from such delusions. Let the people, by all means, make their charges against me. Let it be that I have no service to my credit about Kheda district and in other matters. Opinions may differ on these points. We should not, however, be carried away by anger. We ought to see that, merely because some actions of a man have seemed bad to us, we do not set down as bad those very actions of his which we had once, on full consideration, held to be good.

[From Gujarati]

Navajivan, 25-1-1920

195. LETTER TO THAKORE

LAHORE,

January 25, 1920

DEAR MR. THAKORE,

I cannot say anything about your work in England beyond saying that you¹ should be accurate in your information and moderate but firm in your demand; extravagance in either case weakens the cause. I am unable to send you any papers because I have nothing with me here. I take it that you will see Mr. Polak and be guided by him. I wish you all success.

Yours sincerely,

From the handwritten pencil draft: S. N. 7027(e)

¹ The original has “we”.

196. LETTER TO ESTHER FAERING

Sunday [January 25] 1920¹

MY DEAR CHILD,

Narahari tells me you are now boarding with Imam Saheb. I am glad you will certainly feel at home there more than anywhere else if only because you have someone who will talk to you constantly in English. And you can shower your discriminating love on Fatima with immediate results.

I shall feel deeply hurt if you lose your health and your peace of mind. 'Resist not evil' has a much deeper meaning than appears on the surface. The evil in Ba, for instance, must not be resisted, i.e., you or for that matter I must not fret over it or be impatient and say to ourselves, 'why will not this woman see the truth or return the love I give her'. She can no more go against her nature than a leopard can change his spots. If you or I love, we act according to our nature. If she does not respond, she acts according to hers. And if we worry, we 'resist evil'. Do you agree ? I feel that that is the deeper meaning of the injunction. And so, in your dealings with everybody I want you to keep your equanimity. Secondly please do not deny yourself anything you may need for your bodily comfort. Ask me, if you will not ask anybody.

I want you to write to me daily whilst I feel uneasy about you.

With love and prayers,

Yours,

BAPU

From a photostat of the handwritten original in N.A.A.; also, *My Dear Child*, pp. 49-50

¹ This date is given in *Mahadevbhaini Diary*, Vol. V.

197. LETTER TO N.D. SAVARKAR

LAHORE,

January 25, 1920

DEAR DR. SAVARKAR,

I have your letter.¹ It is difficult to advise you. I suggest, however, your framing a brief petition setting forth the facts of the case bringing out in clear relief the fact that the offence committed by your brother was purely political. I suggest this in order that it would be possible to concentrate public attention on the case. Meanwhile as I have said to you in an earlier letter² I am moving in the matter in my own way.

Yours sincerely,

From a photostat of the handwritten draft: S. N. 7043

¹ Dr. Savarkar had written in his letter of January 18 : “ . . . Yesterday I was informed by the Government of India that the Savarkar Brothers were not included in those that are to be released. The telegram runs as follows: ‘Your telegram 8th inst. Savarkar Brothers have not been included in those receiving clemency under the amnesty.’ It is now clear that the Indian Govt. have decided not to release them. Please let me hear from you as to how to proceed in such circumstances. They (my brothers) have already undergone a rigorous sentence for more than ten years in the Andamans and their health is utterly shattered. Their weight has come down from 118 to 95-100. Though they are given a hospital diet at present, their health does not show any sign of improvement. At least a change to some Indian jail of better climate is the most essential for them. I have received a letter from one of them very recently (a month back) in which all this is mentioned. I hope that you will let me know what you mean to do in this matter.” The Savarkar Brothers had been sentenced to life. They were ultimately released in 1937.

² This is not available.

198. LETTER TO ASAF ALI

January 25, 1920

MY DEAR ASAF ALI,

I was sorry to hear of your illness. I hope you are now better if not quite restored.

I thank you for your frank letter.

I shall certainly take every step to see that there is no misunderstanding regarding the cow-slaughter resolution. I quite agree with you that no false hopes should be raised regarding the Mahomedan attitude on [the] point and that all propaganda on our (Hindus') part among Mahomedans should be avoided.

I am glad too that you have raised the moral issue and discussed it not on purely orthodox religious but on broad and humanitarian grounds. I would however say on the orthodox religious grounds that, when two great communities live side by side, the religious sense of the one demands a scrupulous regard for the practices of the other, so long as they are not immoral from a universal stand point. For instance I see nothing wrong in non-Muslims going to Mecca. But there is nothing immoral in your prohibiting non-Muslims from entering it. And as the sentiment of prohibition has grown during all these 1,300 years, I support it.

So may it be for the Mahomedan regarding the cow-slaughter. Now for the broad humanitarian ground: we shall probably have to agree to differ; your view point seems to be so different from mine. I consider that God has not created lower forms of animal life for man to use them as he will. Man realises his highest station not by indulging but by abstinence. I have no right to destroy animal life if I can subsist healthily on vegetable life. I have no right to slaughter all animal life because I find it necessary to slaughter some animal life. Therefore if I can live well on goats, fish and fowl (surely enough in all conscience) it is sin for me to destroy cows for my sustenance. And it was some such argument that decided the *rishis* of old in regarding the cow as sacred, especially when they found that the cow was the greatest economic asset in national life. And I see nothing wrong, immoral or sinful in offering worship to an animal so serviceable as the cow so long as my worship does not put her on a level with her Creator. I immensely appreciate the idea (so emphasized by Islam)

that special worship must be reserved for the Creator of us all. But I must not mix up cow-worship and cow-slaughter. If you accept the proposition that man is more man as he abstains more, you will have no difficulty in allowing that cow-slaughter is indefensible on moral grounds.

I agree with you that so far as the economic ground is concerned, the slaughter for the Europeans is much the most important. In my opinion the cry against the Mahomedan slaughter on the Bakr Id is unbecoming so long as we Hindus remain dumb about the daily slaughter going on in the public abattoirs. We strain at a gnat and swallow a camel.

Yours sincerely,

From a photostat of the draft in Gandhiji's hand : S. N. 7064

199. LETTER TO SOMEONE IN MADANPALLI

LAHORE,

January 25, 1920

DEAR MR.¹

I have drawn the distinction between passive resistance as understood and practised in the West and satyagraha before I had evolved the doctrine of the latter to its full logical and spiritual extent. I often used passive resistance and saytagraha as synonymous terms : but as the doctrine of satyagraha developed, the expression passive resistance ceases even to be synonymous, as passive resistance has admitted of violence as in the case of suffragettes and has been universally acknowledged to be a weapon of the weak. Moreover passive resistance does not necessarily involve complete adherence to truth under every circumstance. Therefore it is different from satyagraha in three essentials: Satyagraha is a weapon of the strong; it admits of no violencer under any circumstance whatever; and it ever insists upon truth. I think I have now made the distinction perfectly clear.

Yours sincerely,

TO

MADANPALLI (P.O.)

From a photostat of the handwritten draft : S. N. 7071

¹ The addressee's name is illegible.

200. LETTER TO NARAHARI PARIKH

[After January 25, 1920]¹

BHAI NARAHARI,

I got your letter just now. I would have been pained if you had not written it. It does not matter if Miss Faering's meals have had to be arranged at Imam Saheb's. I have already written to her about Ba. The latter has obstructed many plans. Let us pray that she does not obstruct this about Miss Faering. It serves no purpose to complain about this weakness of hers. See that you look after Miss Faering as you do after Mahadev.

I have sent your letters to Chi. Maganlal. You should believe with me that I have acted wisely in doing so.

Blessing from

BAPU

From a photostat of the original in Gujarati : S. N. 11883

201. LETTER TO J.B. PETIT

[LAHORE,

January 26, 1920]²

DEAR MR. PETIT,

I had taken it for granted that you had paid Rs. 900 odd to Mrs. Kunverbai Sorabji, but a postcard just received from her shows that she has not received the money at all. Please send the amount to her as early as you can. The poor woman seems to be suffering. She is just at present with the Palonji's.³

Yours Sincerely,

From a photostat of the draft in Gandhi's hand : S. N. 7072

¹ From the reference to Esther Faering having her meals with the Imam Saheb, it is clear that the letter was written after Gandhiji's letter of this date to her.

² The date is quoted in Petit's letter to Gandhiji, dated February 4, 1920.

³ Petit wrote back to say that Rs. 925.50 had already been forwarded to Mrs. Sorabji Shapurji Adajania.

202. AN AWARD

January 26, 1920

In virtue of reference made by the parties to me as sole arbitrator, I award that the defendants pay the plaintiffs Rs. 8,000/- (Eight thousand rupees) bearing simple interest at 7 p.c. from the 17th day of June 1918. On failure to pay the said sum with interest, I further award that the property described in the mortgage deeds referred to in the plaint be sold for the recovery of the amount awarded. I further award that each party should pay his own costs to the date hereof but that the cost of collection if any should be paid by the defendants.

Given at Lahore the 26th January 1920.

From a photostat of the draft in Gandhiji's hand : S. N. 7056

203. LETTER TO AZMATULLAH KHAN

[January 26, 1920]

DEAR CAPT. AZMATULLAH KHAN,

I enclose herewith my award¹ in your case. The duplicate I have sent to the Solicitor for the plaintiff.

Yours sincerely,

From a photostat of the handwritten draft: S. N. 7056

204. LETTER TO MOTICHAND & DEVIDAS, SOLICITORS

January 26, 1920

TO

MOTICHAND & DEVIDAS

SOLICITORS

BOMBAY

GENTLEMEN,

I enclose herewith my award in connection with the matter between the Patan Pinjrapole and Capt. Azmatullah Khan and others referred to me. I have sent duplicate copy to Capt. Azmatullah Khan.

¹ *Vide* the preceding item.

I don't know whether any stamp is required in connection with the award. You will please affix it yourself should any be necessary, and if it requires defacing by me, I shall do so on your returning the award duly stamped.

From a photostat of the handwritten draft: S. N. 7056

205. *LETTER TO ESTHER FAERING*

LAHORE,

January 26, 1920

MY DEAR CHILD,

I have your brief note. I hope you have been receiving my letters regularly. I have hardly missed a day. I cannot send you a love-letter today as I have not many minutes for the post.

How is Deepak shaping? Please tell Deepak he has not written to Sarladevi for the last 4 days. He must be regular in writing.

Please see that he writes at least a p[ost]c[ard] every day.

Yours,

BAPU

From a photostat of the handwritten original in N.A.I.; also, *My Dear Child*, p. 49.

206. *PUNJAB LETTER*

LAHORE,

Magh Sud 6 [January 27, 1920]

(9)

DELHI

I am back to my pilgrimage of the Punjab and have thus the opportunity of renewing my Punjab Letters for readers of *Navajivan*.

I shall first say something about my stay in Delhi and a few other places before I came back here.

I had hoped to go to Bombay and, having met friends, inspected the work of the Swadeshi Sabha and Satyagraha Sabha and met the men and women engaged in spinning, to proceed to Prayag and thence to Lahore.

But either God or the Khilafat Committee had planned otherwise. Haji-ul-Mulk Hakimji Ajmal Khan wired to me requesting

me to join the Khilafat deputation which was to wait on the Viceroy. Reports of this deputation have already appeared in the papers. I shall, therefore, write nothing about it. The inclusion of Hindus in the deputation has created an excellent impression. I could see how the Ali Brothers had been able to win the affection of their community. Their sweet speech, their constant readiness for work, their loving nature and sympathy for all, their religious zeal—who would not be charmed by such qualities! Their very presence fill our Muslim brethren with happiness. They are, as it were, the eyes of the Muslims and now, by their love, they are winning over the Hindus as well.

KANPUR

From Delhi I had in any case to go to Prayag. When I returned from there after meeting Pandit Motilal Nehru, I was pressed to go to Kanpur. The citizens of Kanpur urged me to go there for a few hours and open the Swadeshi Bhandar, saying I could leave by the next train. I could not refuse them.

Kanpur is between Prayag and Delhi and is four hours from Prayag by Mail. It is a centre of commerce and mills, like Bombay. The climate too is excellent. This was the first venture here by way of a swadeshi store, Hasrat Mohani's being the chief hand behind it. Thousands attended the opening ceremony and the people's enthusiasm was boundless.

A PAINFUL INCIDENT

The Ali Brothers had preceded me and a huge procession was organized for them. The horse drawing their carriage shied and started kicking. The crowd was thick. A young and sturdy Muslim named Abdul Hafeez was standing close by. Recently he had been devoting himself entirely to public service. He was hit in the chest and collapsed. In a second this youth, who had looked as if he could never die, passed away. The two brothers came down from the carriage on the instant, asked for a cot to be brought and laid the body on it. They both bore it on their shoulders and went with the procession for some distance. Others then took their places and they went away to their work. The procession which had started as a celebration now accompanied a bier. The day was darkened.

I arrived within about four hours of this occurrence and the news was given to me at the station. I made a request that the procession organized for me be cancelled and that I be taken direct to the Bhandar and, after the opening ceremony was gone through, to

see the body of Abdul Hafeez; the leaders agreed. Having opened the Bhandar some of us proceeded to pay our homage to the body of our brother who had passed away. The sight of the dead body of Abdul Hafeez was heart-rending. I was overwhelmed with grief as I looked upon that sturdy frame and that charming face, but I took heart from the fortitude of the Muslim brethren standing around. I observed no wailing and weeping near the body. The people were exchanging remarks, unmoved with fear, as though standing round someone in deep sleep, and described to me how he had been killed. The scene appealed to me greatly. I thought of the wailing and crying usual among the Hindus. I wished that we were delivered from that horror. I also told myself that we could do a great many things if we discarded this fear of death. I have often felt that the followers of Hinduism, who should least fear death, fear it most. The very thought of this makes me feel ashamed. We learn right from our childhood that the soul is immortal and the body transitory, and that every act will have its consequence. Why then do we fear death? The only son of Abdul Hafeez was standing by my side. He too spoke as if untouched by fear. May God give peace to the soul of Abdul Hafeez.

VISIT TO MEERUT

I left Kanpur by the evening train and reached Merrut the following morning, i.e., on the 22nd. Meerut is on the G.I.P. line on the way to Lahore. I had promised to stop there for a few hours. The citizens had made elaborate preparations. There was almost a competition between the Hindus and the Muslims in showering affection on me. The Ali Brothers had been there only recently and had stayed in the house of a Hindu. I was to stay at the house of a well-known Muslim barrister of Meerut, Bhai Ismail Khan. Seven hundred and fifty volunteers were active in the reception, many of them being from aristocratic families. A mounted cadet corps also stood at attention. Flag-Poles had been erected along a three-mile route and ropes tied connecting them. The procession moved along inside the rope-fence and the crowds stood outside. It included a band, camel-drawn carriages, men on horseback, people in fancy dress, etc. The procession, I imagine must have been a mile long. Thousands had come in from neighbouring villages. Yet the arrangements were excellent. Addresses were presented to me by the Municipality, the Khilafat Committee, the general public, Hindu and Muslim women. There was a separating meeting for women. They were overflowing with joyous enthusiasm. About a thousand women

were present. I was almost terrified. how could I support so much affection? I offered it up then and there to Lord Krishna.

My sincere efforts in the cause of the Khilafat have commended themselves to our Muslim brethren. As long as they base their case on justice and fight non-violently, I shall be ready to lay down my life for them. If they put forward unreasonable demands, I will offer satyagraha even against them. This statement of mine has appealed to them and they have taken strength from it. All, Hindus and Muslims, have welcomed the emphasis on truth, whether they themselves abide by it or not. They are therefore showering affection on me. If the time comes for me to offer satyagraha against them, they may be angry with me, too. Those who love us have also the right to be angry with us.

MUZAFFARNAGAR

From Meerut, I was taken the same night to Muzaffarnagar. There had been some minor differences between Hindus and Muslims in this place and I had been dragged there to settle them. The car reached there at 9 p.m. The crowds were all enthusiasm. No one was in a mood to take instructions from anyone else. Men on horseback were present but there was no order as in Meerut. The people surrounded the car. I was taken through it with great difficulty and put into a carriage. I had no longer the strength to bear their joyous tumult. Literally, I had stuffed my ears with cotton wool. Somebody's foot was hurt. I was reminded of Abdul Hafeez and took the injured man into the carriage. I begged the people to move away. But who would listen and to whom? I then brought out my usual weapon. I announced that, if the carriage started before the crowds had moved aside, I would jump out to the ground, for I could not tolerate anyone being injured. This miraculous weapon had an electric effect. The people became quiet and, a little frightened, moved away, whereupon I asked [the driver] to be quick and start the carriage. The control was with me now. All this took a lot of time. The roads were illuminated as on the festival of lights and a good deal of time was spent in passing through them. The meeting was yet to take place. The time for the departure of my train was fast approaching and it was imperative that I reach Lahore the following day. But the people had realized that they should no longer make noise nor press round me. We reached the *pandal* at 11 p.m. There, at the meeting, everything was in wonderful order, without anyone's efforts. Those present must have been 4,000

or more. My voice was slightly hoarse but the audience maintained such silence that I could be heard even by those sitting farthest from me. I said a few words on how, if we were to work among lakhs of people, it was necessary to maintain order. I then referred to the local dispute and, having advised them to show a spirit of accommodation and resolve their differences, I took leave from them. Having thus rushed through these two towns, I reached Lahore on the morning of the 23rd.

A MIRACLE

Where earlier I had seen a woman, separated from her husband and living all alone, the image of a lioness, I saw today a happy couple. Pandit Rambhuj Dutt Choudhri was long since out of jail. I saw a new glow on Smt. Sarladevi's face. The face which had been lined with care was today bright with joy. Or perhaps I am doing her an injustice. Even during separation Sarladevi had not lost the light on her face. However, I could see a difference between that light and this; let us say, rather, that I imagined such a difference. It is certain that the sadness I used to feel when I stayed before at Sarladevi's house has entirely disappeared now, thanks to the return of Choudhriji.

KHILAFAT DISCUSSED

Immediately on arrival I was to engage myself in consultations. It had been decided to have a meeting with the Ali Brothers and other prominent Muslim friends in Lahore on the 23rd. They had also, therefore, arrived by some other trains and the entire day was occupied in preparing a draft of their demands. Sarladevi's house has become a veritable dharmshala. This lady proffered her hospitality to these distinguished Muslim friends as if she were their sister. The day passed in preparing the draft and in accepting the hospitality. Night fell and the time came for the Ali Brothers to depart. "When you offer satyagraha, invite me to join you; at other times, I am not with you." Listening to these words and accepting this as the agreement between us, the Brothers and Hasrat Mohani Sahab made their departure. The three have but one thought day and night-how to secure justice on the Khilafat issue. The Brothers do not put unqualified faith in satyagraha. Hasrat Mohani Sahab, however, whispered to me in passing, "I cannot say whether satyagraha can always be a practicable proposition but, for this purpose and in these times, I too believe that there is no other weapon like it. I shall therefore certainly propagate it."

The Ali Brothers embraced Hasrat Mohani, introducing him as “our mad Mullah”¹. This man does not want honour nor does he mind insults. He remains engrossed in his work, indifferent to heat and cold and making no difference between day and night. These are three jewels of the Muslim community and I feel that Hasrat Mohani is the brightest of the three. There are not many even among Hindus who could rival him in his single-minded devotion it is doubtful if there is any. And just as they are true Muslims, they are true Indians. The fate of the Khilafat case and the future peace of India depend largely on the wisdom of these three. I can see that none of them will be afraid to follow the path they think is right.

[From Gujarati]

Navajivan, 1-2-1920

207. THE KHILAFAT

The question of questions today is the Khilafat question, otherwise known as that of the Turkish peace terms. His Excellency the Viceroy deserves our thanks for receiving the joint deputation even at this late hour² especially when he was busy preparing to receive the heads of the different provinces. His Excellency must be thanked for the unfailing courtesy with which he received the deputation and the courteous language in which his reply was couched. But mere courtesy, valuable as it is at all times, never so valuable as at this, is not enough at this critical moment. “Sweet words butter no parsnips” is a proverb more applicable today than ever before. Behind the courtesy there was the determination to punish Turkey. Punishment of Turkey is a thing which Muslim sentiment cannot tolerate for a moment. Muslim soldiers are as responsible for the result of the War as any others. It was to appease them that Mr. Asquith said, when Turkey decided to join the Central Powers, that the British Government had no designs on Turkey and that His Majesty’s Government would never think of punishing the Sultan for the misdeeds of the Turkish Committee. Examined by that standard the Viceregal reply is not only disappointing but it is a fall from truth and justice.

¹ Gandhiji uses the English words.

² The deputation waited on the Viceroy on January 19.

What is this British Empire? It is as much Mohammedan and Hindu as it is Christian. Its religious neutrality is not a virtue, or if it is, it is a virtue of necessity. Such a mighty Empire could not be held together on any other terms. British ministers are therefore bound to protect Mohammedan interests as any other. Indeed, as the Muslim rejoinder says, they are bound to make the cause their own. What is the use of His Excellency having presented the Muslim claim before the Conference? If the cause is lost, the Mohammedans will be entitled to think that Britain did not do her duty by them. And the Viceregal reply confirms the views. When His Excellency says that Turkey must suffer for her having joined the Central Powers, he but expresses the opinion of the British ministers. We hope, therefore, with the framers of the Muslim rejoinder that His Majesty's ministers will mend the mistakes if any have been committed and secure a settlement that would satisfy Mohammedan sentiment.

What does the sentiment demand? The preservation of the Khilafat with such guarantees as may be necessary for the protection of the interests of the non-Muslim race living under Turkish rule and the Khalif's control over Arabia and the Holy Places with such arrangement as may be required for guaranteeing Arab selfrule, should the Arabs desire it. It is hardly possible to state the claim more fairly than has been done. It is a claim backed by justice, by the declarations of British ministers and by the unanimous Hindu and Muslim opinion. It would be midsummer madness to reject or whittle down a claim so backed.

Young India, 28-1-1920

208. LETTER TO FATIMA SULTANA¹

[After January 28, 1920]

DEAR MADAM,

I have your papers forwarded to me from Ahmedabad. I have read them and I feel that I am unable to help you in the matter.

I enclose the paper herewith registered post.

Yours sincerely,

From the pencilled original in Gandhiji's hand : S. N. 7077

¹ This was in reply to the addressee's letter dated January 28, 1920 in which she had requested Gandhiji to secure for her some land or a monthly subsistence from the Government with which she could pass the remaining days of her life peacefully.

209. LETTER TO V.T. AGASHE

LAHORE,
January 29, 1920

V. T. AGASHE, ESQ.

POONA CITY

DEAR SIR,

I have gone through your memorial.

- (1) Have the European pensioners been granted an increase?
- (2) Have all the pensioners in the United Kingdom [been] granted an increase?
- (3) Are not the pensioners here capable of and, in the majority of cases, adding to their pensions by some employment?

The case for the pensioners does not appear on sight to be one of unavoidable relief from the public purse.

Yours sincerely,

From a photostat of the office copy in Gandhiji's hand : S. N. 7080

210. LETTER TO SIR GEORGE BARNES

LAHORE,
January 29, 1920

DEAR SIR GEORGE BARNES,

I thank you for your letter of the 21st instant¹ regarding the situation in East Africa and for the sympathetic assurances contained therein. May I, however, draw your attention to one sentence in your letter? With reference to the proposed "Undesirables Ordinance", you say, "It is not possible to question the right of any government to remove 'undesirables' from the country over which it exercises jurisdiction." Whilst the above statement is perfect as a theoretical proposition, in the East African case, seeing that the legislation is aimed at Indians and that the term "undesirable" has an artificial meaning I venture to think that it is not only open to the Government

¹ This was evidently in reply to Gandhiji's letter of January 13, 1920.

of India, but it is their duty to protest against the proposed measure and its use.

Yours sincerely,
M. K. GANDHI

Young India, 4-2-1920

211. LETTER TO ESTHER FAERING

January 29, 1920

MY DEAR CHILD,

I passed two days by without writing but not without thinking or talking of you. Your health is not what it should be. You may not be able to digest *chapati*. You should then take the usual loaf. Anasuyabehn will bring it for you. Tell Imam Sahib about it. And you may take milk in the morning with some fruit and bread and *dahi*¹ in rice for breakfast, with some vegetables simply boiled. Perhaps the dal² may not suit you. Thus a little bread, a little rice, a little vegetable and *dahi* may be your breakfast. In the evening too it may be this. And a little fresh fruit, an orange, say, at noon; whether this is proper or something else you will finally decide. Only you must put your body right even as an artisan's first duty is to keep his tools in order. God has given us this body as a tool to be used efficiently for His service neither for pampering nor for keeping in cotton wool but not even for abusing or spoiling it by neglect. This is a wretched sermon but much needed.

With love,

Yours,
BAPU

From a photostat of the handwritten original in N.A.I.; also *My Dear Child*, pp. 51-2

¹ Curds

² The original has "dholl".

212. LETTER TO ANASUYABEHN SARABHAI

LAHORE,

*Friday, [On or before January 30, 1920]*¹

RESPECTED ANASUYABEHN,

For the moment I am not too crowded here. I feel like writing to you about swadeshi. Are you paying attention to it at all? It is a stupendous work. It is fraught with difficulties but unless it is taken in hand there is no chance for the country to overcome starvation.

Vandemataram from
MOHANDAS

From the Gujarati original : S. N. 11572

213. LETTER TO ESTHER FAERING

Friday [January 30, 1920]

MY DEAR CHILD,

No letter from you today. I am surrounded by too many people who want me, to be able to write to you a love-letter. I therefore send you my prayers and all love.

Yours,
BAPU

[PS.]

Do give me a cheering and cheerful letter if you can.

M. K. G.

From a photostat of the handwritten original in N.A.I.; also *My Dear Child*,
p. 54

¹ From the contents; *vide* "Petition to Lord Ripon", 5-5-1895.

214. LETTER TO K. K. CHANDA

LAHORE,
January 30, 1920

DEAR MR. CHANDA,

I think you for your letter. I have not received the text of the new resolution referred to in your letter.

Even if the Viceroy had not ruled out your O'Dwyer resolution, I would have considered it to be premature.

Yours sincerely,

From a photostat of the office copy in Gandhiji's hand : S. N. 7079

215. TELEGRAM TO SHAUKAT ALI²

LAHORE,
[Before *January 31, 1920*]

DEPUTATION HAS SACRED MISSION. IT HAS TO APPEAL NOT MERELY TO IMPERIAL GOVERNMENT AND BRITISH OPINION BUT HAS TO WIN WORLD OPINION. ITS STRENGTH LIES IN ITS ABILITY TO APPEAL TO REASON AND JUSTICE. IT MUST THEREFORE BE MODERATE IN PRESENTATION AND FIRM IN DEMAND. ODDS FROM A WORLDLY STAND-POINT SEEM HEAVILY AGAINST US BUT IN PROPHET'S WORDS MINORITY OF TWO WHEN IT HAS GOD ON ITS SIDE CAN FACE OVERWHELMING NUMBERS WITH CONFIDENCE AND HOPE. IN MY OPINION HINDU INDIA SOLIDLY ON YOUR SIDE FOR YOUR CAUSE IS NOT MERELY SPIRITUALLY TRUE BUT IT IS MORALLY JUST AND PRESENTLY ENGLAND WILL BE ON OUR SIDE WHEN THROUGH DEPUTATION ENGLISHMEN LEARN THAT BRITISH HONOUR IS AT STAKE IN THIS QUESTION FOR WE ARE ASKING NOTHING MORE

¹ K.K. Chanda, a member of the Imperial Legislative Council, had written on January 28 that he was forwarding a draft of the amendment he was proposing to make in his own resolution on Sir Michael O'Dwyer, Lt.-Governor of the Punjab, during the martial law regime in April 1919. Chanda had requested for Gandhiji's suggestions in regard to the draft amendment. Moderate Party members were urging its withdrawal and the Viceroy disallowed it.

² This was read out at a public meeting held in Bombay on January 31, 1920.

THAN WHAT BRITISH MINISTERS HAVE PLEDGED THEMSELVES
TO GIVE. MAY GOD GUIDE DEPUTATION.

Young India, 11-2-1920

216. LETTER TO NARAHARI PARIKH

[On or before *January 31, 1920*]¹

BHAISHRI NARAHARI,

I have your letter. Mahadev, it seems has had to suffer much. He deserves to reach the end of the suffering now. Often, a person improves in health after an attack of typhoid if good care is taken later. It is also true that some remain weak for ever, Sundaram, for instance. He over-indulged his palate subsequently and ruined his health. You did well in writing to me. Your resolution not to let the Ashram inmates know is also correct. We have no right to criticize anyone if we cannot tolerate criticism by the other party. Hence it should be your vow to hold your tongue despite the charge levelled by Maganlal. It is necessary, however, to get out of this state of mind. We must draw a person's attention even to those of his weaknesses which he will not admit, unafraid that we might incur his displeasure by doing so. If we see a serpent moving up to a bed, we must wake up the sleeper though we know that he will kick at us. We do not always get an opportunity for doing this through a neutral intermediary. It is only on such seemingly trivial occasions that we can test ourselves. Till such time as you can act in this way, you may convey through me what you wish to.

I am writing to Anandshankarbhai about religious education and shall see if he agrees.

I have been a little concerned on hearing that Miss Faering has gone to Lilavatibehn's. Miss Faering is a very simple-minded girl. She puts trust in everyone all too readily. Lilavatibehn will befriend her for unworthy purposes. So let me know in more detail what happened and why she went. If anyone makes unworthy approaches to her, it would be a matter of shame for us. Do not talk about this. I have dropped a hint to Maganlal and do so to you.

Blessings from

BAPU

From a photostat of the Gujarati : S. N. 11888

¹ Gandhiji wrote to Anandshankar Dhruva, as he says, in this letter, on this date.

217. LETTER TO ANASUYABEHN SARABHAI

LAHORE,

*Saturday [On or before January 31, 1920]*¹

RESPECTED SISTER,

I have received your letter. The proposals you have got published with regard to the labourers appear all right to me. There appear to be signs of amity between workers and mill owners there. The main reason for it is the fact that you have largely got rid of the ill will towards the owners. Even now, the more you get over that ill will and inculcate the quality of humility I have no doubt the more will be the fruit that your act of service will bear. Each day I am directly experiencing how great a thing even-mindedness is. By making the workers persons of character, that is, by making them honest, hardworking and self-respecting, we shall be able to get much more work out of them. Whatever rules the workers formulate about their Union² keeping in mind the. . .³ element would do. None the less, if you send me the draft, I shall try to improve it.

Do not give up the work for swadeshi. Make the changes in the prices and the cotton rolls as I have suggested.

Mahadev is very ill. Pray keep visiting him. Look after Miss Faering⁴. Entertain Deepak⁵.

I hope to be there towards the end of February.

Vandemataram from

MOHANDAS

From a photostat of the Gujarati: G.N. 11578

¹ Inferred from the reference to the proposals regarding labourers. For Gandhiji's views on the subject, published on February 8, 1920, *vide* "Coondition of Labour", 8-2-1920. Saturday prior to February 7, 1920, was January 31.

² Labour Union of Ahmedabad; *vide* "Speech at Meeting of Mill-Hands, Ahmedabad", 25-2-1920.

³ Illegible in the source

⁴ Esther Faering, a Danish missionary, who was staying at the Satyagraha Ashram

⁵ Son of Rambhuj Dutt Chowdhary and Saraladevi

218. LETTER TO MRS. BROWN

LAHORE,

January 31, 1920

DEAR MRS. BROWN,

I thank you for your kind letter. I have just arrived in Lahore. I am now having the poster translated and shall make the necessary inquiry. I presume from your letter that you have acquired the site but you do not want to hurt people's feelings unnecessarily and that you want to prevent a misunderstanding and avoid if at all possible the persecution of those who are said to have distorted facts.

Yours sincerely,

From a photostat of the office copy in Gandhiji's hand : S. N. 7083.

219. LETTER TO ANANDSHANKAR DHURVA

January 31, 1920

DEAR FRIEND,

Herewith a letter I have received on the subject of books for religious education. Can you do something in the matter? Do you think you can bring out a *Mahabharata* and a *Ramayana* on the model of the *Bible Story* and similar books? I will henceforth use the money only for¹ It will be possible to obtain [the amount] by begging. I shall not bother you with the problem. Do you have the time? Would you like to write anything? I don't want books written by a mere scholar. Apart from you, I can't think of anyone who combines learning with character. That is why I am seeking your help. This is not the first time that such a request has been made to me. I want something which a child may read and which may help it to understand Hinduism.

I get reports from time to time that you maintain excellent health.

¹ Something is missing here in the source. Something is missing here in the source.

I received the photograph of the English spinning-wheel. More than the photograph itself, it was the love which made you think of sending it, which made me happy.

Do send me something for *Navajivan* when you get some time. A description of Kashi? Some account of the University? Panditji¹ has again and again expressed to me his happiness at your joining there. I felt quite proud.

PROF. ANANDSHANKAR DHURVA

KASHI

From a photostat of the Gujarati original: S. N. 7084

220. THE KHILAFAT

The question of the Khilafat² that is, of the peace terms with Turkey, is so important a one that before it all others fade into insignificance, for on a satisfactory solution of this problem depends the peace of India. The Government may with its armed might succeed in maintaining an artificial peace for the time being but, should the solution of this problem prove unsatisfactory, a peace enforced by strength of arms will not be an enduring peace. There are questions which may not be satisfactorily solved, but the dissatisfaction is forgotten in the course of time. If, however, the solution of the Khilafat problem is felt to be unsatisfactory, time will be no cure for the resulting discontent; on the contrary, the effects will grow in strength from day to day and unrest will go on increasing.

Hence it is the duty of every Indian to know what the problem is and know its right solution, and to take steps to bring about a satisfactory settlement. What has hurt seven crores of Muslims ought to hurt Hindus too. We do not, therefore, hesitate to place this issue before the people again and again. The Government's duty in this matter is as important as that of the people.

¹ Madan Mohan Malaviya.

² The Caliphate. The object of the Khilafat movement was to ensure that the Sultan of Turkey was restored to the status which he enjoyed before World War I.

The deputation which waited¹ on His Excellency the Viceroy included both Hindus and Muslims. His Excellency's reply was courteous. He showed the utmost consideration to the deputation and spared time for it from his heavy schedule of work. We should thank him for all this. But mere courtesy and good manners cannot satisfy the Muslims or the nation this time. Courtesy is essential at all times, but there are occasions when courtesy fails to meet one's object. There is a saying in English that "fine words butter no parsnips". This applies very well to the present situation.

The Viceroy pointed out that there was nothing strange in Turkey, having taken the sword against the Allies, paying the penalty for doing so. No Muslim would admit the justice of this. When Turkey threw in its lot with Germany, Mr. Asquith, the then Prime Minister, said that the Sultan had no hand in this step; it was the mistake of a few Turks and Turkey would not have to suffer for it. Why did he have to declare this? Surely, not for reasons of good manners or justice. He said it lest there be disaffection among Muslim troops. The result was as desired. The Muslim troops remained staunch in their loyalty. A promise of reward thus made in order to reassure people cannot be lightly set aside now. If it is, one should not be surprised that Muslims feel hurt. Thus the threat uttered by the viceroy or the hint dropped by him as to the shape of things to come is such as can lead only to discontent, and the statement issued² by the deputation in reply to the Viceroy is very much to the point. Let us hope that the Government will give its best attention to it.

What is the Muslim demand? The Khilafat means the Turkish Empire. Its authority should remain substantially what it was at the commencement of the War. The Allies may demand any guarantees they choose for the protection of the interests of non-Muslim subjects of the Empire. Turkish rule, however, should be preserved. Likewise, the Khalifa's control over Arabia which is called Jazirat-ul-Arab³ and

¹ On January 19, 1920. The deputation consisted of Gandhiji, Hakim Ajmal Khan and Maulanas Abul Kalam Azad, Abdul Bari, Mahomed Ali and Shaikat Ali.

² On January 20, 1920

³ Literally, "the island of Arabia" which, as defined by Muslim religious authorities, included Syria, Palestine and Mesopotamia as well as the peninsula of Arabia

over other holy places of Islam should remain. It has been objected against this that Arabs too are Muslims; why should they not [it is asked] have swaraj in Arabia? Our Muslim friends reply that they have no objection to a scheme of swaraj for Arabia. Their only claim is that Arabia should not be subject to any but Muslim authority. This demand of the Muslims is perfectly just. If it is rejected and unrest spreads in consequence, the responsibility will not be the Muslims' but the Government's.

It is not enough that the Government presented the Muslim claim effectively before the Peace Conference. It is in duty bound to make the Muslim cause its own. The Empire belongs as much to Muslims and Hindus as to Christians and, therefore, it cannot sacrifice Muslim interests any more than it will sacrifice Christian interests.

[From Gujarati]

Navajivan, 1-2-1920

221. LETTER TO ESTHER FAERING¹

LAHORE,

Sunday [Morning, February 1,]² 1920

MY DEAR CHILD,

You have been a bad child to keep me without a line for so many days. I do however hear about you from others. You are at a marriage party. I have felt a little disturbed. What is it all about? How could you have fared in the midst of strangers? It was wrong if you went as a matter of duty. For no duty lay on you to attend such parties. If you went for the sake of a change I don't know that you had a desirable change. Where was the party? What were the people? Did they know English? What was your food there? Where did you have to sleep? Who suggested your going? It seems all so strange to me. I do not want you to make experiments in the dark. It is early

¹ A Danish missionary who came to India in 1916 and later joined Sabarmati Ashram, where Gandhiji treated her as a daughter

² This and the following letter were written on the same day; *vide* the following item.

Sunday morning and I am filled with anxiety about you. I know it is stupid to be anxious. God is above us all to protect and guide His own. But you give me the privilege of calling you my child. 'Rock of ages, cleft for me; let me hide myself in Thee.'

With deep love,

Yours,

BAPU

From a photostat of the original in N.A.I.; also *My Dear Child*, pp. 54-5

222. LETTER TO NARAHARI PARIKH

[About *February 1, 1920*]¹

BHAISHRI NARAHARI²,

Esther has made a big mistake in leaving. I have repeatedly written to her and Maganlal. If she, of her own accord, shows my letters, you will find all of them worth reading. I am studying you all from this distance and, in the process, learning some things myself.

You are right in what you write about Kaka.³ If his health improves further, he will rise higher still. I have never ceased to think of him ever since I met him. But he needs a congenial atmosphere. In an unfriendly atmosphere, it is not unlikely that his spirit will wither. For some time past, he has been making himself very useful. For 'forceful' we may use the word *jabardust* [in Gujarati] but it does not convey the right shade of meaning. I shall think of another word. At the moment, I have some visitors.

Blessings from

BAPU

From a photostat of the Gujarati : S.N. 11886

¹ The reference to letters written to Esther Faering and Maganlal Gandhi on February 1, 1920, suggests this date.

² Narahari Dwarkadas Parikh

³ Dattatreya Balkrishna Kalelkar

223. LETTER TO ESTHER FAERING

LAHORE,

Sunday [February 1, 1920]¹

MY DEAR CHILD,

The enclosed² was written in the morning. I have just got your pencil letter. I do clearly see that you made a mistake in accepting the invitation. You are young, you are inexperienced. You have a golden heart but it needs steadying. What is a big ship without a rudder? Where does it go? Does it not drift? My heart weeps for you today. You have left a surrounding³ where you could grow after a fashion; you have come to a surrounding⁴ where you can grow much more if you will assimilate the surrounding. You must not prick yourself in your waywardness. A disciplined conscience is one to obey. It is the voice of God. An undisciplined conscience leads to perdition, for the devil speaks through it. I wish I was with you. 'Not everyone that sayeth unto me Lord, Lord, shall enter the kingdom of heaven, but he that doeth the will of my Father which is in heaven shall enter that kingdom.' I am quoting from memory but it will do.

Do put yourself under discipline. Never do anything without consulting Maganlal⁵. Let him be as elder brother to you. Come close to him. Ask for the food you need, take the rest you want and put your mind and body at rest.

Write to me daily a full letter.

I shall pray for you and love you all the more for your waywardness.

Yours,

BAPU

From a photostat of the original in N.A.I.; also *My Dear Child*, pp. 55-6

¹ It would appear from the contents that this letter was written immediately on receipt of Esther Faering's letter of January 30, 1920 (S.N. 7066). In 1920, the first Sunday after that was February 1.

² *Vide* the preceding item.

³ The Danish mission to which Esther Faering had belonged

⁴ The Ashram at Sabarmati

⁵ Maganlal Gandhi (1883-1928); second son of Khushalchand, Gandhiji's cousin; sometime manager of the Phoenix Settlement; Manager, Satyagraha Ashram, Sabarmati, 1915-28.

224. LETTER TO MAGANLAL GANDHI

LAHORE,

*Sunday [February 1, 1920]*¹

CHI. MAGANLAL,

There is a letter from Esther and hence I write this second letter to you. I have written to her as well. She made a great mistake in going.² I can see her weakness. This is how a holy soul falls. She claims too much independence. She feels humiliated to have to ask anyone. She is like a ship without a rudder. She has a large heart, but does not know what to do with it.

I have advised her in my letter that she should look upon you as an elder brother and obey you, discuss matters with you. You should see her and find out her needs. If necessary, she may stay with you. It is possible that, by herself, Ba will not be able to look after her. I so much want to be in the Ashram at this time. My heart is bleeding. It does not seem that Esther has done anything sinful. But I also believe that she may do such a thing in no time. This feeling may be only an expression of my fear.

Blessings from

BAPU

From the Gujarati original : C. W. 5782. Courtesy : Radhabehn Chowdhari

¹ This letter was evidently written on the same day as the preceding item.

² To attend a marriage party

225. PUNJAB LETTER¹

LAHORE,

Magh Sud 13 [February 2, 1920]

TWO DEPUTATIONS

Deputations from Fiji and British Guiana have been in India for some time.² The Fiji Islands are in the vicinity of Australia. During the last 50 years, there has been extensive cultivation of sugar-cane in these islands with the help of indentured labour from India and through this means the Australian Central Sugar Company has earned to the tune of crores. Our friend Andrews³ has graphically described to us the iniquity of the indenture system. Now, however, thanks to the firmness of the Viceroy, even the indentures whose terms had not expired have been terminated.⁴

British Guiana is a part of South America. It is situated south of the equator. Here also, sugar-cane is grown on a colossal scale and sugar can be produced at the rate of three tons per acre. In India the production is one ton per acre. This question is being investigated at the moment by the Sugar Committee, which has the well-known Mr. Burjorji Padshah as one of its members. It may, therefore, be hoped that some good will result from their deliberations. According to them, at present we may even be suffering losses in sugar-cane cultivation. Imported sugar is found cheaper and no one is thrown out of work by our not producing sugar in the country. I report this information just as it has come to my ears. I cannot say, either, that these are Mr. Padshah's final conclusions, nor do I wish to discuss the matter here. I merely mention this incidentally while on the subject of British Guiana.

Be the condition of our sugar trade what it may, British Guiana and Fiji have both prospered entirely because of this trade of theirs.

Indentured labourers used to emigrate to British Guiana as well.

¹ Gandhiji toured the Punjab in November and December 1919, and again in February 1920. From there he dispatched this weekly series of news-letters for *Navajivan*, the first appearing in the issue of November 2, 1919.

² Both were unofficial deputations.

³ C. F. Andrews (1871-1940); English missionary, author, educationist and a close associate of Gandhiji

⁴ The Government of Fiji cancelled all indentures with effect from January 2, 1920.

No knowledgeable person has visited that place and we are ignorant of the local labour conditions. Emigration of indentured labour to that place has also been stopped.

Consequently, it has now become a problem of great urgency for both the countries how to maintain their prosperity. If they are unable to secure further Indian labour, it will be a serious matter for them.

They cannot get British labourers for this work. The latter cannot settle in those parts, as they cannot stand the climate. If, therefore, they fail to secure Indian labour, they will have to think of China or other sources. It is said that they do not find the honesty and submissiveness of the Indian labourer in his Chinese counterpart.

These two deputations have come here to consult with the Indian Government and public men. They have come to ascertain under what conditions independent Indian labour may emigrate to these two places, and to make the required arrangements. I have met both the deputations here. The one from British Guiana includes their Attorney General¹ and some Indians long settled there. From Fiji have come the Bishop and another Englishman. The suggestion of British Guiana is that some of our agriculturists should emigrate voluntarily and take up farming there. They need not work as labourers. In British Guiana, there is equality between Indians and whites. This is not due to the magnanimity of the white people but is the result of circumstances. The British belong mainly to the officer class, and in any case cannot undertake agriculture. It need not be imagined that the whites in that area have cast off their prejudice against us. However, it may be admitted that in British Guiana they do not have two classes of citizens as in other countries, and If Indians settle there, they are not likely to be harassed as in East Africa.

In Fiji the conditions are different. The Fiji deputation does not ask for Indians of independent means but for Indians who will work as free labourers. The latter will go, not as indentured labourers but as independent workers, in the same way as they go to Singapore and other places.

I have been asked to give my opinion on both these matters. I have not yet done so publicly. The Attorney General of British Guiana has, however, taken my signature to certain observations I made to him.²

¹ Dr. Joseph Nunan

² Gandhiji met Dr. Nunan on February I, 1920.

I feel that we are not yet ready to send out “colonists”¹. Our people have not yet developed the requisite independence or self-reliance. Therefore, I think it unlikely that any independent labourers will, in fact, go. Nor do I think it possible that any agriculturists will go there as independent men and succeed in maintaining their independence.

There is not that ingenuity in us; we are not drawn to the idea of emigration, nor is there any need for us to emigrate. If an ignorant but adventurous class does emigrate, it is essential that it be followed by an educated class devoted to higher aims. If such men go to serve the people, I am sure that excellent results will follow. But there are few such men even in India. Where, then, are we to find any who might go abroad? Therefore, though I would not like peasants to be prevented by law from emigration to these parts as labourers or otherwise, I would not, directly or indirectly, encourage them to go either. All I can do at the moment is to place this humble opinion before my readers.

[From Gujarati]

Navajivan, 8-2-1920

¹ Here the original has the English word.

226. LETTER TO L. FRENCH¹

LAHORE,
February 3, 1920

Inquiries are daily being made with reference to those Martial Law and other political or semi-political prisoners not yet discharged. I have not worried you with even an inquiry, as I know it takes time to prepare lists of all the possible prisoners fit for discharge.

But if you could now tell me whether the other prisoners including Bhai Parmanand² and those who were sentenced during the Lahore Conspiracy trials are to be discharged [*sic*].

Exception has also been taken to the undertaking taken from the recent discharges.³ Is it possible to give a reason for making the distinction?

From a copy : S. N. 7102

227. BRITISH GUIANA AND FIJI DEPUTATIONS⁴

[Before February 4, 1920]⁵

There are at present two deputations in India from overseas. The one headed by its Attorney General, Dr. Nunan, is from British Guiana, and the other by the Bishop of Polynesia is from Fiji. Both these deputations have arrived from their respective colonies for the purpose of obtaining Indian labour. Hitherto both have had indentured labour. In both, the existing indentures have only just been cancelled.

¹ Then Chief Secretary to the Punjab Government

² A revolutionary leader of the Punjab who was sentenced to life transportation but was subsequently released; later became President of All-India Hindu Mahasabha

³ In his reply of February 6, 1920, the Chief Secretary stated that out of 734 prisoners, 638 had been released in view of His Majesty's Proclamation, that cases of those sentenced under the Lahore Conspiracy trials (including Bhai Parmanand's) were still under consideration and that undertakings had been taken from those charged with the more serious non-political offences.

⁴ *Vide* also "Punjab Letter", 2-2-1920, "Letter to V. S. Srinivasa Sastri", before February 4, 1920, and "Letter to Dr. Joseph Nunan", February 5, 1920.

⁵ This article was evidently written before February 4, 1920; *vide* the following item.

His Excellency the Viceroy, whose attitude on the status of British Indians living in the different colonies has been generally correct, put the popular case very clearly when His Excellency said that India could not be expected to consider the convenience of the colonies at her own expense nor could the Government of India prevent free Indian emigration if there were Indians who wanted to go to any of the colonies with a view to bettering their own position. His Excellency further added that a committee of probably non-official members would be appointed to confer with these deputations and consider the question, and that the Government would be guided by the advice of that committee.¹

Now let us examine the position. The British Guiana deputation wants free Indian settlers of the farmer type for its plantations. The Fiji deputation wants free in the place of indentured labour. Both are tropical countries chiefly growing sugar-cane. These colonies unlike South Africa and the Uplands of East Africa cannot hold European colonists. These places are not fit for European colonization, but they are being developed by European capital assisted by Indian labour. If they cannot get Indian labour, whether as servants or master workers, they must tap some other sources, possibly China.

I had the pleasure of meeting both the deputations—the British Guiana more than once. From British Guiana there have been no complaints of ill-treatment of its indentured Indians. There is no doubt that there are no legal inequalities in British Guiana. In Fiji, too, there are probably no glaring inequalities in law. I believe, too, that the Fiji Government and the planters are now willing to treat the Indian labour better and offer better terms.²

The question for us, however, to consider is : do we want Indian labour to go to these colonies, and, if we do, are the terms such as would make the Indians morally and materially better?

In my opinion we want all the labour we have in India. A willing labourer has ample scope for earning a substantial living in India. Our industries require labour. India is not over-populated. The pure agriculturist does not need to go out of India to earn a

¹ In February 1920, a resolution was accepted by the Indian Legislative Council appointing this Committee.

² In the beginning of 1920 Indian labourers in Fiji went on a strike apparently designed to secure better pay and working conditions but which subsequently led to serious disorder which was forcibly repressed.

living. Emigration cannot solve the problem of Indian poverty. The causes are too deep and widespread to be solved by a scheme of emigration no matter how ambitious it may be. A few thousand emigrants going out every year can produce no effect on the deep and deepening poverty of the vast masses of India. My conviction is that the returned emigrants in the majority of cases disrupt the home life without doing any counter-balancing benefit to society in general or the members of the home so disrupted in particular. Whilst, therefore, I would not interfere with any agriculturist, I would not encourage him to leave India unless there was a distinct moral advantage to be gained by emigrating.

We are not a colonizing nation in the modern sense of the term. The labourers are not followed by their better-class countrymen who whilst they would want to earn a living would make it dependent upon their service of their countrymen. The religious and the social tie is loosened. The restraints of Indian environment do not follow the emigrant. Going therefore to an environment which has become debased by servility and degraded by the inevitable immorality of the system under which his predecessors have lived, the new emigrant succumbs to that environment. It is not right to expose the would-be emigrants to such grave moral risks.

Both the deputations have urged that it is our duty to send more emigrant families in order that the deficiency in the female Indian population may be redressed. In other words we should send more women to these colonies. I totally dissent from the view. I would not be a party to sending a single woman to be exposed to a life of shame. The only remedy for the evil to which both the colonies and the Government of India have been party is for the superfluous young men, if they are so minded, to come to India, get decently married and take their wives with them. Such an uplifting movement can only come from the colonies. And I suggest to both the deputations that if they are in earnest about the moral welfare of the Indian settlers in their midst they will start societies in the colonies for the encouragement of young men temporarily returning to India for the purpose of seeking life-companions. Indeed, the mention of this great difficulty tempts me to say that if both the missions were to occupy themselves in clearing the moral atmosphere around them, one would be better able to respond to their mission.

Moreover, no scheme of free emigration can be really successful until the relations between Englishmen and ourselves have

considerably improved everywhere. The Englishman in South Africa is no worse than in India or in Fiji and British Guiana. In South Africa a short-sighted conception of his interest demands expulsion of the Indian. And he is struggling between his conscience and his interest. In British Guiana his interest and conscience coincide. He therefore desires Indian settlement. But he no more considers the Indian to be his equal than the Englishman in South Africa. What is more, the average Indian considers that he is not the Englishman's equal. There is, therefore, mutual distrust, despise [*sic*] on the one hand and fear on the other. Until the relations become normal and natural it is not proper to encourage or countenance even free emigration to these colonies.

These deputations, I take it, propose to set up a kind of agency or bureau for the collection of the type of emigrants they require. I cannot contemplate with equanimity the idea of Indians going to Fiji as free labourers. With their present equipment, they would not know the distinction between free and indentured labour after being in Fiji. In British Guiana the agriculturist will not know what to do with himself and would drift into the plantations as a labourer. Side by side with this free agency, there must be a corresponding advisory agency on our part to enable the people to make their choice. I have suggested an experimental shipment to Dr. Nunan and the sending of Mr. C. F. Andrews or some leading Indian with a knowledge of labour conditions to British Guiana and report [*sic*]. This is about as much as is possible to be done at the present moment. And I hope that neither the proposed non-official committee nor the public will countenance anything more.

Young India, 11-2-1920

228. LETTER TO V. S. SRINIVASA SASTRI

[Before February 4, 1920]¹

DEAR MR. SHASTRI²

I know the Fiji and the Br. Guiana deputations have seen you or will presently see you. I have just sent off an article³ for *Young India* which cannot be published before Wednesday week. It will be sent to you in due course. But meanwhile I wish to say that I distrust the objects of the mission. The members are well meaning enough. But they cannot understand our difficulty. I feel that we cannot countenance any emigration at the present moment. It is like good milk added to bad milk also going bad. The environment in Fiji and British Guiana is reeking with the odour of indentured labour. Let the pestilential odour go before we can send a new supply of emigrants. True, now it is a question of free agency and free labour. But we must advise our countrymen. I have suggested to Dr. Nunan that if he would get a cultured Indian to go to British Guiana to report it would be good. I have said too that I do not mind a shipment of agriculturists going as an experiment. Can you spare Amritlal Thakkar⁴ for a visit to these places, or Tiwary? Dr. Nunan has agreed to pay the expenses.

I hope you are keeping good health.

Yours sincerely,

From a copy : S. N. 7393

¹ The article to the publication of which Gandhiji refers in the text appeared in *Young India* of Wednesday, February 11, 1920. Both the article and this letter must therefore have been written before Wednesday, February 4, 1920.

² Rt. Hon. V. S. Srinivasa Sastri (1869-1946); educationist and orator; President, Servants of India Society, 1915-27; member, Viceroy's Legislative Council and Council of State; Agent General of the Indian Government in South Africa

³ *Vide* the preceding item.

⁴ Amritlal Vithaldas Thakkar (1869-1951); Gujarati engineer who, as life member of Servants of India Society, took up full-time social work and later devoted himself to the cause of Harijans and aboriginal tribes

229. LETTER TO ESTHER FAERING

Wednesday [February 4, 1920]¹

MY DEAR CHILD,

I have your letters. It is no use crying over spilt milk. How to mend matters now is the question. You shall certainly go where you wish during Easter or any time. Your mental and spiritual happiness is the primary consideration. For the irregularity you mention there is a sovereign remedy tried by L. K. It consists in hip and friction baths and a diet without salt and other condiments. We have the book at the Ashram. Read it. S. K. and others know it. Ba also has tried them for a number of years with the best of results. Do try them whilst you are there. Please don't hesitate to get bread. It is such a simple thing to procure.

I agree with you that you should have a quiet time and spiritual communion. Why will you not go to the church in Ahmedabad? But this is not suggested in the place of the convent. God will guide you and give strength and light.

With prayers and love,

Yours,

BAPU

From a photostat of the original in N.A.I.; also *My Dear Child*, pp. 52-3

¹ Judging from the contents, it would appear that this letter was written very soon after the letters of February 1 to the addressee, and the first Wednesday after February 1 in 1920 was February 4.

230. LETTER TO BRIJSUNDER DASS

2. MOZANG ROAD,
LAHORE,
February 5, 1920

DEAR B. BRIJSUNDER DASS,

I have received your printed circular on the Oriya Movement.¹ I have not got the papers; probably they will follow. I would, however, like you to keep me informed of the progress that the Movement may make from time to time. I am giving a paragraph² to it in *Young India* which, I hope, you receive.

Yours sincerely,

PRESIDENT
ORIYA PEOPLE'S ASSOCIATION
CUTTACK

From a photostat : S. N. 7105

231. LETTER TO ESTHER FAERING

LAHORE,
*Thursday [February 5, 1920]*³

MY DEAR CHILD,

I see I have hurt you; forgive me. I wrote as I did because I love you so. I am afraid it is no use your coming here, because I shall be touring from the 11th.⁴ So I cannot be with you even if you come. I hope to be with you on the 23rd at the latest.⁵ And we shall have some time at least together. Meanwhile please take the hip and the sitz baths. And why will you not be examined by the doctor who is there? If I were you I should have no such compunction. But I don't wish to press you.

With prayerful love,

Yours,
BAPU

From a photostat of the original in N.A.I.; also *My Dear Child*, p. 57

¹ *Vide* "A Cry from Utkal", 18-2-1920.

² *ibid*

³ The letter appears to have been written just after "Letter to Esther Faering", February 4, 1920.

⁴ Gandhiji was on tour in the Punjab from February 11 to February 15.

⁵ Gandhiji reached Sabarmati Ashram on February 22.

232. LETTER TO DR. JOSEPH NUNAN

February 5, 1920

DEAR DR. NUNAN,

I enclose herewith an extract from the *Daily Argosy* sent by Mr. Polak¹. You will see from it that there seems to be a party in British Guiana opposed to your scheme. They evidently consider it to be not a Colonization Scheme but one intended to find labour. Will you please let me know who this party is and what exact position [it] is that you wish to reach. I have written for *Young India* an article setting forth my views; you will have a copy as soon as it is published. This extract from the *Argosy* has certainly unsettled me a bit and it makes me revise ever over what I have written for *Young India*. As soon as I get a moment's leisure I propose to put down my own thoughts of what any Colonization Scheme should be if it is to give any satisfaction at all and to receive any countenance even from those [of] you [who] believe in emigration.

Yours sincerely,

From a copy : S. N. 7393

233. LETTER TO V. S. SRINIVASA SASTRI

2, MOZANG ROAD,

LAHORE,

February 5, 1920

DEAR MR. SHASTRI,

I have your letter which I hope to reply in a day or two; meanwhile I enclose an extract received from Mr. Polak. The extract adds to the difficulty of even considering a scheme of emigration, however nice it may appear on paper. I am trying, however, to draft some kind of a scheme which should be a minimum scheme for those who are prepared to consider a scheme of emigration.

Yours sincerely,

From a copy : S. N. 7393

¹ H. S. L. Polak, who had been a close associate of Gandhiji in South Africa

234. TELEGRAM¹ TO C. R. DAS²

LAHORE,

[On or after *February 5, 1920*]

IMPOSSIBLE LEAVE. MUST FINISH WORK³ BEFORE TWENTIETH.

GANDHI

From a photostat : S. N. 7104

235. VALUE OF KHADI

Mr. Vithaldas Jerajani sends news from Bombay that the demand for khadi there has gone down or altogether vanished. This was painful reading for me, but not at all surprising. It was painful because the reduced demand indicates that our enthusiasms are short-lived, that they lack the backing of a religious sentiment or ideal. The people who, in the name of religion, are prepared to drink dirty water, the Hindus who, in the name of religion, abstain from eating while travelling in a train and prefer to remain hungry for fear of pollution, the Muslims who refuse to eat meat unless it has been prepared in a specific way—if such a people were to view the use of khadi as a duty dictated by compassion, as something holy, they would not give it up.

That all khadi is not of equally good quality; that is easily crumples and coat and trousers do not remain stiff; it shrinks so much that the sleeve recedes from the wrist to the elbow; it looks like a sieve so much so that *moong*⁴ grains can easily pass through it: people perhaps have had experience of one or the other of all these things but my personal experience is that the more I wear khadi shirts the softer they feel. I do not find even the dhotis heavy, so that now I find it something of a hardship to have to wear machine-made dhotis. All this may be sheer fancy; anyway, for me wearing khadi is a matter of dharma.

¹ Sent in reply to a telegram, dated February 5, 1920, inviting Gandhiji to Calcutta, presumably to attend the Bengal Provincial Khilafat Conference held in the last week of February under the presidentship of Maulana Azad. Gandhiji drafted this reply on the back of the telegram from C. R. Das, evidently on or after February 5.

² Chitta Ranjan Das (1870-1925); eminent lawyer and Congress leader; orator and author; elected President of the Congress in 1921

³ In regard to the Punjab Disorders Inquiry, as the meeting of the Commissioners appointed by the Congress Punjab Sub-committee was to be held at Banaras on February 20, 1920, to finalize the draft report

⁴ one of the pulses

How is all this khadi made? The yarn is spun mostly by our poor sisters. The lives of some of them were wretched, but have now improved; again, there are those who had no occupation, but have now begun to earn an anna a day, if not more. They can use it for buying vegetables for the family or milk for their children. The anna we casually throw away in Bombay is certainly worth four annas in the villages.

Those who weave this khadi are weavers who had either left off their profession or were about to do so.

Using khadi is the foundation of swadeshi, since khadi is the only thing which can be made from thick yarn, and made easily. It has not so far had to compete with machine-made cloth. The consumption of khadi alone enables lakhs of poor people to earn an honest living, staying at home.

This khadi will show, it has been showing, daily improvement. It has a variety of uses. If shirts made of it seem impossible, loose shirts and underwear are decidedly wearable. Handkerchiefs, large and small, can be made of it, also covering for pillows and bedding. It can be used for making quilts. It can thus be put to a variety of uses. I do not say, of course, that those who have no need of new clothes should throw away their money just that they might use khadi; even if that is done, the advantage to the people will not be very great. I do certainly say, however, that we should use khadi alone wherever it is possible to use it. A good use for khadi will easily be found if one is keen on it.

The effort to increase production of khadi continues; in fact production has increased. Now efforts must also be made to sell it. In this I want help from the Bombay business men. Suggestions for necessary improvements in khadi will also prove useful. Wherever swadeshi stores have been opened, they should proceed to order khadi. Besides khadi, production of other goods will also increase. It is only when people develop a liking for hand-woven, swadeshi good that hand-spinning and hand-weaving will gather full speed.

From my experience in the Punjab I see that, if people cultivated a sincere regard for swadeshi, large numbers of Punjabi women would take up their ancient occupation of spinning. The Punjab can easily turn into a swadeshi centre. It produces cotton, almost every Punjabi woman knows spinning and there are weavers in the Punjab. It has everything necessary. But, at present, Bombay is the centre of

business and hence the co-operation of its business men is also required.

[From Gujarati]

Navajivan, 8-2-1920

236. *CONDITION OF LABOUR*¹

Two paths are open before India today, either to introduce the western principle of 'might is right' or to uphold the eastern principle that truth alone triumphs, that truth knows no mishap, that the strong and the weak have alike a right to secure justice. The choice is to begin with the labouring class. Should the labourers obtain an increment in their wages by violence, even if that be possible? They cannot resort to anything like violence howsoever legitimate their claim may be. To use violence for securing rights may seem an easy path, but it proves to be thorny in the long run. Those who live by the sword also die by the sword. The swimmer often dies by drowning. Look at Europe. No one seems to be happy there; no one is contented. The labourer does not trust the capitalist and the capitalist has no faith in the labourer. Both have a sort of vigour and strength but even the bulls have it. They fight to the very bitter end. All motion is not progress. We have got no reason to believe that the people of Europe are progressing. Their possession of wealth does not argue the possession of any moral or spiritual qualities. King Duryodhana² was a master of untold wealth, but with all that he was pauper in comparison to Vidura³ and Sudama⁴. Today the world adores Vidura and Sudama, whereas Duryodhana's name is remembered only as a byword for the evil qualities one should shun.

What shall we do then? The labourers in Bombay made a fine stand. I was not in a position to know all the facts⁵. But this much I could see that they could fight in a better way. The millowner may be wholly in the wrong. In the struggle between capital and labour it may be generally said that more often than not the capitalists are in

¹ This translation is reproduced from *Young India*, 11-2-1920.

² Characters in the *Mahabharata*. Duryodhana was the eldest son of King Dhritarashtra and the leader of the Kaurava princes in the battle of Mahabharata while Vidura, 'the wisest of the wise', was adviser to the Pandava and Kaurava princes.

³ *ibid*

⁴ A poor Brahmin friend of Lord Krishna

⁵ Regarding the strike of mill-hands in Bombay in January 1920

the wrong. But when labour comes fully to realize its strength, I know it can become more tyrannical than capital. The mill-owners will have to work on the terms dictated by labour if the latter could command intelligence of the former. It is clear, however, that labour will never attain to that intelligence. If it does, labour will cease to be labour and become itself the master. The capitalists do not fight on the strength of money alone. They do possess intelligence and tact.

The question before us is this : when the labourers, remaining what they are, develop a certain consciousness what should be their course? It would be suicidal if the labourers rely upon their numbers or brute force, i. e., violence. By so doing they will do harm to industries in the country. If, on the other hand, they take their stand on pure justice and suffer in their person to secure it, not only will they always succeed but they will reform their masters, develop industries and both masters and men will be as members of one and the same family. A satisfactory solution of the condition of labour must include the following :

1. The hours of labour must leave the workmen some hours of leisure.
2. They must get facilities for their own education.
3. Provision should be made for an adequate supply of milk, clothing and necessary education for their children.
4. There should be sanitary dwellings for the workmen.
5. They should be in a position to save enough to maintain themselves during their old age.

None of these conditions is satisfied today. For this both the parties are responsible. The masters care only for the service they get. What becomes of the labourers does not concern them. All their endeavours are generally confined to obtaining maximum service with minimum payment. The labourer on the other hand, tries to hit upon all tricks whereby he can get maximum pay with minimum work. The result is that although the labourers get an increment there is no improvement in the work turned out. The relations between the two parties are not purified and the labourers do not make proper use of the increment they get.

A third party has sprung up between these two parties. It has become the labourers' friend. There is need for such a party. Only to the extent to which this party has disinterested friendship for the labourers can it befriend them.

A time has come now when attempts will be made to use labour

as a pawn in more ways than one. The occasion demands consideration at the hands of those that would take part in politics. What will they choose? Their own interest or the service of labour and the nation? Labour stands in sore need of friends. It cannot proceed without a lead. What sort of men give this lead will decide the condition of labour.

Strikes, cessation of work and hartal are wonderful things no doubt, but it is not difficult to abuse them.¹ Workmen ought to organize themselves into strong Labour Unions, and on no account shall they strike work without the consent of these Unions. Strikes should not be risked without previous negotiations with the mill-owners. If the mill-owners resort to arbitration the principle of *panchayat*² should be accepted. And once the *panch* are appointed, their decision must be accepted by both the parties alike, whether they like it or not.

Readers, if you are interested in ameliorating the condition of labour, if you want to befriend the workman and serve him, you will see from the above that there is only one royal road before you, viz., to elevate the workmen by creating between the two parties family relationship. And to secure this end there is no path like truth. Mere increase in wages not satisfy you; you must also watch by what means they get it and how they spend it.

[From Gujarati]

Navajivan, 8-2-1920

¹ There were 200 strikes in India during the year 1920. *India in 1920*, Ch. V.

² The traditional Indian practice of getting local disputes settled by the *panch*, a permanent committee of five elders chosen by members of the community

237. LETTER TO ESTHER FAERING

Sunday [February 8, 1920]¹

MY DEAR CHILD,

I have seen your pathetic letter to S. I am glad you have poured out your heart in it. I have telegraphed² to you today asking you not to leave³ before I reach if you can at all stay. I want to have a few long chats with you in the early morning which I get only at the Ashram. I could urge you too to have the baths I have suggested. Ask for the water to be brought to you.

Are you an unworthy child? You have made yourself dearest to me by your wonderful love and conscientiousness. You do not for one moment think that your waywardness can make any alteration in my estimation of your worthiness. It is my privilege to point out where you need strengthening. If the body is the temple of the Holy, it requires the utmost care—certainly not pampering but equally certainly not disregard or even indifference.

With deep love always mingled with prayer,

Yours,

BAPU

From a photostat of the original in N.A.I.; also *My Dear Child*, pp. 56-7

238. LETTER TO L. FRENCH

LAHORE,

February 9, 1920

I thank you for your prompt, full and frank reply to my letter of the 3rd instant. I am sure everybody appreciates the manner in which the Royal Proclamation⁴ is being given effect to and I hope that the remaining prisoners whether convicted under Martial Law or other special laws, will be soon released.

With regard to the undertaking taken from the recent discharges,

¹ From the contents it appears that this letter was written after the letters of Sunday, February 1, 1920 to the addressee and before the letter of Sunday, February 15, 1920, on which date Gandhiji left Lahore. The letter must, therefore, have been written on the Sunday in between, what is, on February 8.

² This telegram is not available.

³ Sabarmati Ashram

⁴ Issued on December 23, 1919, announcing Royal clemency to political prisoners

whilst I appreciate the force of your reasoning, I cannot help submitting that it would have been more gracious had the men been unconditionally released specially as the popular belief is that the majority of the convictions were unwarranted.

From a copy : S. N. 7114; also N. A. I.: Home, Political (A), March 1920, No. 327

239. LETTER TO NARAHARI D. PARIKH

Lahore, [February 9, 1920]¹

BHAISHRI NARAHARI,

Enclosed is a letter to Deepak. Read it and give it to him. See if he understands it. This is the third time that Saraladevi has sent Deepak away from her. Her old mother is not pleased and I do not think that Panditji² is, either, but he has never stood in Saraladevi's way. It is her earnest wish that the boy should become a scholar and a man of character. We should help as much as we can in this. Make arrangements for his Sanskrit and Bengali [studies]. He will easily learn Bengali if Manindra teaches him. Why not have him write to Saraladevi in beautiful Bengali, or let him write sometimes in Bengali and sometimes in English?

Blessings from

BAPU

From a photostat of the Gujarati: S.N. 11885

¹ From the S.N. Register for letters to the addressee dated February 12 and 13; *vide* also "Letter to Narahari Parikh", 12-2-1920; 13-2-1920.

² Pandit Rambhuj Dutt Chowdhary, father of Deepak

240. STATEMENT ON SOUTH AFRICAN COMMISSION¹

LAHORE,

February 9, 1920

I do not think that the Commission² is a strong Commission. Certainly it is not an impartial Commission. So far as the terms of reference are concerned, I am not disposed to quarrel with them. Indeed I would have, if it was at all possible, avoided a Commission altogether and obtained relief regarding land and trading by other means. But I am inclined to think that it is possible for Sir Benjamin Robertson to secure the rights of ownership of land and trading which are in imminent danger. The whole situation hinges round the strength that the Government of India through Sir Benjamin Robertson puts forth. It is difficult for me to go further in the absence of any cablegram from South Africa which I expect hourly from our people. It is a matter of great consolation that Mr. Andrews is on the spot.³ He knows the people and he knows the members of the present South African Ministry and other public men of South Africa.

The Tribune, 10-2-1920

241. LETTER TO NARAHARI PARIKH

Sunday [February 9, 1920]⁴

BHAISHRI NARAHARI,

Your letter received today has given me a fright. Jivraj Mehta believes, though, that your telegram received the day before yesterday must have been of a later date. That, and the absence of any

¹ Made to a representative of *The Tribune*

² Appointed by the South African Government to enquire into the question of Asiatics trading and holding land in South Africa. The Commission was assisted by Sir Benjamin Robertson on behalf of the Government of India and sat from March to July, 1920.

³ C. F. Andrews was in Africa from December 1919 to March 1920.

⁴ Dr. Jivraj Mehta was with Gandhiji for some time during this month (*vide* "Punjab Letter", 29-2-1920). On February 16, 1920, which was a Sunday, both arrived in Banaras. It is likely that Gandhiji wrote this letter from Lahore, where he spent most of the time from January 23, 1920, to February 15, 1920, after his letter to Narahari Parikh, written about January 31, 1920, in which he mentions Mahadev Desai's illness. The following Sunday, February 2, is obviously too early a date for this letter.

subsequent telegram, reassures me. If I didn't have on hand the Punjab work, I would not remain here a moment longer but would hasten there and embrace Mahadev. For the present, however, I can only embrace him through you all. Many such clouds have cleared from over my head and I cling to the hope that this, too, will clear.

Blessings from

BAPU

From a photostat of the Gujarati : S.N. 11884

242. LETTER TO ESTHER FAERING

LAHORE,

Tuesday [February 10]¹, 1920

MY DEAR CHILD,

I have your dear telegram and two letters in one day. I had telegraphed before I received your letter about your father. I am sure that you should answer that call by going² as early as possible. Only I want to have many a chat with you before you go. Never mind the weakness of body today. I would like you still to consider the Ashram as your home to which you could return whenever you wished to. If you feel like going now to Madras and come back on your way to Denmark you may do so. But I prefer seeing you before you go to Madras. But pray do whatever is in your opinion best. Take warm baths and you will get rid of the rash. The hip baths must do you good.

I want Devdas³ to go with you. I shall discuss it with him and with you when we meet. The idea of Mahadev going attracts me more.

D. has a little book given to him by a missionary. It is called *The Inner Shrine*. In a hymn I read these lines: "With happy grief and mourn-ful joy, /My spirit now is filled", and at once I thought of

¹ Gandhiji left Lahore on Sunday, February 15, 1920, and this letter seems to have been written shortly before his departure.

² To Denmark

³ Devdas Gandhi (1900-1957); youngest son of Gandhiji; worked in Champaran villages in 1917 and went to jail during the Salt Satyagraha, 1930; managing editor *The Hindustan Times*; twice president of Indian & Eastern Newspapers Society

you. 'Happy grief' and 'mournful joy' are wonderful expressions. But no more today.

With love and prayer,

Yours,

BAPU

From a photostat of the original in N.A.I., also *My Dear Child*, pp. 50-1

243. PUNJAB LETTER

[Before February 11, 1920]¹

JALLIANWALA BAGH

The Hon'ble Pandit Malaviya had announced during the Congress session² that Jallianwala Bagh³ had become the nation's property. But later, serious difficulties were encountered. There was nothing in writing and some of the joint proprietors changed their mind. They thought of presenting a small part of the Bagh to the nation and putting the rest to sale. Everything was done to explain to them that a cemetery should not be cut up, that there was not a corner of that garden which had not been stained by the blood of innocent men and it would be improper, therefore, to exploit it for financial gain. Moreover, it had been announced through a staunch worker, grown old in the service of India, that the entire Bagh had become the nation's property. In these circumstances, it was undesirable that there be any division of the plot. The owners, however, who had changed their mind remained unconvinced. Finally, Panditji and Swami Shraddhanand⁴ had to go to Amritsar. A settlement has now been reached and a temporary agreement signed.

FIVE LAKHS

The land has been valued at rupees five lakhs and it has been agreed to pay the amount within three months. If payment is not made by the end of that period, there is every danger that the land will be lost to the public.

¹ The letter seems to have been written before Gandhiji's visit to Gujrat on this date mentioned in "Punjab Letter", 15-2-1920.

² Held at Amritsar in December 1919

³ The site of the tragedy of April 13, 1919

⁴ Munshiram Nanakchand (1856-1926); later known as Shraddhanand; nationalist leader of Arya Samaj who took a prominent part in public activities in Delhi and the Punjab

The next step, now, is to collect this amount in as short a time as possible. The best thing is that every citizen should contribute his mite to the cause; that will bring honour to the nation and raise it higher. This Bagh is a unique thing, a consecrated spot. We want that it should become a place of pilgrimage for us. During the Congress, thousands visited it. Thousands had come only for this purpose. Hardwar is a pilgrim centre for Hindus, but the term does not include Jains, Sikhs and others who do not call themselves Hindus. For Muslims, Christians, Parsis and Jews, it is certainly not a holy place. Jallianwala Bagh, on the other hand, is a sacred spot for all who were born or who live in India. At least, we want it to be so. This idea does not have its source in hatred but is born of our love for those innocent men and women who lost their lives. In visiting the Bagh, our purpose is not to remind ourselves of General Dyer's¹ cruelty. Men have always made mistakes. We do not want to keep alive the memory of General Dyer's wrong and thereby feed our hatred. Even so, if we do not preserve the memory of the innocent, the nation would perish. The sacrifice of innocent people, killed for no crime of theirs, is a great opportunity to a nation to raise itself higher. If the people do not treasure the memory of such an event, then, as a spendthrift, careless of his wealth, becomes a pauper, so the nation also will become insolvent. If, on the contrary, it treasures this wealth, it is bound to prosper. If 500 or 1,000 innocent persons deliberately embrace death, this will have the effect of raising the country instantaneously, an effect so tremendous as to be regarded a miracle. Maybe we cannot bring about such a miraculous result from the slaughter of the innocent people in the Jallianwala Bagh; the event, however, will always be recognized as a potent influence in uniting Hindus and Muslims and in creating an awakening throughout the land. It is, therefore, our duty to see that it every lives in our memory.

If this idea is right, then everyone, great or small, rich or poor, can join in collecting these five lakhs. If a single person donates the amount, we may, thanks to our inertia and laziness, feel relieved, but the spiritual value of the place will be reduced. If there crores and 20 lakhs of Indians contribute one pice each, five lakhs will easily be

¹ Reginald Edward Harry Dyer (1864-1927); Officer Commanding, Amritsar Area, who ordered firing on a peaceful assembly of people gathered at the Jallianwala Bagh; *vide* "Congress Report on the Punjab Disorders", 25-3-1920.

made up and all will agree that a spot purchased with the money so collected will be most sacred indeed. If, when offering the pice, the people would also meditate on the subject, its holiness would be even further enhanced.

Already the question has arisen as to how to collect this sum so that the minimum is spent in the process and the danger of misappropriation avoided. There is apprehension that dishonest people may collect money for themselves on the pretext of collecting it for the Bagh fund, and misuse it.

PRACTICAL WAY OUT

The practical way out of this is for an honest man in every village to take it upon himself to collect the money. He should, at once, forward the amount to the main committee. Contributions should never be handed over to anyone except a person known to one. By "known" we mean a person in whom one has trust. This person should immediately present the account to the people of the village.

MODE OF COLLECTION

Those who collect contributions must not bring pressure on anyone but rely entirely on persuasion. Although it should be our aim to collect the amount pice by pice, yet it is only proper that all contribute to the best of their capacity. It has never happened in this world, and obviously it should not happen, that the rich and the poor contribute equally. It is not right to offer the minimum and no more. It is our duty to give, at any rate, in accordance with the principle : "the greater the effort, the greater the fruit." In this way the burden on others is reduced and our objective will the more quickly be achieved. To be content merely to give our share is a sign of miserliness. There is magnanimity in what is done with love. Love will not have its actions weighed in a pair of scales. Anything which does so is not love, but the spirit of business. Such an attitude is out of place here. This collection is to be raised from Hindus, Muslims, Christians, Parsis and all others. I earnestly wish that readers of *Nava-jivan* contribute their full share in this sacred task. They should keep in mind that six lakh have to be collected without delay.

COMMITTEE'S REPORT

We have read in the papers that the report of the Hunter Committee¹ will be presented to the Viceroy in the first week of March. Our Committee's report² should be out very soon.³ The printing of the evidence is nearly over. Mr. Jayakar⁴ has taken this work upon himself. The report, too, is almost drafted. Members of the Committee⁵ are to meet in Kashi on the 16th to scrutinize and approve the report, and it is hoped that the latter will be approved and sent to the press by 20th February. The cost of printing the report will be quite heavy and it is likely that a copy of the report and evidence together will be priced at Rs. 8.

[From Gujarati]

Navajivan, 15-2-1920

¹ Set up by the Government of India on October 14, 1919, to investigate the April disturbances in the provinces of Bombay, Delhi and the Punjab. The Committee presented its report to Government on March 8, and it was published on May 28, 1920.

² Of the Commissioners appointed by the Punjab Sub-committee of the Indian National Congress to enquire into the Punjab disorders

³ The report was published on March 25, 1920; for the text, *vide* "Congress Report on the Punjab Disorders", 25-3-1920.

⁴ M. R. Jayakar (1873-1959); Bombay lawyer and Liberal leader; educationist, political negotiator and peacemaker

⁵ Gandhiji, C. R. Das, Abbas S. Tayabji and M. R. Jayakar

244. LETTER TO ESTHER FAERING

Thursday [February 12]¹, 1920

MY DEAR ESTHER,

You and Mahadev are foremost in my mind as I finished my mouth wash. I have detained you in Ahmedabad. But have I done right? If your health grows worse where am I? I therefore want you to await me only if you keep at least tolerably well. Otherwise we must meet on your return from Madras. Please don't consider yourself bound to stay on because I have expressed the wish. To express purest love is like walking on the edge of a sword. 'None of self and all of Thee' is easier sung than practised. We never know when we are not selfish even when we fancy we are all love. The more I think of it, the more I feel the truth of what I have often said. Love and truth are two faces of the same coin and both most difficult to practise and the only things worth living for. A person cannot be true if he does not love all God's creatures; truth and love are therefore the complete sacrifice. I shall therefore pray that both you and I may realize this to the fullest measure.

Yours,

BAPU

From a photostat of the original in N.A.I.; also *My Dear Child*, pp. 53-4

245. LETTER TO NARAHARI PARIKH

LAHORE,

Thursday [February 12, 1920]²

BHAISHRI NARAHARI,

I get your letters regularly and they give me much peace. You may show my letter to Mahadev, but only if you wish to. You may destroy it if you like.

I hope to arrive there on the 23rd. I may arrive even on the 22nd. You did well in forwarding the Doctor's³ letters.

Does Dipak⁴ take dal and vegetables in addition to *rotli* and

¹ Vide "Letter to Esther Faering", February 10, 1920

² Gandhiji arrived in Ahmedabad on February 22, 1920, after his three weeks' tour of the Punjab. His last Thursday in Lahore fell on this date.

³ Presumably Dr. Jivraj Mehta

⁴ Son of Saraladevi Chowdharani who had joined the Ashram school in January 1920

jaggery? Did he again go to his uncle's? He has a standing invitation to go every Sunday. It will be better if you yourself take him there on foot next Sunday.

Esther's condition is miserable indeed.

Blessings from

BAPU

From a photostat of the Gujarati : S.N. 11887

246. *SPEECH AT SARGODHA*

February 13, 1920

Mahatmaji appeared in public at 2.30 p. m. when he delivered a short discourse to the ladies of the town in the Arya Samaj exhorting them to always keep quiet and attentive while attending a meeting and take to spinning. After that he wended his way to the Municipal Gardens. . . .

Mahatmaji spoke for a short time touching briefly on the questionable methods of recruitment resorted to by some of the officials in the ecstasy of their zeal in this district during the period of the War. He said that dining together could not constitute the chief basis of love between the different communities as was wrongly understood by some of the people. Love being the quality of heart could be fostered and developed without forsaking one's religion, by sharing the sorrows as well as joys of each other. The people should observe strict discipline while attending a meeting. Swadeshi should be encouraged in view of our country being the poorest on the surface of the earth, its average annual income being not more than Rs. 24 or 25 per head. He advocated spinning and weaving as cloth alone to the value of rupees sixty crores was imported into the country in a year.

The Tribune, 22-2-1920

247. *LETTER TO NARAHARI PARIKH*

[February 13, 1920]¹

BHAISHRI NARAHARI,

Two points in your letters have been left unanswered. It is true that by taking Dipak there I have added to your work. It is also true that the thing will make your task hard. However, I see difficulties in

¹ As stated in the text, Gandhiji wrote this letter from Sargodha, which he visited on this date in the course of his Punjab tour.

the way of adhering to the rule that no non-Gujarati should be admitted. I do not understand how we can refuse admission to anyone who agrees to join on the same conditions as Dipak has joined. All the same, I shall abide by any rule you want to be followed. After all, it is for you to carry out the thing and, therefore, your word will be law to me. I shall make what suggestions I feel inclined to. I unreservedly accept the principle that any boy whom we admit will have to have his education through Gujarati. In regard to Dipak's Bengali, I did not mean that he should be taught through that language. I merely meant that it would be good if we could make some arrangements for his Bengali. I want this only in his case. There is no other boy in the country, in the same circumstances as Dipak, who is likely to join us. Sarladevi is the only Bengali woman who, married to a Punjabi, is keen on her son keeping up his mother's tongue. This principle deserves support. All of you, that is you, Kaka and others, know Bengali and, moreover, Manindra is there at present. I, therefore, felt that Dipak should keep up the use of Bengali.

The second point, concerning fixed times for Dipak for writing letters. About this, I am sure you have been hasty in expressing the view you have done. Writing letters as a matter of rule should no doubt be mechanical. Anything which becomes natural, instinctive, is of course mechanical. When you give fruit juice to Mahadev at 2, you may be so absorbed in the work that it becomes mechanical for you. "Mechanical" has two meanings. One, anything done unintelligently, in the manner of a machine, or occurring in that way. Two, anything done or occurring according to rule, like the functioning of a machine. The first is to be avoided, and the second to be welcomed. If Dipak's love for his mother burns bright in him, he should, once he has realized that it is good on his part to write to her, set apart a fixed time for the purpose and adhere to it. Reciting *Gayatri*, daily or occasionally, without a fixed rule can never bring the same reward as reciting it with a devout heart at a fixed hour every day. Progress in life is possible only if one regulates one's life according to rules. I think you will have no further doubts in this matter. If you have any, put them to me when we meet or write about them to me at Kashi.¹

We are in Sargodha today. Tomorrow we shall be in Lahore and the day after in the train on our way to Kashi. I wrote to Mahadev yesterday apologizing to him. My intention was absolutely pure.

¹ Gandhiji was in Banaras from February 16 to February 21, 1920.

When writing that letter, I had repeated to myself the verse: "I desire to see the suffering of all suffering creatures ended."¹ I had no idea that all of them suffered in the same way, but I suffered because they were suffering and had been applying remedies to end their sufferings. The pain felt by Ma-hadev showed me how complex one's feelings are and how inadequate our *tapascharya* was. That he smiled away his pain was his goodness indeed.

Blessings from
BAPU

From a photostat of the Gujarati : S.N. 11889

248. APPEAL FOR JALLIANWALA BAGH MEMORIAL FUND

AMRITSAR,
February 14, 1920

We are glad to be able to inform the public that the Jallianwala Bagh has now been acquired for the nation in terms of the resolution that was passed by the last Congress. The undersigned were appointed as a Committee to carry out the wishes of the Congress. The purchase price has been finally fixed at Rs. 5,40,000 (five lakhs and forty thousand rupees), inclusive of costs and has to be paid to the sellers within three months from the 5th instant. Lala Dewanchand, proprietor of the firm of Messrs Radhakishen Ramkrishna of Amritsar, had been appointed treasurer and Lala Girdhari Lal¹ of Amritsar as the secretary of the Fund. The Central Bank of India, the Punjab National Bank, the Punjab and Sindh Bank and the Allahabad Bank, Amritsar, have been appointed bankers. Subscriptions should be remitted direct to one of these banks or their branches and the fact should be communicated to the treasurer or the secretary. A formal receipt signed by the treasurer and the secretary, will be sent to every donor. Relying upon the enthusiasm shown in this matter as an index of the national wish, we trust that the donors

¹ The Sanskrit couplet of which this is the second line runs :
नत्वहं कामये राज्यं न स्वर्गं नापुनर्भवम् ।
कामये दुःखतप्तानां प्राणिनामार्तिनाशनम् ॥

² Deputy Chairman, Punjab Chamber of Commerce; Managing Director, Amritsar Flour & General Mills

will without any personal canvassing send in their own subscriptions. Whilst the least amount necessary is six lakhs, our aim is to collect ten lakhs and not more, but even less if possible. Though we have come to no final conclusion, we propose that the Bagh should be converted into a park, whereon a simple memorial will be erected with a suitable inscription perpetuating the memory of the dead and commemorating Hindu-Muslim unity. There will not be a word on it calculated to promote or encourage bitterness or ill will against anybody. We invite suggestions as to the inscription and also tentative proposals regarding the use of the ground. We consider that it should be used as a place of national pilgrimage. We desire emphatically to repudiate the suggestion made in some quarters that the memorial is designed to perpetuate bitterness between Englishmen and ourselves. Nothing can be farther from our wish than any such idea, but we believe that it is our bounden duty in some shape or other to cherish and perpetuate the memory of the many hundreds of innocent men who were shot dead on the fateful 13th of April. It was a tragedy of national importance which cannot be allowed to be forgotten and we came to the conclusion that there was no better method of achieving the object than by acquiring the site hallowed by innocent blood and using it in some such manner as we have suggested. We trust that all, without distinction of party, not excluding Englishmen, will subscribe to the memorial and respond to the Committee's invitation for suggestions as to the inscription and the use of the Bagh.

M. K. GANDHI
MADAN MOHAN MALAVIYA
MOTILAL NEHRU
SHRADDHANANDA
HARKISHEN LAL
KITCHLEW
GIRDHARI LAL

The Bombay Chronicle, 16-2-1920

249. PUNJAB LETTER

ON THE WAY FROM LAHORE,
Magh Vad 11 [February 15, 1920]

GUJRAT

Gujrat is the name of a district in the Punjab with Gujrat as the main town. The battle of Gujrat which occurred during the Sikh War

in 1849 is well known. I even saw the field on which that battle was fought. I went to this district because it, too, had been under Martial Law.¹ Sarladevi Chowdhani² accompanied us on this journey.

There is a small village called Jalalpur Jata near Gujrat, which also we had to visit. This village may be said to be inhabited almost entirely by weavers. The women spin and the men weave. The whole of the little lane had been decorated with hand-made cloth. The cloth was not just white khadi but khadi dyed red and embroidered with silk. Such cloth is known here as *phulkari*³. Beautiful designs are worked on the cloth and these make the cloth delightful to the eye. At a marriage this *phulkari* is presented to the bride and the bridegroom and in many families the garments are preserved. Many women may be observed wearing scarves of *phulkari*. Nowadays people also make curtains of it. The seats prepared for me are, I generally see, decorated with such *phulkari* and the affection which inspires this gives me great happiness.

But the sight of the bazaar filled with *phulkaris* also saddened me and my heart became heavy. The thought that this beautiful craft, which had been the chief source of India's prosperity, is about to vanish made me disconsolate. The beauty and the sanctity, the conservation of our resources which I see in this *phulkari*, I do not see in foreign saris. The prosperity of Indian homes lies in spinning. With the disappearance of this occupation, prosperity too has gone.

The Commissioner had not requested the imposition of Martial Law in this district of Gujrat and when, nevertheless, it did come he dispatched a telegram to make sure, thinking that possibly Gujarat in the Bombay Presidency was intended—so innocent was the Gujarat district in the Punjab. I have no desire to write about what happened in the district. But the matter was mentioned before the Hunter Committee and so I recall it here.

SARGODHA

After spending a night at Gujrat we went on to Sargodha. This is a newly-settled village. Several such villages have come up near the canals. This village is included in the Shahpur district. One reason

¹ From April to June, 1919

² Wife of pandit Rambhuj Dutt Chowdhari and grand-niece of Rabindranath Tagore. She and her husband became followers of Gandhiji in 1919 and sent their son Dipak to be educated at Sabarmati Ashram.

³ Literally, flower-work

for our going there was to investigate the cruelties perpetrated during the recruitment drive. We arrived at night but even at 10 it was impossible to restrain the enthusiasm of the people. Thousands had flocked from near-by villages. The bazaar was a blaze of countless lights.

I found the people of Shahpur district quite different from those of other districts. Though physically tall, they are rather dull, simple and not too bold. They are much afraid of soldiers and are quite incapable of defending themselves. The majority are Muslims but they must have been enfeebled by starvation. With the digging of canals, starvation among them has been considerably reduced, but the people have had no training in civic life and so have remained helpless.

MALAKVAL

From Sargodha we went to Malakval, which is a city in Gujrat district. Being a railway junction, it has become a well-known place. This place, too, had been under Martial Law. The people here had been so suppressed that their leaders did not have the courage to put us up. But the relations between the leaders and the public are none too good at present. Consequently, when the news of our arrival spread, the station was filled with people. Such crowds poured in from surrounding villages that quiet became impossible. The leaders, however, continued to remain aloof out of fear. We had to stay here for the night. Early next morning, men and women came from near-by villages playing on their instruments and woke us up. The crowd became so thick that there was no hope of any quiet talk or of recording statements. In the end, it was only after I had led the people to a *maidan* near by and held a meeting that I could have some peace. In all these meetings, some- times composed of thousands, I am always both chairman and speaker or, perhaps, it would be more correct to say that there is no chairman at all. Day by day the number of women attending these meetings is found to be increasing. We left Malakval for Lalamusa at 11 o'clock.

SCENES ON THE WAY

This is a junction on the main line and is two and a half hours' journey from Malakval. There are four or five intermediate stations. I can scarcely describe the scenes at these stations. Although at almost every station the train stopped for only a few minutes, hundreds of people—both men and women—used to collect. There is a station on

the way called Bahuddin. The village is a fairly large one. A multitude of men and women stood there as far as my eye could reach and women competed with the men in their efforts to come to me. In every place, the women made offerings to me of yarn spun with their own hands. But, at a station named DHINGA where the train stops for five to seven minutes, the scene was simply wonderful. The women stood behind the men and, from there, they threw ball after ball of handspun yarn and we in the train and the men who stood in between caught them as they came. I understood the feelings of these women and my heart overflowed with joy. To the question, 'Why do all these women show such love?' I found the answer in the miracle at DHINGA station. It is my deep conviction that the women of the Punjab have understood my message. They have felt that swadeshi is not merely a means of protecting India's wealth but that it makes for protection of women's honour, that it is a form of *Ishwar bhakti*¹ and that in it lies the country's best freedom. Moreover, they have been able instinctively to grasp the significance of the holy message of satyagraha and have received from it great peace of mind and a new assurance. They feel that, if my message is adopted by the country, peace will prevail in India and through India, in the whole world and the *Satyayuga*² will be born. They have understood that, whether all this is realized in the near future or not, it is for us to work on with faith for these two objectives and this is why they come to me in ever larger numbers, shedding their fear. I was convinced during this journey that there is no exaggeration in saying that women have understood how we can fight our opponents with love and without hate, and be a match for them, how we can fearlessly point out to the officers their errors and they will have to listen to us, and that, seeing all this, they are extremely happy.

I hope the reader will not get the impression that I am indulging in self-praise in all this. The admission of imperfection that I made before the Hunter Committee³ was no gesture of modesty. It was literally true. I said that I could not claim to be a perfect satyagrahi. If I had been one, it would not have been necessary even to write this sentence. I would not, then, have had even the fear that I might be accused of self-praise. I have not the self-assurance to claim that I never praise myself. But in order that I might engage the genuine

¹ Worship of God

² The Age of Truth

³ On January 9, 1920 at Ahmedabad, in his evidence before the Committee

interest of readers in truth and swadeshi, I beg leave to state, deliberately and knowingly, that I do not believe the profound feelings of the Punjabi women to be directed towards me personally. They are taken up with admiration for me because of the truth they see in me and the simplicity of swadeshi which they have come to realize through me. The men's love is no less. But I am not sure of its purity. Some are drawn to me because I am a fighter against the Government. Some think that, though I do not speak out, in fact I harbour a good deal of hatred which, being a shrewd man, I hide from others. Some consider that I have great fighting capacity, no doubt, but that I am something of a fool for lack of intellect. They do not, therefore, think it wrong to avail themselves of my fighting capacity and to show me sufficient regard with that end in view. Others are genuine lovers of truth and swadeshi and, regarding me as more experienced in these matters than themselves, bear sincere affection for me. Thus, since I suspect that men's feelings for me are mixed, I am frequently uneasy and nervous when surrounded by men and sometimes I fear lest they and I together bring about some calamity. But with regard to women, such an idea would not occur to me even in a dream. They come to me with but one feeling in their heart and therefore their presence, even by the thousand, gives me nothing but a sense of peace. They strengthen my faith and confidence in satyagraha and swadeshi, make me ever more resolute and create a new zest in me and inspire me to greater effort. If I could inspire in men devotion as pure as I find in the women, within a year India would be raised to a height impossible to imagine. As for swaraj, it would be the easiest thing in the world.

A Muslim servant of Sarladevi said something to her and she reported it to me. I shall place it before my readers and close this letter with a request to them to ponder over it very carefully. Many men and women address Sarladevi as *Mataji* or mother

This servant said, "*Mataji*, if Mahatmaji keeps talking to all women about the spinning-wheel, surely it is not without reason. He is a man of God and believes that the Indian women can safeguard their dharma through it. This is why he does what he does." Sarladevi told me in some context that this servant was a good and devout man, and she passed on his ideas about swadeshi to me. She was amazed to find such wisdom in one who could be called ignorant. I was greatly pleased but by no means surprised. The wisdom I have seen and learnt from so-called illiterate people I have not learnt from others.

[From Gujarati]

Navajivan, 22-2-1920

250. LETTER TO L. FRENCH

2, MOZANG ROAD,

LAHORE,

February 15, 1920

DEAR MR. FRENCH,

I have just returned from Sargodha where I heard from the lips of many witnesses the story of the persecution they said they underwent at the hands of the Tahsildar, Nadir Hosen Shah, who was in 1918 cruelly murdered, and other officials whilst recruiting was going on.¹ I think that hard recruiting was necessary during the late War and that some kind of moral pressure was inevitable. I think too that a certain amount of overzeal on the part of the inferior officials was to be looked for and can only now be looked [sic].

But the stories that had been repeated to me by several witnesses—men and women—cannot be ignored and I am sure His Honour² will not desire to excuse the oppression that is said to have been practised.

The statements made before me go to show that villagers were brought up on a wholesale scale and were called upon on pain of suffering inhuman tortures and indignities to send their sons as recruits if they were at all of age. It is stated that for this purpose men were made naked, they were whipped on their buttocks and were made to bend themselves on thorns whilst they were whipped. Women were made to drag men whose modesty was outraged. Women themselves were made naked and subjected to disgraceful treatment because their husbands and boys were hiding themselves. It has also been stated that men were falsely challaned³ and otherwise brought under legal processes, that punitive police has been imposed on several villages in connection with the murder of the deceased Tahsildar and that members of the police levy unlawful exactions from the poor villagers.

In my humble opinion this is essentially a matter which requires a searching investigation and the officials who can be found to have

¹ Vide "Congress Report on the Punjab Disorders", 25-3-1920.

² The Lt.-Governor of the Punjab

³ Charge-sheeted

persecuted villagers deprived [*sic*] of the opportunity of so doing. I venture to think that the punitive police should be removed without delay and villagers freed from daily exactions.

The statements made are so serious that I feel it my duty not to publish them without at least drawing His Honour's attention to them. I shall be pleased to submit the statements for His Honour's inspection should he desire to see them. I am also prepared to wait on His Honour in this matter and render what assistance I may be capable of rendering in order to bring the true situation to light.

I am leaving today for Benares, c/o Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya, by the Calcutta Mail and shall be there up to the 20th instant; thereafter at Sabarmati, B. B. & C. I. Railway. I could wait on His Honour some time after the 6th March. Urgent business will keep me away from the Punjab at least till that date.

I shall esteem it a favour if you will please drop me a line to say what His Honour's wishes are in this important matter.

Yours sincerely,

L. FRENCH

PUNJAB GOVERNMENT CAMP

From a copy : S. N. 7125

251. LETTER TO ESTHER FAERING

ON THE TRAIN TO BENARES,
*Sunday [February 15, 1920]*¹

MY DEAR CHILD,

I am on my way to Benares² and we shall soon meet. How I wish you were with me serving me like Devdas. I know you would love it and so would I. No man can supply the place of father but I would like to be that to you to the extent of my ability in this land of your adoption. I feel humiliated at the thought of your having to go to Denmark to recuperate yourself. Nothing would please me better than to send you to Denmark fully restored to health and a fuller Christian and a fuller daughter. And you have all the possibilities in you of a full growth in this life. May God grant you all your dearest wishes and may He make you an instrument of great service to humanity. Your love for India can only be acceptable as an expression of your love for humanity. "None of self and all of Thee" is a big prayer, [the] biggest of its kind.

May it be true of you and me.

With all love,

Yours,

BAPU

[PS.]

You will give your whole heart to A.³

From a photostat of the original in N.A.I.; also *My Dear Child*, p. 58

¹ Esther Faering left India for Denmark in 1920, and in that year Gandhiji proceeded from Lahore to Banaras on February 15.

² For a meeting where the draft report of the Commissioners appointed by the Punjab Sub-committee of the Congress was to be finalized

³ This sentence is not found in the photostat available at the National Archives.

252. A CRY FROM UTKAL

Utkal¹ is a much better term than Oriya. The Hon'ble B. Brijunderdas, ex-secretary, Utkal Union Conference and president, Utkal People's Association, Kattak,² has circulated a printed letter in which he says :

Oriya has been placed under four administrations, viz., Behar Madras, Bengal and Central Provinces; they are in a minority everywhere. An autonomous growth is impossible in their case. For the last fifteen years they have been struggling for administrative union. Docile and non-agitating as they are, their repeated prayers have caught no authoritative ear. Advancement of India does not preclude a part of India. The new Indian nation cannot be built upon the ashes of an ancient race.

We need not cavil at the language used by the Hon. B. Brijunderdas. The complaint is sound and raises the large question of redistribution on a linguistic basis. This fine face cannot possibly make the natural advance which is its due, if it is split up into four divisions for no sound reason, and we trust that the Oriya Movement will be examined by the public with sympathetic care and attention.

Young India, 18-2-1920

253. JALLIANWALA BAGH

There was an unfortunate hitch about the purchase of this Bagh for the nation.³ Thanks to the efforts of the Hon'ble Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya, Sannyasi Swami Shri Shraddhanand and the local leaders, it has now become the property of the nation subject to the full payment of the purchase price within three months from the 6th instant. The purchase price is Rs. 5,36,000. And the amount must be raised within the prescribed period.

It is, therefore, necessary to examine the propriety of making this purchase on behalf of the nation, especially as it has been questioned even in enlightened quarters. With the Cawnpore

¹ This name for Orissa was popularized by Rabindranath Tagore.

² Cuttack, the old capital of Orissa

³ Vide "Punjab Letter ", before 11-2-1919.

Memorial' before us the attitude is not to be wondered at. But with all respect to objectors, I cannot help saying that if the Bagh had not been acquired, it would have been a national disgrace. Can we afford to forget those five hundred or more men who were killed although they had done nothing wrong either morally or legally? If they had died knowingly and willingly, if, realizing their innocence they had stood their ground and faced the shots from the fifty² rifles, they would have gone down in his-tory as saints, heroes and patriots. But even as it was, the tragedy became one of first-class national importance. Nations are born out of travail and suffering. We should forfeit all title to be considered a nation, if we failed to treasure the memory of those who in our battle for political freedom might, innocently or for the crimes of others, lose their lives or otherwise suffer. We were unable to protect our helpless countrymen when they were ruthlessly massacred. We may decline, if we will, to ave-nge the wrong. The nation will not lose if we did. But shall we—can we afford to—decline to perpetuate the memory and to show to the surviv-ing members of the families of the dead that we are sharers in their sufferings, by erecting a national tombstone and by telling the world thereby that in the death of these men each one of us had lost dear relations? If national instinct does not mean at least this much kinship, it has no mea-ning for me. I hold it to be our duty to tell the generations yet unborn that in our march towards true freedom we must be prepared for repetiti-ons of the wrongs such as the Jallianwala Bagh massacre. We must prov-ide against them; we must not seek them, but we must be ready to face them if they come again. I would not have us flinch from the battle of national life. The supreme lesson of the Amritsar Congress³ was that the sufferings of the Punjab did not dishearten the nation but the nation treat-ed them as a matter of course. Some of us made stupid mistakes and the innocent suffered for them. We must in future try to avoid the mistakes but in spite of our best effort, we may fail to convert everyone to sanity. We must, therefore, be ready for the repetition of the sufferings of the gu-iltless by telling the country now that they and theirs shall not be forgot-ten but that the memory of the innocent dead shall be regarded as a sacred trust and that the surviving relations shall have the right to look

¹ In connection with the Mutiny of 1857

² Fire was opened at Jallianwala Bagh by all the fifty soldiers led by General Dyer; *vide* "Congrees Report on the Punjab Disorders", 25-3-1920.

³ Held in December 1919

to the nation for maintenance in case of need. This is the primary meaning of the memorial. And has not the blood of the Mohammedan mixed with that of the Hindu? Has not the blood of the Sikh mixed with that of the Sanatanist¹ and the Samajist² ? The memorial should be a national emblem of an honest and sustained effort to achieve Hindu-Muslim unity.

But the objector's objection still remains unanswered. Will not the memorial also perpetuate bitterness and ill will? It will depend upon the trustees. And if I know them, I know that that is not their intention at all. I know that such was not the intention of the vast assembly. I do not wish to convey that bitterness was not there. It was there—not in any way suppressed. But the idea of the memorial had nothing of bitterness in it. The people want to, they must be encouraged to, forget the doer and his madness. What General Dyer did we may all do if we had his irresponsibility and opportunity. To err is human and it must be held to be equally human to forgive if we, though being fallible, would like rather to be forgiven than punished and reminded of our misdeeds. Nor does this mean that we may not ask for General Dyer's dismissal. A lunatic cannot be kept in a position from which he can do harm to his neighbours. But just as we do not bear ill will towards a lunatic, so too may we not bear ill will even towards General Dyer. I would therefore eschew from the memorial all idea of bitterness and ill will but treat it as a sacred memory and regard the Bagh as a place of pilgrimage to be visited by all irrespective of class, creed or colour. I would invite Englishmen to appreciate our feeling in the matter, ask them by subscribing to the memorial in the spirit of the Royal Proclamation³ to make common cause with us in our endeavour to regain consciousness, to realize the same freedom that they enjoy under the same constitution and to realize Hindu-Muslim unity without which there can be no true progress for India.

Young India, 18-2-1920

¹ Follower of orthodox Hindu religion

² Member of the Arya Samaj, a reformist Hindu denomination following the old Vedic religion

³ Of December 1919

254. *LETTER TO MOTILAL NEHRU*¹

BENARES.

February 20, 1920

THE HON'BLE PANDIT MOTILAL NEHRU
EX-OFFICIO PRESIDENT, SUB-COMMITTEE
ALL-INDIA CONGRESS COMMITTEE
LAHORE
SIR,

On the 14th November 1919, the Punjab Sub-committee of the All India Congress Committee appointed yourself, the Hon'ble Fazlul Haq², and Messrs C. R. Das, Abbas Tayabji³ and M. K. Gandhi, as Commissioners, with Mr. K. Santanam as Secretary, to examine, sift, collate, and analyse the evidence already collected by and on behalf of the Sub-committee regarding the events of last April in the Punjab, and to supplement such evidence where necessary, and to present their conclusions thereon.

On being nominated President-elect of the National Congress you considered it necessary to resign your office as Commissioner. The resignation was duly accepted by the Sub-committee and as the work of taking evidence was practically concluded when you resigned, no other commissioner was appointed in your place.

The Hon'ble Fazlul Haq was called away on important business immediately after his arrival. Mr. M. R. Jayakar of the Bombay Bar was therefore appointed in his place.

We entered upon our work on the 17th November 1919.

We examined the statements of over 1,700 witnesses and we have selected for publication about 650 statements, which will be found in the accompanying volumes of our report. The statements excluded were mostly statements proving [the] same class of acts.

Every admitted statements was verified by one of us and was

¹ This is the covering letter accompanying the draft report of the Commissioners appointed by the Punjab Sub-committee of the Indian National Congress. The draft prepared by Gandhiji is not available. For the report, whose final manuscript for the press was prepared by Gandhiji with the assistance of M. R. Jayakar, *vide* "Congress Report on the Punjab Disorders". 25-3-1920.

² Nationalist Muslim leader; Chief Minister of Bengal during World War II

³ 1853-1936; nationalist Muslim leader of Gujarat

accepted only after we were satisfied as to the *bona fides* of the witness. This does not apply to a few statements from Manianwala and neighbourhood, which were mostly brought at our request by Mr. Labh Singh, M. A., Bar-at-Law. Every such statement bears his name at the foot thereof. No statement was accepted without sufficient cross-examination of the witnesses.

It will be observed that many witnesses are men of position and leaders in their own districts or villages.

It will be further observed that some of the witnesses have made very serious allegations against officials. In each and every case the witnesses were warned by us of the consequences of making those allegations and they were admitted only when the witnesses adhered to their statements, in spite of the knowledge of the risk they personally ran and the damage that may ensue to the cause by reason of exaggeration or untruth. We have moreover rejected those statements which could not be corroborated although in some cases we were inclined to believe the witnesses. Such for instance were the statements regarding ill-treatment of women.

Needless to say that our inquiry was confined to the Martial Law area and to the districts¹ in which it was proclaimed. The principal places were personally visited by us. Thus Lahore, Amritsar, Tarn Taran, Kasur, Gujranwala, Wazirabad, Nizamabad, Akalgarh, Ramnagar, Hafiza-bad, Sangla Hill, Sheikhpura, Chuharkana, Lyallpur, Gujrat, Malakwal and Sargodha were visited by someone of us. In most places large public meetings were held and the public were invited to make their statements to us. The nature of the evidence already recorded was placed before the meetings and those who wished to challenge the accuracy of the statements made, were invited to send in their statements even under pledge of confidence if they so desired. No contradiction was received by us.

We have freely availed ourselves of the evidence led before the Disorders Inquiry Committee², in order to strengthen or correct our conclusions. It may be mentioned that the vast majority of the statements appended were received by us before Lord Hunter's Committee began its sittings.

The majority of the statements were given in the vernaculars. We have endeavoured to procure the most accurate translations, but

¹ Amritsar, Lahore, Gujranwala, Gujrat and Lyallpur

² Lord Hunter's Committee

the statements appended to our report may be treated as original, as we checked the witnesses through the translations and made corrections or amendments ourselves, wherever necessary.

We have also studied the records of the trials by Martial Law Commissioners or Summary Courts, in so far as they were available to us, and we have studied the judicial records of several cases that arose during the recruiting period and out of recruiting methods.

In conclusion we desire to place on record our great obligation to the leading men of every place we have visited and the many workers in Lahore and elsewhere who have rendered valuable assistance without which we could not have brought our labours to a close within the time at our disposal.

We are,
Yours faithfully,
M. K. GANDHI
C. R. DAS
ABBAS S. TAYABJI
M. R. JAYAKAR

Report of the Commissioners Appointed by the Punjab Sub-committee of the Indian National Congress

255. SPEECH AT KHILAFAT MEETING, BANARAS

February 20, 1920

A public Khilafat meeting was held at 3.30 in the afternoon in the Town Hall ground. . . . Among the distinguished visitors, besides Maulanas Shaukat Ali¹ and Abul Kalam Azad, were Mr. Gandhi, Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya, Pandit Motilal Nehru, Lala Harkishen Lal and other Punjab leaders. . . . Hakim Mohamed Husain Khan was voted to the chair. . .

Mr. Gandhi, the lover and beloved of India, rose amidst deafening cheers and dealt with the Khilafat question and Hindu-Muslim unity emphasizing that the two sister communities could have real and true oriental love for one another, while following the dictates of their respective religions. He also narrated the interview that he had with Mr. Candler² who had asked him if the Hindus were going to eat and

¹ 1873-1938; Nationalist Muslim politician who along with his brother, Maulana Mohamed Ali, took a leading part in the Khilafat movement

² Edmund Candler; well-known English journalist, then Publicity Officer in the Punjab. He wrote some open letters to Gandhiji questioning his attitude towards the Khilafat problem.

drink with the Mussulmans and have intermarriages with them. Mahatmaji said that he had replied to Mr. Candler that for Hindu-Muslim unity it was not at all necessary that there should be intermarriages and one table for Hindus and Mussulmans. He said:

Why did the Germans and English who belonged to the same race and same religion and who entered into marriage bonds, fight with each other, if that was necessary for unity?

Mr. Gandhi appealed in strong terms to the Hindus to help the Mussulmans in the cause of the Khilafat which was a righteous one.

The Bombay Chronicle, 23-2-1920

256. SPEECH AT MEETING OF STUDENTS, BANARAS

February 21, 1920

Mr. Gandhi's address to the Hindu University students under the Vice-Chancellor's presidentship this morning was full of lofty ideals and breathed a high tone of morality. The audience consisted of students and teachers of various other schools also and of ladies. He spoke in Hindi and referred to Tulsidas¹ several times. He exhorted the students to follow absolute honesty which should not be adhered to simply because of policy. He said students in the Punjab had suffered great hardships on account of Martial Law, but they could not be said to have been quite free from blame. Students should study politics but should not be active participatos in it. He said they should have as their ideal *sanyam*² and not *swechchachara*,³ regulated life and not life prompted by self-will. He gave examples of *sanyam* from the life of Bharata⁴. The Hindu University would not justify its existence and its prompters would not feel encouraged if its students failed to live up to the ancient ideal of *sanyam*. He said he knew almost every student of the Gujarat College⁵ and some of them found fault with their teachers. Mr. Gandhi acknowledged that teachers had received education in the materialistic system, but the boys should learn to revere them as teachers and not find fault with them. He eulogized the services of Pandit Malaviya to the country and said that his life was an example to teachers and boys.

The Leader, 23-2-1920

¹ A seventeenth-century Hindi poet and saint; author of *Ramacharitamanas*

² Self-restraint

³ Self-indulgence

⁴ Younger brother of Rama, the hero of the *Ramayana*

⁵ At Ahmedabad

257. LETTER TO ESTHER FAERING

THE ASHRAM,

Sunday [February 22. 1920]¹

MY DEAR CHILD,

I found three love letters from you awaiting me on my return today. I was delighted to note the air of cheerfulness, quiet resignation and trust in God in your letters. The latter you always had in you. But your letters show deeper trust. May your trust go deeper and deeper still till at last you are freed from all doubt and therefore are all joy whatever happens. For as we go forward in our journey of life, we have always problems coming up for decision and they are the hardest when the voice of Satan nearly approaches the voice of God. Only fullest trust and perfect purity and extreme humility can lead us to the right choice.

I hope to be at the Ashram for at least a week and then hope to seek solitude and rest for a fortnight.

I shall certainly miss you tonight at the time of retiring.

With love,

Yours,

BAPU

[PS.]

You will be glad to learn that S. 's father has returned your watch. The value lies not in the return but in the motive behind it. You will take it when you return on your way to Denmark.

BAPU

From a photostat of the original in N.A.I.; also *My Dear Child*, p. 59

¹ It is clear from the text that this letter was written on February 22, 1920, the day Gandhiji arrived at the Ashram.

258. LETTER TO NAOROJI KHAMBHATTA

ASHRAM,

SABARMATI,

Tuesday [February 23, 1920]¹

BHAI NAOROJI KHAMBHATTA,

I have your letter. Convey the blessings of us both to Jal at the time of his *navjot*².

Vandemataram from

MOHANDAS

SHRI BEHRAM NAOROJI KHAMBHATTA

IBRAHIM NAOROJI KHAMBHATTA

NO. 8, NAPIER ROAD

CAMP, POONA

From the Gujarati original : C. W. 5800. Courtesy: Tehmina Khambhatta

259. HINDU-MOHAMMEDAN UNITY

Mr. Candler some time ago asked me in an imaginary interview whether, if I was sincere in my professions of Hindu-Mohammedan unity, I would eat and drink with a Mohammedan and give my daughter in marriage to a Mohammedan. This question has been asked again by some friends in another form. Is it necessary for Hindu-Mohammedan unity that there should be inter-dining and intermarrying? The questioners say that if the two are necessary, real unity can never take place because crores of *Sanatanis* would never reconcile themselves to inter-dining, much less to inter-marriage.

I am one of those who do not consider caste to be a harmful institution. In its origin caste was a wholesome custom and promoted national well-being. In my opinion the idea that inter-dining or intermarrying is necessary for national growth is a superstition borrowed from the West. Eating is a process just as vital as the other sanitary necessities of life. And if mankind had not, much to its harm, made of eating a fetish and indulgence, we would have performed the operation of eating in private even as one performs the

¹ This date has been taken from the postal cancellation mark on the envelope.

² Investiture of a Parsi with the *kasti*, a sacred thread worn round the waist

other necessary functions of life in private. Indeed the highest culture in Hinduism regards eating in that light and there are thousands of Hindus still living who will not eat their food in the presence of anybody. I can recall the names of several cultured men and women who ate their food in entire privacy but who never had any ill will against anybody and who lived on the friendliest terms with all.

Intermarriage is a still more difficult question. If brothers and sisters can live on the friendliest footing without ever thinking of marrying each other, I can see no difficulty in my daughter regarding every Mohammedan as a brother and *vice versa*. I hold strong views on religion and on marriage. The greater the restraint we exercise with regard to our appetites whether about eating or marrying, the better we become from a religious standpoint. I would despair of ever cultivating amicable relations with the world if I had to recognize the right or the propriety of any young man offering his hand in marriage to my daughter or to regard it as necessary for me to dine with anybody and everybody. I claim that I am living on terms of friendliness with the whole world; I have never quarrelled with a single Mohammedan or Christian, but for years I have taken nothing but fruit in Mohammedan or Christian households. I would most certainly decline to eat cooked food from the same plate with my son or to drink water out of a cup which his lips have touched and which has not been washed. But the restraint or the exclusiveness exercised in these matters by me has never affected the closest companionship with the Mohammedan or the Christian friends or my sons.

But inter-dining and intermarriage have never been a bar to disunion, quarrels and worse. The Pandavas¹ and the Kauravas² flew at one another's throats without compunction although they inter-dined and intermarried [*sic*]. The bitterness between the English and the Germans has not yet died out.

The fact is that intermarriage and inter-dining are not necessary factors in friendship and unity though they are often emblems thereof. But insistence on either the one or the other can easily become and is today a bar to Hindu-Mohammedan unity. If we make ourselves believe that Hindus and Mohammedans cannot be one unless they inter-dine or intermarry, we would be creating an

¹ The Pandavas, sons of King Pandu, and the Kauravas, sons of King Dhritarashtra, fought against each other the epic battle described in the *Mahabharata*, although they were cousins.

² *ibid*

artificial barrier between us which it might be almost impossible to remove. And it would seriously interfere with the growing unity between Hindus and Mohammedans if, for example, Mohammedan youths consider it lawful to court Hindu girls. The Hindu parents will not, even if they [merely] suspected any such thing, freely admit Mohammedans to their homes as they have begun to do now. In my opinion it is necessary for Hindu and Mohammedan young men to recognize this limitation.

I hold it to be utterly impossible for Hindus and Mohammedans to intermarry and yet retain intact each other's religion. And the true beauty of Hindu-Mohammedan unity lies in each remaining true to his own religion and yet being true to each other. For, we are thinking of Hindus and Mohammedans even of the most orthodox type being able to regard one another as natural friends instead of regarding one another as natural enemies as they have done hitherto.

What then does the Hindu-Mohammedan unity consist in and how can it be best promoted? The answer is simple. It consists in our having a common purpose, a common goal and common sorrows. It is best promoted by co-operating to reach the common goal, by sharing one another's sorrows and by mutual toleration. A common goal we have. We wish this great country of ours to be greater and self-governing. We have enough sorrows to share. And today seeing that the Mohammedans are deeply touched on the question of Khilafat and their case is just, nothing can be so powerful for winning Mohammedan friendship for the Hindu as to give his whole-hearted support to the Mohammedan claim. No amount of drinking out of the same cup or dining out of the same bowl can bind the two as this help in the Khilafat question.

And mutual toleration is a necessity for all time and for all races. We cannot live in peace if the Hindu will not tolerate the Mohammedan form of worship of God and his manners and customs or if the Mohammedans will be impatient of Hindu idolatry or cow-worship. It is not necessary for toleration that I must approve of what I tolerate. I heartily dislike drinking, meat-eating and smoking, but I tolerate all these in Hindus, Mohammedans and Christians even as I expect them to tolerate my abstinence from all these although they may dislike it. All the quarrels between the Hindus and the Mohammedans have arisen from each wanting to force the other to his view.

Young India, 25-2-1920

260. SPEECH AT MEETING OF MILL-HANDS, AHMEDABAD¹

February 25, 1920

We have assembled here today to set up a union of workers, to approve its rules and adopt the necessary resolutions.

Before we start on this work, I must tell you that we should be perfectly clear about the aim of the organization we have undertaken to set up. About two or three years ago, revered Anasuyabehn² had thought of founding a union of weavers and she had even taken some steps in that direction. But my advice to her then was that it was responsible work and that, though we may have taken it up with the idea of serving the workers, if later we failed to shoulder the responsibility adequately we might, instead of serving the workers, do them much harm. I do not mean to say that I am free of that fear today, but it is becoming plain to me that, in some ways, conditions in India are changing so much that we would do well to watch these changes carefully, study them and set up some such organizations by way of protection. All I want you to understand is that, if we do not have, for running our organizations, sincere workers who know their duties well, we would be bringing down the axe on our own feet. If such workers are not available, we had better not take up the difficult business of running a union. This is exactly what I said two years ago, and I repeat it here today.

All manner of movements are going on these days among the workers of our country. In all the countries ruled by the British and the European States, there is such chaos after the War that, if the workers fail to look after and safeguard their interests, they would be crushed. Today, those people who cannot stand together as a nation and do not keep in step with other nations will find it impossible to survive. The very machinery of Government is such that anyone who refuses to play his part in it and remains ignorant of his interests is sure to be wiped out. In former times, there was no need for us to know what the king was doing, no need even to mention his name. It was enough then if one paid the revenue dues in time, gave a bold

¹ The workers of the spinning departments of various mills had met to consider the formation of a labour union.

² Anasuyabehn Sarabhai, a social worker and labour leader of Ahmedabad

answer on occasion or bought survival for the moment with a bribe. Today one cannot get away in this way. Whether we want it or not, we are so intimately connected with the administration that, if we do not learn to look closely into affairs and understand our interests, we are bound to be crushed. It is for this reason that I, though religiously inclined and having no interest in politics whatever, have been busy for the last several months with nothing but politics. The sole reason for this is that I doubt whether I would be able to follow my dharma without thus participating in political affairs. And this is exactly the point I wish to explain to you in simple words, namely, that the workers have no option but in some measure to interest themselves in politics.

Formerly, we knew only our fields. There were neither mills, nor mill-owners, nor laws governing them. All these things have come in now. We should therefore know what they are. There are laws of dharma and of family life. We do not, however, call them laws because they provide for no punishment or fine. Now the time has come when no single individual can do us good, nor harm us either. We shall have to manage our affairs ourselves. It may so happen, in all this, that our representatives in the Government or the legislature may cut our throats for us while professing to speak for us. For this reason, too, we shall have to understand these matters. We shall have to learn how to bring up our children, shall have to discover the reasons why the facilities for their education are poor and know why the prices of food grains rise. The mothers present here will also have to learn how to bring up their children. The time will come when it will be compulsory for us to send our children to the schools which will be opened. If we do not exert ourselves to understand how these things work, to our advantage or otherwise, if we do not learn to be independent of others, we are as good as dead. We have always had unions of *Vanias*¹ and Brahmins, even of Kshatriyas, of a slightly different kind. Now the time is ripe for unions of workers in which weavers, smiths, and spinners may come together and establish unity among their ranks, may discover what is good in themselves and what is bad and remedy the latter. I caution you once again; by all means set up organizations, establish your unions, but see that you frame your rules and select your representatives, men to whom you will entrust your interests, with a full understanding of your responsibility.

¹ Members of a mercantile community

You will keep a watch over them not only about the finances and the management of your affairs, but also to know what they have actually done in your name and where they have signed on your behalf. You will have to go into all these things.

I want to tell you another thing. To those of you who believe that the unions we are establishing are for the purpose of fighting or coercing the mill-owners or that we shall be able to use these unions for such purposes, I would advise not to join the proposed union at all. I have never done anything in my life to coerce owners or harm their interests, and I will never allow myself to be an instrument in this. Only, if they try to suppress the workers, I will be ready to give up my life to save them. Neither the revered Anasuyabehn nor Shankarlal¹ has the slightest ill will for the mill-owners. I know well enough that they only love service of the workers. Hence it is that, whenever I get the chance, I join them in this service of theirs and I tell them over and over again on this occasion that, if they would truly serve the workers, they should have regard for the interests of both the workers and the mill-owners. The mill-owners do not need anyone's services. The workers are poor, timid and simple minded and need others' services. By establishing unions, we do not wish to intimidate the mill-owners but to protect the workers, and we certainly have the right to do this.

If the workers find it necessary today to send their wives and children to work in factories, it is our duty to see that they do not have to. There ought to be no need for workers' children to go and work, at the cost of their education, for the sake of an extra income of three to four rupees. Work is not for children. Nor is it for women to work in factories. They have plenty of work in their own homes. They should attend to the bringing up of their children; they may give peace to the husband when he returns home tired, minister to him, soothe him if he is angry, and do any other work they can staying at home. If we want our family life to be comely and sweet, we ought to do this. It is not for women to go out and work, as men do. If we send them to the factories, who will look after our domestic and social affairs? If women go out to work, our social life will be ruined and moral standards will decline. To those who advance the example of Europe, asking how it is that thousands of women there do the work

¹ Shankarlal Banker, a political and labour leader of Ahmedabad. He was also associated with *Young India* and *Navajivan*, and with the Home Rule League and the Satyagraha Sabha, Bombay.

of men and that men and women work together, my reply is: 'I don't bother myself about Europe.' From what little insight into the laws of social life I have gained, I feel convinced that for men and women to go out for work together will mean the fall of both. Do not, therefore, send your women out to work; protect their honour; if you have any manliness in you, it is for you to see that no one casts an evil eye on them. Today the workers, in their helplessness, are forced to send their women and children out for work, much against their will. It is true, of course, that they should have better wages if they are not to be so obliged. All this could be easy to achieve through a union, if established.

Thus, in setting up a union of this kind, you have to apply your mind and decide about three things:

1. You should go through the laws of labour unions.
2. The mill-owners should not have undue authority over workers.
3. For joining the union, will have to pay an entrance fee and a monthly subscription afterwards.

Moreover, if you receive more money, you will have to think what you will do with it. It would be better for me that I do not receive this money if I were to lose this extra money in a tavern, or drink tea or eat fritters with it. Personally, I would prefer to give some relief to my wife and educate her; if I had more money still, I would engage a lady-teacher for her, educate my children, get my clothes washed, change my damp and dirty house for a better one; if I do this, I would have received the extra money to good purpose. If we could do all these things through a union, it would be a good thing to establish one. But I am still doubtful, and I tell you again and again that, if we forget all this, we who wish to serve you, and you as well, will be wicked creatures in our next birth.

There was a time when all people were religiously inclined. By joining and sharing in all these activities, I have been trying if, even in this way, the religious temper may somehow be revived in the people of this country. It is my firm belief that we shall be saved in these hard times if this comes about; else we are doomed. This religious temper is not very difficult to cultivate. It is the simplest of things and can be cultivated most easily. I tell you, in a word, that he who gives a free rein to his desires is self-indulgent, and has no regard for self-control, that such a one is far removed from religion. He who

wrongs none, who never robs anyone of a single farthing, he understands what dharma means. If we turn ourselves into drunkards, rogues and knaves, our living, or earning will all be in vain. If we become truthful, good, straightforward, courteous and religiously inclined, we shall have lived indeed. Let our unions be established; they will foster understanding and unity among us. We shall be able to work systematically. I know that the mill-owners want a union to be formed. Today, each has some difficulty or other to solve, and complaints to attend to, individually. If there were a union, matters could be discussed with the office-bearers and settled in orderly fashion. Thus, a union is to the advantage of both the parties; give the fullest thought, therefore, to the matter before you proceed further.

[From Gujarati]

Navajivan, 29-2-1920

261. LETTER TO REGISTRAR, HIGH COURT, BOMBAY¹

THE SATYAGRAHA ASHRAM,

SABARMATI,

February 27, 1920

THE REGISTRAR

HIGH COURT

BOMBAY

DEAR SIR,

I enclose herewith the statement I wish to read or submit to the court on the 3rd proximo, the date fixed for taking the Rule *Nisi*² issued against me. I enclose also Mr. Mahadeo Desai's statement.

Yours [faithful]ly,

[ENCLOSURES]

[GANDHIJ'S STATEMENT]

With reference to the Rule *Nisi* issued against me I state as follows:

¹ The drafts of this letter and of both the statements enclosed are in Gandhiji's hand.

² Issued in the proceedings for Contempt of Court against Gandhiji as editor and Mahadev Desai as publisher of *Young India*, Bombay, which, on August 6, 1919, printed with comments a letter from B. C. Kennedy, District Judge of Ahmedabad, to the Registrar, High Court, Bombay. *Vide* also "Was It Contempt of Court?", 10-3-1920.

Before the issue of the Rule certain correspondence passed between the Registrar of this Honourable Court and myself. On the 11th December I addressed to the Registrar a letter¹ which sufficiently explains my conduct. I therefore attach a copy of the said letter. I regret that I have not found it possible to accept the advice² given by His Lordship the Chief Justice.

I am sure that this Honourable Court would not want me to tender an apology unless it be sincere and express regret for an action which I have held to be the privilege and duty of a journalist. I shall therefore cheerfully and respectfully accept the punishment that this Honourable Court may be pleased to impose upon me for the vindication of the majesty of law.

I wish to say with reference to the notice served on Mr. Mahadeo Desai, the publisher, that he published it simply upon my request and advice.³

[MAHADEV DESAI'S STATEMENT]

With reference to the Rule *Nisi* served upon me I beg to state that I have read the statement made by the Editor of *Young India* and associate myself with the reasoning adopted by the Editor in justification of his action. I shall therefore cheerfully and respectfully abide by an[y] penalty that the Honourable Court may be pleased to inflict on me. Moreover I have been unable to accept the advice because I do not consider that I have committed either a legal or a moral breach by publishing Mr. Kennedy's letter or by commenting upon the contents thereof.

From a copy: S. N. 7128

¹ For the text of this letter, *Vide* "Letter to Registrar, High Court, Bombay", 11-12-1919

² To apologize in the form suggested by him

³ The statement as reproduced in *Young India*, 10-3-1920, ends here.

262. LETTER TO MATHURADAS TRIKUMJI¹

Phagan Sud 8 [February 27, 1920]²

I got your letter yesterday. I hope to arrive there on Monday³. Hence I do not write myself, but just dictate a brief reply. I feel completely exhausted today and so am lying down. With some rest, however, I think I shall feel somewhat better. When you served me like a good son, how could it ever be that I felt dissatisfied? Because of you, I moved everywhere with no anxiety about my correspondence.⁴ Had you not been there, Devdas would have fallen ill and I also would have had to abandon so many of the things I could do. More on Monday.

[From Gujarati]

Bapuni Prasadi

263. SPEECH AT AHMEDABAD

February 27, 1920

Perhaps all of you know that for some time past I have been something of an invalid and I shall, therefore, address you sitting. I hope you will excuse me for doing so.

I find my name, too, included in the list of speakers at this meeting. I have been assigned the duty of thanking Sarladevi and the Chairman.⁵ The sister who addressed you today and the Chairman are known to me very well and it gives me great pleasure, therefore, to perform this duty.

I am, personally, a beggar. In my begging, I especially seek out sisters. Men I have found everywhere. But I try especially to seek out sisters, for I know that, unless our sisters in the country give their blessings to the brothers, India's progress is impossible. In Ahmedabad, particularly, I have found such a sister. At Bombay,

¹ 1894-1951; grandson of Gandhiji's step-sister; author, and follower of Gandhiji; secretary, Bombay Congress Committee, 1922-3; member, Bombay Municipal Corporation, 1923-5, and later Mayor

² Footnote 2 on page 54 of Mathuradas's *Atmanirikshana* indicates that the meeting which Gandhiji suggests in the letter took place on March 3, 1920.

³ Gandhiji reached Bombay on Wednesday, March 3, 1920.

⁴ Mathuradas worked as Gandhiji's secretary in Bombay in 1919 and accompanied him when he toured the Punjab in January and February, 1920.

⁵ Sir Ramanbhai Mahipatram Nilkanth

Madras and elsewhere, too, I have found someone or other. In the Punjab, I found Sarladevi. I first came to know her in 1910 and then I saw the husband and wife again in Hardwar. Sarladevi invited me to the Punjab. I accepted the invitation but felt nervous. At the time she extended it, she was separated from her husband. That made me wonder whether it would be proper for me to accept her hospitality. However, I look upon it as my good fortune if I can share others' suffering and so I stayed with her in the Punjab. I had from her as much service as from one's own sister and thus became her debtor.

If any sister carries my message to the country, I would bow to her in all reverence. But, at the moment, I want to tell you that she has delivered to you not my message but Pandit Rambhuj Dutt Chowdhari's. On an occasion such as this, this lady, ever doting on her husband, thought only of conveying her husband's message, and so put him on a pedestal. Well, Chowdhariji's message is the message of the entire Punjab. It asks you never to fear, never to accept defeat come what may, to love God and work on with patience and fortitude. We would do well to inscribe this message in our hearts.

I go after good men as I do after good women. This Chairman at today's meeting is known for his simplicity, his amiable nature and other fine qualities. He has added to the achievements of his father and earned greater fame for himself. As a reformer as also in other capacities, Shri Ramanbhai has done much. If we learn his virtues and achieve something, that will be doing a great deal.

I once again thank Sarladevi and the Chairman on behalf of you all.

[From Gujarati]

Navajivan, 7-3-1920

264. A LETTER¹

[After *February 27, 1920*]²

DEAR SIR,

I enclose herewith a copy of the statements³ sent by me to the Registrar of the High Court and which I propose to read before the Honourable Court on the 3rd proximo when the Rule *Nisi* issued against me is to be taken. I enclose, too, a copy of Mr. M. H. Desai's statement.

Yours [faithful]ly

From a copy: S. N. 7128

265. PUNJAB LETTER

LEFT THE PUNJAB

I am writing this letter sitting in the Ashram, after prayers. How can a letter written in the Ashram be called a Punjab Letter? I take the liberty of calling it so because my soul is still in the Punjab. I find it impossible to forget the frankness and the plain living of the Punjabis, their simplicity and magnanimity of heart, nor can I forget their sufferings. I feel that I have been purified by sharing, in however small a measure, in their tribulations. I can now better understand the greatness of the religion of compassion and love sung by Tulsidas. If I get time, I shall take some occasion to place before readers certain concrete instances of how that dharma is being followed.

However, my heart being still in the Punjab is not sufficient justification for calling this a Punjab Letter. This letter, though written outside, will be mainly about the Punjab and for that reason can rightly be called a Punjab Letter.

PILGRIMAGE TO KASHI

Last week I described the journey to the Gujrat district of the Punjab. After this no more journeys were necessary for the purpose of the Committee's report. It was time, moreover, that the report was

¹ Addressee not known

² Judging from the contents, this was written after 'Letter to Registrar, High Court, Bombay', 27-2-1920.

³ *Vide* enclosure to "Letter to Registrar, High Court, Bombay", 27-2-1920.

finalized. The question was where the Commissioners¹ should assemble to read it over. Kashi was likely to suit Pandit Motilal Nehru, Mr. C. R. Das and Pandit Malaviya. It was decided, therefore, that all should go to Kashi. Mr. Jayakar was already in Lahore. He, together with Mr. Santanam, Dr. Parasram and Lala Harikishen Lal left Lahore for Kashi on the 15th. On the way, Lala Girdhari Lal joined them at Amritsar. Dr. Jivaraj Mehta² also came along to look after me. We reached Kashi on the 16th. I was deeply gratified to see Pandit Malaviya and our pious and scholarly Bhai Anandshankar Dhruva³ on the platform.

The duty of drafting the report had been laid on me and I had not been able to complete the drafting in Lahore. I had, therefore, to spend the entire time in writing it out and the other Commissioners in reading what I had written. The commissioners guarded me and saved me out of their great affection. This is a memory which I shall ever cherish. Malaviyaji's love is something I cannot describe. He literally stood guard and, although our relations are such that we would scarcely allow a moment to pass without talking about the virtue of service, we both controlled ourselves and refrained from conversation. I wanted very much to have a talk with Anandshankar and listen to his experiences in Kashi but had to restrain myself. It was in this sanctifying and loving atmosphere that the report was completed. We may now confidently expect that it will be published in the beginning of March.

SUNRISE

We were staying with Panditji on the banks of the Ganga. Dawn and sunrise are impressive everywhere, but from these banks the sight was simply sublime. As the clouds brightened with the light of dawn, a golden sheen would appear on the waters of the Ganga and, when the sun had come into view over the horizon, there seemed to stand in the water of the river a great pillar of gold. It was a scene on which the eyes would rest with supreme satisfaction and make the pious devotee burst forth spontaneously into the *gayatri*⁴ hymn. After

¹ Appointed by the Punjab Sub-committee of the Congress; vide "Letter to Motilal Nehru", 20-2-1920.

² An eminent physician who later became the first Chief Minister of Gujarat State

³ Vice-Chancellor, Banaras Hindu university

⁴ Vedic prayer to the sun-god for illumination

witnessing this magnificent sight, I felt I understood a little better the worship of the sun, the adoration of the rivers and the significance of the *gayatri* hymn.

Walking on that spot, I was filled with pride for our country and our traditions but at the same time, as I thought of the present conditions, I felt sad. I observed people defecating on the very banks of the river. We no more go out to the jungle but, instead, go to the river bank. In this holy spot, it should be possible for us to walk barefoot with our eyes closed, whereas one has to walk here with the greatest caution. One also feels disgust to sip the Ganga water at this spot. Before I had finished thinking of the filth of this spot, I was reminded of the Kashi Vishvanath temple. The narrow lane leading to the temple, the stink, the heap of rotting flowers which I had seen there, the harshness and the lack of cleanliness of the Brahmin priests—as I thought of all these, I heaved a sigh and remembered the cause of degradation of the Hindus. From this my mind turned to Panditji and his work. He will be judged in future by the success of the Kashi University. Will he pass the test? I remembered his piety, his sacrifices, his magnificent service to Bharatvarsha¹. Dhruvaji² is his right hand. Remembering that the affairs of the university were in the hands of two such pious men, I felt reassured. I thought that, if the students of this university grew to be religious and learned men, there was room to hope for cleanliness in the temple and on the banks of the Ganga. Whether the university has this capacity or not, it is the task of every Hindu to find ways to remove the inner and outer defilement that has crept into the Hindu religion and every Hindu, even sitting in his own home, can make a start this very day. If each one was scrupulous about his own cleanliness, the Kashi Vishvanath would soon be as clean as we could wish.

STUDENTS OF THE UNIVERSITY

Having been commanded by Panditji to say a few words to the students, I spoke before them at 7.30 on the morning of my departure, and gave them my ideas about student life³. The student's stage of life is similar to the sannyasi's and his life should, therefore, be pure and celibate. Today two cultures are competing for the students' attention—the ancient and the modern. Self-restraint was the

¹ India

² Anandshanker Dhruva

³ Vide "Speech at Meeting of Students, Banaras", 21-2-1920.

key-note of the former. Ancient culture tells us that a man advances in the measure that he deliberately and with full knowledge reduces his wants. Modern civilization teaches us that man progresses by increasing his wants. The difference between self-restraint and self-indulgence is the difference between dharma and *adharma*¹. The ideal of self-restraint attaches less importance to the outward life than to the inner. There is a danger that in place of the ancient culture based on self-restraint, the modern civilization of self-indulgence will be accepted. Students can play decisive part in averting this danger. University students will be judged, not by their knowledge, but solely by their good conduct. Religious education and ethical conduct should be given the first place in this university. This requires the fullest co-operation from the students. Panditji himself is a man of piety and virtue. By bringing another man of similar qualities, viz., Anandshankar, he has provided an opportunity to the students. I should like them to make the best use of this opportunity and adorn their learning with dharma. These were the thoughts I placed before them on that morning. I have repeatedly expressed these ideas, in one form or another, at several places, and a summary of these same ideas which I explained to the students of Kashi University on getting this happy opportunity, I now lay before readers of *Navajivan* for them to think over. I am convinced that we cannot profit from political reforms unless we also give thought to religion. Religion will not be revived through these reforms. Rather, it is religion which will supply what the reforms may lack.

GUJARATIS IN KASHI

I did not know till today that a large number of Gujaratis lived in Kashi. Anandshankarbhai got me an opportunity of meeting them. Panditji was also present. The Gujaratis showed their sense of propriety by using this occasion for presenting an address to him. While offering my thanks to them, I put a few suggestions before them. I advised them to send back to Gujarat those defects which were regarded as typical of Gujaratis, and bank only on their good qualities. By so doing they would bring credit both to Gujarat and to the country. In practical affairs, every man encounters numerous moral difficulties. At such times, a friend becomes a necessity. This they had in the person of Anandshankarbhai. I hoped that they would take ample advantage of his presence among them. Proceeding

¹ Irreligion

from Kashi to Delhi, I met the Hon'ble Srinivasa Sastri and, bringing Sarladevi¹ along with me, I was back in the Ashram on the 23rd.

[From Gujarati]

Navajivan, 29-2-1920

266. *HINDU-MUSLIM UNITY*

It would be no exaggeration to say that the unity which prevails today between the Hindus and the Muslims is unparalleled in the present age. We all desire that it should remain undisturbed. However, unless our desire is backed up by efforts to that end, this unity cannot be kept up, nor can it be strengthened.

There is no doubt that, if it has been brought about to serve self-interest, it will not continue once the interests have been served. We should therefore examine the reasons for this growth in unity.

Many of my friends question me about it. Some misunderstandings may be removed if I repeat here the answer I gave them.

Some of them feel I am not well-advised to take a leading part on the Khilafat issue. One party asserts that it is impossible to overcome the bitter hostility between the Hindus and the Muslims. I do not wish to answer this question here. I can only observe that, if we keep raising such questions it will become impossible for us to solve many of our complicated problems. It is said the human effort can achieve anything and we see that indeed it does. If so, we need not assume that the problem is incapable of solution.

Another party argues that, though the Khilafat may well be a religious issue for Muslims, they do not have justice on their side. How are we concerned with Turkey? There is no limit to the injustices perpetrated by that country. What good will it do to the world to restore its tyrannical rule? A number of similar questions are raised. I shall try to answer them all some other time, but the main points I shall examine now. I believe that, on the Khilafat issue, the Muslim stand is entirely just. If it were purely a case of religious feelings and these feelings did not appeal to our reason, I admit that we would in no wise be bound to help them in the matter. Even apart from the religious issues involved in the Khilafat, the Muslims are still on the path of justice. The Allies had accepted, and so had President Wilson, the principle that the boundaries of the different countries as they

¹ Sarladevi Chowdhurani

existed when the War started should remain intact, and that no country should be made to suffer by way of punishment. The Muslims want them to abide by this principle. They demand that the territories held by Turkey in August 1914 be restored to her, that Arabia and the holy places of Islam remain under the control of the Khalifa, and they say that they would not mind the Sultan being asked to furnish reasonable guarantees for the protection of his Christian and Jewish subjects, consistent with his dignity. The Arabs may remain free. I find none of these demands unreasonable. They meet the objection based on the alleged oppression by Turkey. There have been promises by British ministers¹ to this effect. If, now, the Muslims do not get what was promised, they will suffer grave injustice and their religious feelings will be hurt. Hence I feel that, if we wish to do our duty by our neighbours, it is incumbent on us to help our Muslim brethren.

The orthodox Hindus, however, tell me : ‘All right, we shall help them. But nowadays Hindus drink water from the same glass, sit at meals together with them and talk of Hindus and Muslims giving their sons and daughters in marriage to one another.’ This is a genuine fear among the orthodox Hindus, but there is no good reason for entertaining it. In order that we may help them on the Khilafat issue, there is absolutely no need to drink water from the same glass, sit together at meals or give sons and daughters in marriage. Unity will come about only when the Hindu, while scrupulously following his own religion, regards the Muslim as his brother. I do not love my son the less though I wash clean the glass he has used, or do not allow him to drink from my glass without washing it . A brother and a sister do not marry, but where else shall we find such pure love as exists between them? Many Hindus do not marry in the same *gotra*² but this does not detract from their unity. Really speaking, if we consider such freedom in matters of drinking, eating and marriage essential for unity, then unity between Hindus and Muslims will never come about. Hence, whenever I hear that a Hindu and a Muslim drank from the same glass or ate from the same plate, I feel sorry because an orthodox Hindu is bound to be hurt even on hearing of these things. It would be an entirely different matter if there is some good reason why we should not mind hurting them. When, however, drinking

¹ Asquith and Lloyd George

² Lineage on the male side

water from the same glass implies no unity, to give prominence to the act as an expression of unity is creating an obstacle in the way of unity. I personally believe that we have given false importance to eating and thus invited disease and starvation, and made self-control difficult. The act of eating is no different from that of excretion; both are unclean and should be performed in private. Because we enjoy eating, we indulge in the pleasure openly and have abandoned shame in this matter as well. I feel that we would do well to emulate those strict Hindus who eat in private, just that they might preserve the body, taking God's name the while. Maybe I am mistaken; I only want to prove that, for promoting Hindu-Muslim unity, it is not necessary to drink and eat in company. By raising this question, we put an obstacle in the way of unity.

Let us now consider the question of marriages. Many Hindus and Muslims eat together of their own free will and Hindu society tolerates this. But nowhere do we find marriages as between Hindus and Muslims; if such a thing were to be encouraged, the Hindu religion would die out. I think it impossible for a Hindu and a Muslim to marry and yet follow his or her own religion properly. Men devoid of the religious feeling live to no good purpose. If we would keep this feeling pure, there can be no question of marriages between Hindus and Muslims. If Hindus and Muslims keep up unity between themselves by being in different to their respective religions, such unity is not real; it is not unity as between Hindus and Muslims, and what we wish for is Hindu-Muslim unity. If we wish to achieve it and would preserve it, we should forget for ever the idea of marriages between Hindus and Muslims. I should think that the zealous Muslims feel the same way. A Muslim can never marry a Hindu who remains a Hindu. What religion will the offspring of such union follow? One spouse must accept the religion of the other or they should both live without religion, or found a new creed. In none of these lies Hindu-Muslim unity. My dream is that a *Vaishnava*¹, with a mark on his forehead and a bead necklace, or an ash-smeared Hindu with a *rudraksha*² necklace, ever so punctilious in his *sandhya*³ and ablutions, and a pious Muslim saying his *namaz*⁴ regularly can live as brothers. God willing, the dream will be

¹ Member of the *Vaishnava* sect among the Hindus; a worshipper of Vishnu

² Literally "Shiva's eye"; seed of a tree sacred to Lord Shiva

³ Morning and evening prayers

⁴ Prayer

realized.

Well may some friend, his mind clouded with doubts, remark that, if help on the Khilafat issue can promote unity, there should be a similar bond between a lawyer and client. I see two fallacies in this doubt. The clients in India are so poor in spirit that they even worship the lawyer whom they have paid. A lawyer, then, who wants no return can easily buy his client as a slave. Those who have never seen Dadabhai¹, even such Indians, suffering from leprosy, with whom Dadabhai would never sit for a meal, worship that lawyer. Gokhale's² gratuitous pleading has gained him immortality. If twenty-two crores of Hindus intelligently plead for the Muslims on the Khilafat issue, I believe that they would for ever win the vote of the eight crores of Muslims.

I stayed at Maulana Bari³ Saheb's with love. He sent for a Brahmin cook for me and even had my milk warmed by him. He is a non-vegetarian but he did not let me catch even a glimpse of meat in his house. Because of his observing such decorum, our friendship was strengthened, not weakened.

[From Gujarati]

Navajivan, 29-2-1920

267. NOTES

MRS. BESANT INSULTED

We find that, at the meeting held⁴ in Bombay to welcome Lalaji⁵, many from among the audience insulted Mrs. Besant⁶. We were deeply grieved to hear this. When we are looking forward to a new

¹ Dadabhai Naoroji (1825-1917); thrice elected president, Indian National Congress; first to enunciate swaraj as objective of the Congress

² Gopal Krishna Gokhale (1866-1915); educationist and politician; president of the Congress, 1905; founder of Servants of India Society; successfully pleaded the cause of indentured Indian labourers

³ Abdul Bari (1838-1926); nationalist Muslim divine; took active part in the Khilafat movement and urged his followers to refrain from cow-slaughter

⁴ On February 20, 1920

⁵ Lala Lajpat Rai (1865-1928); nationalist leader of the Punjab. He arrived in Bombay on February 20, 1920, after being away from India for six years and was accorded a great welcome.

⁶ Annie Besant (1847-1933); philosopher and political leader; president of Theosophical Society, 1907-33; left in 1919 the Indian Home Rule League founded by her in 1916

and beautiful life in India, employing the weapons of rudeness and contempt against people who hold views different from ours will obstruct our progress. In public life, courtesy, respect and toleration for opponents are indispensable. The insult to Mrs. Besant brings disgrace to us. The incomparable service which this good lady had in a few years' time rendered to India, very few Indians have done. Maybe at present her views do not appeal to us, maybe we see her errors all the time; even so, by insulting one who has rendered such magnificent service to India, —one who, in her old age, displays enthusiasm worthy of youth, still continues to contribute her share for the advancement of India--we insult ourselves. It is our duty to clear the air immediately of this noxious wind of rudeness.

MRS. SARLADEVI CHOWDHURI

Sarladevi has been in Ahmedabad for some time and hence it will not be out of place to give some additional information about her to readers of *Navajivan*. In a general way, all have heard of Sarladevi, but only as an erudite lady doing public service. To be more specific about her, she is a niece of Sir Rabindranath Tagore, daughter of the well-known former secretary of the Congress, Mr. Ghosal and wife of the famous Pandit Rambhuj Dutt Chowdhari of the Punjab. She completed her B.A. at the age of 19, and from then onwards has been engaged in public service in one form or another. It was she who started the Bengali monthly, named *Bharati*, and it is said that she showed in it the great power of her pen. Her poetic power is of a high order and her sweet song "I bow to India", which was sung in Banaras, is known all over the country. Shrimati Sarladevi took a leading part in establishing committees in Bengal and, when the War broke out, and it came to telling the educated Bengalis that they should join the army and do their duty, few were as effective as this lady. We see her hand in the public movement in the Punjab too. Her musical talent perhaps exceeds her gift for poetry and she is, therefore, in demand at every Congress. Pandit Rambhuj Dutt Chowdhari himself has some poetic gift. One of his poems is very powerful and popular as well. It is in Gurumukhi¹ and is sung by thousands of men. It was sung at the Congress², Sarladevi having trained some boys and girls for the purpose. It can almost serve as the song of satyagrahis and we publish it, therefore, on the opening page

¹ A script in use in the Punjab; here, the Punjabi language

² At its Amritsar session in December 1919

of this issue, with the meanings of the difficult words.

PROPAGATION OF SWADESHI IN NADIAD

To propagate swadeshi in Nadiad, a company named the “Swadeshi Bhandar Limited” has been formed. It has ten shares of a lakh each and ten thousand shares of ten rupees each. This enterprise has been launched with the purpose of supplying sufficient cloth to those who have taken the vows of pure and of mixed swadeshi in Nadiad and other places and for popularizing hand-spun, hand-woven cloth. The company's profit is restricted to a maximum of six and a quarter per cent and the commission for the agents has been fixed at 25 per cent on the net profit. This venture has been started not with the object of making profit, but solely for the purpose of propagating swadeshi, and the friends who will manage it have joined it, we believe, wholly with the idea of service. We have, therefore, welcomed this enterprise. The organizers hope that, instead of a few persons buying up the shares, a large number will buy a few shares each. It is also their aim to permit no speculation in the name of this company and no transfer of shares purely for such purpose. The shareholders, too, it is hoped, will not subscribe with the sole object of earning heavy interest but entirely with the idea of encouraging swadeshi. A company formed with such restrictions ought to be welcomed. We, therefore, hope that people of ordinary means will buy shares in this company and encourage this enterprise, and also that the organizers, despite any difficulties they may have to face, will never give up the aims they have set before them.

[From Gujarati]

Navajivan, 29-2-1920

268. *LETTER TO L. FRENCH*

[CALCUTTA,]¹

February 29, 1920

DEAR MR. FRENCH,

I beg to thank you for your letter of the 19th instant in reply to mine² regarding the recruiting methods in Shahpur. I feel grateful to

¹ Although this letter is written on Gandhiji's personal letter-paper bearing his Sabarmati address, it must, in fact, have been written from Calcutta, for he was there on February 29, 1920.

² *Vide* “Letter to L. French”, 15-2-1920.

His Honour¹ for the assurance that he will investigate the matter. I am sorry that there has been some unavoidable delay in sending the statements that were taken before me. I left them to be translated in Lahore with instructions to send them immediately after translation. I am expecting them every day and as soon as I receive them, I shall forward them for His Honour's perusal.

I may mention that the punitive police is still posted at Lak Tahsil Sargodha, at Bahk Lurkhan, at Kot Inoman and at Kot Ranja in Tahsil Bhalwal. Whatever the final opinion about the statements may be, I trust that punitive police will be withdrawn at the earliest moment.

Yours sincerely,

From a copy: S. N. 7125

269. LETTER TO MAHADEV DESAI

[About *February 29, 1920*]²

BHAI MAHADEV,

Do what I will, I cannot find time for a long letter to you. Dr. Mehta³ casually told me about your health. I came here in connection with Khilafat work and am returning to Ahmedabad. God alone knows when I shall join you in Sinhgadh.⁴ I believe Anandanand⁵ writes to you frequently.

Blessings from

BAPU

From a photostat of the Gujarati : S.N. 11410

¹ The Lt.-Governor of the Punjab

² The letter seems to have been written from Calcutta, where Gandhiji attended the Khilafat Conference on February 29, 1920. He was back in Ahmedabad on March

³ Jivraj Mehta

⁴ Gandhiji reached Sinhgadh on March 26, 1920.

⁵ Swami Anandanand; manager of the Navajivan Press during the decade after the publication of *Navajivan* was commenced from Ahmedabad in September 1919

270. *THE AMRITSAR APPEALS*¹

So these appeals have been dismissed in spite of the advocacy of the best counsel that was 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 his argument 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 [for it] 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 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 Proclamation² to the letter. That great political document orders the

¹ On July 24, 1919, the Privy Council had granted leave of appeal to 21 citizens of Amritsar convicted by the Court Martial at Lahore in connection with the Amritsar riots of April 1919. They appealed on the ground that the Viceroy had no power to issue the Martial Law ordinances and that the procedure followed by Summary Courts was irregular.

² Of December 1919

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 goodwill 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.

Young India, 3-3-1920

271. TELEGRAM TO ANASUYABEHN SARABHAI

BOMBAY,
March 3, 1920

ANASUYABEHN
MIRZAPUR
AHMEDABAD

JUDGMENT RESERVED INDEFINITELY.¹ LOVE. REACHING
SUNDAY.

GANDHI

From the original: S.N. 32781

¹ The judgment in the Contempt of Court case against Gandhiji and Mahadev Desai was delivered on March 12. For Gandhiji's article on the subject, *Vide* "What is Contempt of Court", 10-3-1920.

272. *LETTER TO ESTHER FAERING*

BOMBAY,
Wednesday [March 3]¹ 1920

MY DEAR CHILD,

The case is going on, and as I have a few minutes' interval, I want to give you a few lines.

You are constantly in my mind. Sometimes I even feel uneasy when I think of our chats and when I think that in some things I might have appeared harsh when I had wanted to be gentle. One's speech cannot be judged by one's intentions but only [by] the effect it produced on the hearer. Are you happy and joyful ? How are you in body?

I would like you to return Mr. Banker's trunk. If you need another, you may take one in Madras. You will let me have your programme, of course.

The case is finished and the judgment has been reserved. I have sent you a telegram².

With love,

Yours,

BAPU

From a photostat of the original in N.A.I.; also *My Dear Child*, pp. 66-7

273. *SPEECH AT KHILAFAT MEETING, BOMBAY*³

March 3, 1920

I am not strong enough to stand and speak. I have spoken often on this issue. It is my belief that nothing can be done to us against our will. They are bound to respect our wishes. I saw today the resolutions passed at the Khilafat Conference⁴ at Calcutta and they made me happy. The Maulana Saheb⁵ has, at this meeting, laid down

¹ The Contempt of Court case to which the letter refers was heard at Bombay on March 3; *vide* "Was It contempt of Court?", 10-3-1920

² Not available

³ The meeting was called by the Khilafat Committee; Mia Mahomed Haji Jain Mahomed Chhotani was in the chair.

⁴ Held on February 29, 1920

⁵ Maulana Abul Kalam Azad, who presided over the Conference

our line of work. He has declared, as with a trumpet, what he wished to say to the Emperor. How do I know that tomorrow my Hindu brethren will not find themselves in the same situation in which you are placed today? I have offered this neck of mine, in the name of Khuda, to the world and to you. What more can I give you? If this question is not settled satisfactorily and if our Muslim brethren resign from the Councils, I can tell you with confidence that my brethren, the Hindu representatives, cannot but follow their example. The Calcutta Conference has passed the resolution on boycott¹ but it does not command my sympathy at all. We should keep away from the idea of boycott. If we are prepared to lay down our lives, where is the point of boycott? This is a sacred cause. We will pay a price only for a cause which deserves it. What can the Archbishops of Canterbury and York do to make us strong? You have the fullest sympathy of the Hindus. These days I have been reading the Koran a little. That brings me nearer to you. We have no desire to subdue anyone with hate. Rather than cut off the other man's head with the sword, offer your own head. All of our representatives should be ready to declare that, if the issue is not settled justly, their help will not be available in running the government of the country.

[From Gujarati]

Gujarati, 7-3-1920

274. SPEECH AT BOMBAY ²

March 4, 1920

Mr. Gandhi congratulated the organizers of the movement on the starting of the Sabha and hoped it would succeed in the work which it had undertaken. The objects of the Sabha appeared to be clear and straightforward, and that being the case, he had no doubt of their success provided they worked industriously to achieve their object. Truth and fearlessness were conditions essential to and sufficient for the success of an object like the one they had in view, and he was sure that if they worked in a spirit of truthfulness, fearlessness and straightforwardness, their effort would be crowned with success.

The Bombay Chronicle, 5-3-1920

¹ Of British goods

² At a public meeting held under the presidentship of G. K. Parekh at the Morarji Gokuldas Hall to welcome the formation of the Kathiawar Hitvardhak Sabha

275. SPEECH ON PRESS ACT, BOMBAY¹

March 5, 1920

The fact that the man² who struggled more than anyone else for the repeal of this law is not present here is a shame both to the people and the Government. If the Government offered to repeal this Act, but wanted to shelve the question of Horniman's return to India,³ I am sure the Indian people would not accept that. The question which I keep asking myself is this: 'if there were no newspapers to give expression to public opinion, how would the Government ever know it?' For want of independent newspapers, the Government has to rely upon the C.I.D.⁴ The people, therefore, request the Government that, if it wanted to lighten this burden on the C.I.D., if it was anxious to see independent newspapers in India and felt the need for people's co-operation, it should not gag newspapers, which are representatives of public opinion. The Government's condition at present is like that of the meteorologist who has smashed his barometer and would yet measure the atmospheric pressure.

Not only journalists but the entire public should carry on a powerful agitation to secure repeal of this Act. Were I to describe the worries and hardships of journalists, I would fill a volume as big as the *Mahabharata*. People sometimes praise me and sometimes swear at me as well; sometimes they defend the authorities, and occasionally denounce them too. It is for journalists to separate the grain from the chaff in all this. It is the journalist's duty to throw light on every matter of public concern. However, not to admit in one's paper a single adjective which does not serve the people's cause in the most effective means of securing the repeal of the Press Act.

[From Gujarati]

Navajivan, 14-3-1920

¹ At a meeting held under the auspices of the Indian Press Association, with Sir Narayan Chandavarkar in the chair. A resolution demanding repeal of the Press Act of 1910 was proposed by Gandhiji and seconded by M. R. Jayakar. The meeting was one of the few occasions which found Nationalists, Liberals and Home Rule Leaguers on the same platform.

² B. G. Horniman (1873-1948); journalist and political agitator; editor of *The Bombay Chronicle*. He was deported from India in April 1919 and could return only in 1926.

³ A resolution requesting the Government of Bombay to permit Horniman's return to India was moved by K. Natarajan at the meeting.

⁴ The Criminal Investigation Department

276. TELEGRAM TO SHAUKAT ALI¹

March 6, 1920

PREPARING APPEAL REGARDING NINETEENTH² GIVING
CONDITIONAL ADHERENCE. ADVISE YOU TEMPER FIRMNESS
WITH MODERATION AND EXPRESS TRUTH IN LANGUAGE
LOVE NOT HATE THEN ONLY SHALL WE WIN.

Bombay Secret Abstracts, 1920, p. 33

277. TELEGRAM TO K. SANTANAM

March 6, 1920

SEND TRANSLATION STATEMENTS³ TAKEN BY ME
IMMEDIATELY AHMEDABAD TRANSLATE REST AND SEND.

GANDHI

From a copy : S. N. 7145

278. CONDITION OF "NAVAJIVAN"

At the time the *Navajivan* was converted into a weekly and I took over its editorship,⁴ I had mentally decided upon certain conditions. Some of those which the reader knows I recall here :

1. Not to accept advertisements for money in *Navajivan*.
2. Not to publish *Navajivan* at a loss.

These days about nine thousand copies of *Navajivan* are sold. I would not be satisfied till the number rises to twenty thousand and would not be surprised if it increased to fifty thousand. So far, however, we have not been able to provide for the printing of so many copies. We do not have such a machine, nor the required number of men. We do not have a building in which so many copies can be printed with ease; moreover, my co-workers and I are not yet able to supply articles of the quality and in quantity to tempt fifty thousand

¹ Who had gone to Calcutta in connection with the Bengal Provincial Khilafat Conference held on February 28 and 29

² March 19, the Khilafat Day

³ In regard to the Punjab atrocities of 1919. Gandhiji had asked for these as he was preparing the manuscript of the Congress Report thereon for the press and also to send to Lt.-Governor of the Punjab; *Vide* "Letter to L. Franch", 29-2-1920.

⁴ This was with effect from September 7, 1919

subscribers. God willing, such a time will come. I would consider the last issue to be of such a standard; previously, too, a few such issues came out. But, as an English saying has it, one swallow does not make a summer. Similarly one good issue of *Navajivan* cannot be the standard for judging all. The last issue was especially good because of Sarladevi's article, "Bandhu", appearing in it. It was written in two instalments. The first part was written several years ago when she was living in some region covered with woods, but it had remained unpublished. Recently, on my begging her, she searched it out, supplemented it and made it into the likeness of a perfect poem and then gifted it to me. The original article is in Bengali. As it was found difficult to translate, its appearance in *Navajivan* was delayed. Two or three meanings can be read in this article. But I would advise my readers to peruse it several times over and extract all the sweetness from it. They will discover that its sweetness is inexhaustible.

But I have digressed. These days *Navajivan* is sold at a loss. The cost of one copy comes to 16 pies, of which eight pies are for paper. Having started with good quality paper, we do not like to change over to inferior quality. Hence it has been decided to effect some saving by reducing the size. Instead of sixteen pages, only twelve pages are given this time, but not even four pies are saved in this way. And so it has been decided to sell single copies in Bombay and Ahmedabad at five pice instead of four. This will stop the loss. The reader will see that so long as basically *Navajivan* suffers loss, increasing its sale would mean increased loss. In its present state of loss, therefore, even increasing its sale is out of the question.

When *Navajivan* was started, eight pages were promised but, the circumstances having permitted, sixteen pages were given. Even now the reader will get more than the promised eight pages. I wish to state at the same time that no subjects will be avoided for lack of space, but more concise articles, costing greater effort, will be given and an attempt made to include as many subjects as at present. Often lengthy articles are produced in order to fill up space in papers. Frequently the author writes his articles in haste and fails to arrange his ideas properly. One finds it difficult to understand them and, sometimes, a thought in itself easy to understand is expressed in such a roundabout way that it costs an effort to understand it. I hope, therefore, that contributors to *Navajivan* will write more concisely and, looking upon themselves as joint proprietors, co-operate to make it prosper. Our aim in starting *Navajivan* was not business; it was,

through its means, to render what little service we could to the people and, at a time when new life was flowing into them, to guide them, to the best of our ability, along straightforward and simple paths and help them in solving complicated problems.

Contributors to *Navajivan* should, therefore, try and see that, though they write more briefly, they do not give less substance.

If the price of paper comes down, or if any losses are due to our inefficiency in the Navajivan Press or the office and if matters can be set right, we will do so and start giving sixteen pages again. If we do not want *Navajivan* to run at a loss, we do not want any profit either. Any saving, therefore, will be passed on to readers. I hope they will see this, and, looking upon *Navajivan* as their own property, co-operate in improving its condition.

[From Gujarati]

Navajivan, 7-3-1920

279. NOTES

SIR RABINDRANATH TAGORE'S VISIT

The Sahitya Parishad¹ will be held in April. News has been received that Sir Rabindranath Tagore will grace the Conference with his presence. His visit will be no ordinary event. He is not a politician, but a great poet. In India, certainly, he has no equal. Our friend Andrews is himself a poet and in his opinion Sir Rabindranath has no equal today even in Europe.

As he is a poet, so is he a philosopher and believes in God. Andrews has even called him a prophet. This great poet is a priceless gem of India. No one can deny that his poetry is full of spiritual wisdom, ethical ideals and other noble elements. His *Gitanjali* and *Sadhana* stand in a world apart; his stories are full of childhood's joy and, equally, of thought and art.

I should like the capital city of Gujarat to accord him a befitting reception. Deafening cheers are not the right thing for him. Despite the crowd, we should avoid jostling and make way for one beloved of us. The way we decorate the roads should have nothing of the West in it but should be in the manner of the East. He is as great a connoisseur of painting and music as he is a great poet. The expe-

¹ The Gujarat Literary Conference, the sixth session of which was due to be held at Ahmedabad

ssion of our feelings, therefore, should be quiet, artistic and so sincere as to be free in all respects from ostentation or sentimentality. I request the organizers to apply their minds from today and think out proper arrangements so that our guest may feel no strain and Gujarat may accord, with religious fervour, a welcome worthy of itself and the poet.

[From Gujarati]

Navajivan, 7-3-1920

280. LETTER TO THE PRESS

[March 7, 1920]¹

The Khilafat 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 fore. The prelates threw down the challenge. The Muslim leaders have taken it up.

I trust that the Hindus will realize that the Khilafat question overshadows the Reforms² 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-Arab, i.e., Arabia as defined by the Muslim savants subject to self-governing rights being given to the Arabs if they so desire. This was what was promised³ by Mr. Lloyd George and this was what Lord Hardinge had contemplated.⁴ The Mohammedan soldiers would not have fought to deprive Turkey of her possessions. To deprive the

¹ This "manifesto" on the Khilafat question was released from Sabarmati Ashram Ahmedabad, on March 7, 1920.

² The Montagu-Chelmsford Reforms of 1919

³ In his speech of January 5, 1918, wherein he declared that the Allies were not fighting "to deprive Turkey of its capital or of the rich and renowned lands of Asia Minor and Thrace"

⁴ Evidently the reference is to the Proclamation issued by the Government of India on November 2, 1914, which declared that "no question of a religious character was involved" in the War.

Khalif of the suzerainty of Arabia is to reduce the Khilafat to a nullity.

To restore to Turkey, subject to necessary guarantees, what was hers before the War is a Christian solution. To wrest any of her possessions from her for the sake of punishing her is a gun-powder solution. The Allies or England in the hour of 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" struggle¹ 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 Muslim 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 In 1913 and 1914

1. The cessation of business on the 19th instant¹ and expression of the minimum demands by means of one single resolution 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 been often told that the C.I.D. sometimes promote violence. I do not believe in it as a general 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 today against violence is based upon pure expedience, i.e., its utter futility.

Non-co-operation is therefore the only remedy left open to us. It is the cleanest 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 sentiment. England cannot accept a meek submission by us to an unjust usurpation of rights which to Mussulmans mean a matter of life and death. We may therefore begin at the top as also the bottom. Those who are holding offices of honour or emolument ought to give them up. Those who belong to the menial services under Government should do likewise. Non-co-operation does not apply to services 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 soldiers 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 leave us. Moreover every step in withdrawing co-operation has to be taken with the

¹ The Khilafat Day, which would be observed as a day of national mourning, betokened by fasting and hartal

greatest deliberation. We must proceed slowly so as to ensure retention of self-control under the fiercest heat.

Many look upon the Calcutta resolutions¹ 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 wholly 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 demands 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 advise every Hindu and for that matter everyone 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 gravest 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 with my life even if I should stand alone. My goal is friendship with the world and I can combine the greatest love with the greatest opposition to wrong.

Young India, 10-3-1920

281. TELEGRAM TO BENGAL KHILAFAT COMMITTEE

[On or after *March 7, 1920*]²

HAVE ISSUED MANIFESTO DECLARING VIEWS APPROVING
NINETEENTH³. SHALL SUPPORT TILL DEATH IF MOVEMENT
DOES NOT DRIFT INTO VIOLENCE.

The Bombay Chronicle, 11-3-1920

¹ Of the Khilafat Conference held on February 29, 1920

² The “manifesto” mentioned in the text is the letter to the Press issued on March 7, 1920, *vide* the preceding item; this telegram must therefore have been sent on or after that date.

³ The Khilafat Day

282. THE 6TH APRIL AND THE 13TH

It is impossible for us to forget the 6th of April¹ which vitalized the whole of India and the 13th of April² which by the spilling of innocent blood has made the Punjab a place of pilgrimage for the whole of India. The 6th of April saw the advent of satyagraha. One may dissent from the civil disobedience part of it but no one can dissent from the essential doctrine of truth and love or non-injury. With *satya* combined with *ahimsa* you can bring the world to your feet. Satyagraha in its essence is nothing but the introduction of truth and gentleness in the political, i.e., the national life. And whether one takes the satyagraha pledge or not, there can be no doubt that the spirit of satyagraha has pervaded the masses. Anyway, that is my experience of thousands of Punjabis I met throughout my tour in the Punjab.

The 6th of April again saw the inauguration of a definite plan of Hindu-Muslim unity and *swadeshi*.

It was the 6th of April which broke the spirit underlying the Rowlatt Act and made it a dead letter. The 13th of April saw not merely the terrific tragedy, but in that tragedy Hindu-Muslim blood flowed freely in a mingled stream and sealed the compact.

How to commemorate or celebrate these two great national events? I venture to suggest that those who will, should devote the 6th April next to fast (twenty-four hours abstention from food) and prayer and that all over India at 7 p.m., public meetings should be held praying for the repeal of the Rowlatt Act and expressing the national belief that there will be no peace in the land till that Act is repealed. That the Act is a dead letter is not enough. Either it is a disgrace or it is not. If it is, the Act must be repealed. The repeal before the reforms³ will be a token of goodwill on the part of the Government.

The whole of the week beginning from the 6th should be devoted to some work connected with the tragedy of the 13th. I therefore venture further to suggest that the week should be devoted to the collecting of funds for the Jallianwala Bagh memorial, it being remembered that the sum to be collected is ten lakhs of rupees. Each

¹ April 6, 1919, the day of universal hartal

² April 13, 1919, the day of the Jallianwala Bagh massacre

³ The Montagu-Chelmsford reforms of 1919, then awaiting implementation

village or town can devise its own plan of collection, guarding against misappropriation and fraud. The collection should be finished by the evening of the 12th April.

Then the 13th. That day of days should be devoted to fasting and prayer. It should be free from ill will or anger. We want to cherish the memory of the innocent dead. We do not want to remember the wickedness of the deed. The nation will rise by readiness to sacrifice, not by preparing to revenge. On that day I would also have the nation to remember the mass excesses¹ and feel penitent for them. We close the week by meetings throughout India to pass resolutions urging the Government, both Imperial and Indian, to take effective steps to render a repetition of the tragedy impossible.

I would further urge that during the week each one does his or her best in his or her own person to realize more fully than ever the principles of satyagraha, Hindu-Muslim unity and swadeshi. In order to emphasize Hindu-Muslim unity I would advise joint meetings of Hindus and Mohammedans on Friday, the 12th April, at 7 p.m., urging that the Khilafat question be decided in accordance with the just Muslim sentiments.

Thus this national week should be a week of purification, self-examination, sacrifice, exact discipline and expression of cherished national sentiments. There should be no trace of bitterness, no violence of language but absolute fearlessness and firmness.

Should there not also be hartal on the 6th and the 13th? My answer is an emphatic 'no'. The week is a Satyagraha Week for those who believe in truth and non-violence. The hartal of the 6th was a satyagraha hartal in the sense that it was a prelude to satyagraha. The hartal of the 6th April last, though it was spontaneous, was not altogether free from undue pressure during the course of the day in the way of asking people not to use carriages, etc. I would therefore not advise hartal at all for this week of discipline and penance. Moreover hartal must not be made cheap. It must be only for rare occasions.

I respectfully trust that all parties and all classes will see their way to take their full share in the observances of the national week and make it an event for the true and definite progress in national awakening.

Young India, 10-3-1920

¹ The disorders of April 1919

283. WAS IT CONTEMPT OF COURT ?¹

This rule² was heard by the Hon'ble Justices Marten, Hayward and Kajji on the 3rd instant. The Editor, Mr. Gandhi and the Publisher, Mr. Desai, of Young India were to show cause why they should not be committed for contempt having published with comments in the issue of the 6th August, 1919 of their paper, a letter addressed by Mr. Kennedy, District Judge of Ahmedabad, to the Registrar of the High Court complaining of the conduct of certain satyagrahi lawyers of Ahmedabad.

The Hon'ble Sir Thomas Strangman, Advocate-General, with Messrs Bahadurji and Pocock appeared for the applicant. Mr. Gandhi and Mr. Desai appeared in person.

The Advocate-General, in opening the case, said that the proceedings were in contempt against Mr. Gandhi and Mr. Desai, about whose being Editor and Publisher respectively there was no dispute. It appeared that Mr. Kennedy in April last, finding that certain lawyers in Ahmedabad had signed the Satyagraha Pledge³, asked them to explain why their sanads should not be cancelled for their having signed the pledge, and as he did not consider their explanation satisfactory he addressed a letter to the Registrar of the High Court on the 22nd April, 1919. In consequence, two notices were issued by the High Court to the lawyers concerned. A copy of Mr. Kennedy's letter was given by the Registrar to Mr. Divetia, pleader for one of the lawyers, who handed the same to Mr. Kalidas J. Jhaveri, one of the satyagrahi lawyers, who in turn handed it to Mr. Gandhi. On the 6th August this letter was published in his paper under the heading "O'Dwyerism in Ahmedabad" along with an article headed "Shaking Civil Resisters"⁴, commenting on the letter. (The Advocate-General at this stage read the letter and the article.) It appeared from the article, said he, that by "O'Dwyer" was meant a disturber of peace. The article said that the District Judge was

¹ This article has been attributed to Gandhiji in *The Law and the Lawyers*, a compilation edited by S.B. Kher and published by Navajivan Publishing House, Ahmedabad.

² Rule *nisi* issued against Gandhiji and Mahadev Desai; *vide* "Letter to Registrar, High Court, Bombay", 27-2-1920.

³ Drafted by Gandhiji in protest against the Rowlatt Bills and signed on February 24, 1919 by Gandhiji himself, Vallabhbhai Patel, Sarojini Naidu, Horniman and others; *vide* "The Satyagraha Pledge", 24-2-1919.

⁴ *Vide* "Shaking Civil Resisters", 6-8-1919

prejudging the issue. His conduct was described as not only ungentlemanly, but something worse, unpardonable. He was said to be fanning the fire of Bolshevism. Those were shortly the charges made against Mr. Kennedy. Then proceedings took place in the High Court. After the proceedings the Registrar addressed a letter to Mr. Gandhi requesting him to attend the Chief Justice's Chamber to give an explanation as regards the publication of the letter. Mr. Gandhi replied by telegram¹ explaining his inability to attend on the appointed date as he was going to the Punjab, and inquiring if a written explanation would be sufficient. The Registrar replied saying that the Chief Justice did not wish to interfere with Mr. Gandhi's appointment and that a written explanation would do. On the 22nd October Mr. Gandhi sent a written explanation² in which he stated that the letter was received by him in the ordinary course and that he published it as he believed it was of great public importance and that he thought that he was doing a public service in commenting on it. He, therefore, claimed that in publishing and commenting on the letter, he was within the rights of a journalist. In reply to this the Registrar wrote³ saying that the Chief Justice was not satisfied with the explanation, but that it would be considered sufficient if an apology in the following terms were published in the next issue of *Young India*.

FORM OF APOLOGY

Whereas on the 6th August, 1919 we published in *Young India* a private letter written by Mr. Kennedy, District Judge of Ahmedabad, to the Registrar of the High Court of Justice at Bombay and whereas on the same date we also published certain comments on the said letter and whereas it has been pointed out to us that pending certain proceedings in the said High Court in connection with the said letter we were not justified in publishing the said letter or in commenting thereon. Now we do hereby express our regret and apologize to the Hon'ble the Chief Justice and Judges of the said High Court for the publication of the said letter and the comments thereon.

The Advocate-General said that he submitted with some confidence that it was an apology which the opponent should have published. A milder form of apology, he thought, it was difficult to

¹ *Vide* "Shaking Civil Resisters", 6-8-1919

² *Ibid*

³ A letter dated October 31, 1919, which Gandhiji received on November 7, 1919 while at Lahore

conceive. Mr. Gandhi, however, did not publish the apology and took counsel's opinion and addressed a letter to the Registrar expressing his inability to apologize. Before the receipt of this letter a notice was ordered by the High Court on the 11th of December to be issued for contempt on which the proceedings were based. The text of Mr. Gandhi's letter dated 11th December, 1919, is as follows.¹

A few days before the hearing of the rule Mr. Gandhi addressed a letter to the Registrar dated 27th February, with which he enclosed copies of statements which he and Mr. Desai desired to submit before the Court. The text of the two statements is given below.²

Continuing the Advocate-General proceeded to cite rulings to show what constitutes Contempt of Court. 2 Q.B., page 36, showed that there were two kinds of contempt : (1) any act or writing tending to scandalize the court; (2) any act or writing calculated to obstruct or interfere with the due course of justice or the lawful process of the court. The Advocate-General submitted that the publication of the letter and the comments thereon constituted contempt in two respects : (1) in the language of Lord Hardwicke it scandalized Mr. Kennedy; and (2) it was an attempt to interfere with the course of justice. He further said that the High Court could punish for contempt of an inferior court. The District Court of Ahmedabad was under the superintendence of the High Court and it had no power to commit for contempt except for what was done in the face of the Court.

Mr. Justice Marten asked if it was Contempt of Court in a civil action to publish the plaint or the written statement.

The Advocate-General replied it was a contempt. The pleadings did not become public documents until the case was heard. The Advocate-General also referred to (1906) 1 Kings Branch, page 132, and (1903) 2 K.B. He added that publication after trial was different from publication before it. In conclusion the Advocate-General drew the deduction that the gist of Mr. Gandhi's article was that as Mr. Kennedy was fanning the fire of Bolshevism, the High Court, if it acted on his letter, would likewise disturb the peace and fan the fire of Bolshevism.

Mr. Gandhi addressing the Court said that he did not propose to say anything beyond what he had already said in his statement.

¹ Not reproduced here. For the text of the letter, *vide* "Letter to Registrar, High Court, Bombay", 11-12-1919.

² For text of the letter and the statements, *vide* "Letter to Registrar, High Court, Bombay", 27-2-1920.

Esteemed friends had asked him to consider if he was not obstinate in not making the required apology. He had considered the matter over and over again and whatever view the Court held, he asked them to believe him that nothing was farther from his thoughts than obstinacy. He wished to pay all respect to the Honourable Court. On the other hand he did expect that the Honourable Court would not grudge his paying the same respect to his own sense of honour and to the dignity of journalism. He had heard the Advocate-General carefully to see if anything he said could convince him that he had been in the wrong. But he had remained entirely unconvinced. Had he been convinced he would readily have withdrawn his statement and tendered apology. He did not wish to say anything more.

Mr. Justice Marten said that the point of law was against Mr. Gandhi. Mr. Gandhi had said that he was entitled as a journalist to do what he had done. But the Advocate-General had cited authorities against him. Had he any authorities to support his position?

Mr. Gandhi said he differed from the Advocate-General on the point of law, but he did not rest his case, such as it was, on points of law. He did not wish to argue legal points and go beyond the limits he had set to himself. The Court had before now done justice in many undefended cases and he wished himself to be considered as undefended. He would be entirely content with their Lordships' finding on points of law.

Mr. Justice Marten reminded Mr. Gandhi that he was himself a member of the Bar and that he could argue out the case from the legal standpoint.

Mr. Gandhi said he was unprepared to do so and repeated that he would be content to take the ruling of the Court with regard to law. But since the Court had coaxed him to argue he would say that what he felt was that he had not prejudiced any party. The Hon. the Advocate-General had said that his comments on the District Judge constituted contempt of a judge. Mr. Gandhi commented on the District Judge not as a judge but as an individual.

J. MARTEN : Take the case of a sensational murder trial. Supposing the Press commented on the events while the case was going on, what would happen?

MR. GANDHI : I would respectfully draw a distinction as a layman between the two cases. The District Judge writes this letter as a complainant and not as a Judge.

J. MARTEN : He was writing as a judge exercising jurisdiction over certain lawyers.

MR. GANDHI : I agree. But he was not sitting in court to decide an action. I feel again that I am travelling beyond the limits I set to myself. The whole law of Contempt of Court is that one ought not to do anything which might prejudice proceedings before a court. But here the Judge does something as an individual. I have not done anything to prejudice in any shape or form the judgment of the judges.

J. MARTEN : Would it not be dangerous if the Press made comments during pendency of proceedings? The court would cease to be the tribunal and the Press would be the tribunal instead.

MR. GANDHI : I would again respectfully draw a distinction. If a son wrongly brought a suit against his father then I would be justified in commenting on the son's conduct in bringing such a suit against his father, without in any way thereby prejudicing the decision of the Court. And do our courts prevent public men from inducing litigants to settle their claims outside? I submit I have committed no contempt. I have prejudiced no party and have made no comment on the action of Mr. Kennedy as a judge. I am anxious to satisfy the Court that there is not an iota of disrespect shown to the Court in commenting on Mr. Kennedy's letter. I may have erred, and in the view of the Court, erred grievously but I have not done so dishonestly or disrespectfully. I need not add that all that I have said applies to the case of Mr. Desai, the Publisher.

J. Marten then drew Mr. Gandhi's attention to a decision in England reported in a recent issue of the London *Times* whereby the editor, publisher and printer of a newspaper were fined for contempt.

MR. GANDHI : There also I submit it is possible for me to draw a distinction. While I was in England the famous Mrs. Maybrick's case was going on and the whole newspaper Press divided itself into two parties, one condemning Mrs. Maybrick and the other going for the Judge, Mr. Justice Stephen, and even suggesting that he was unfit to try the case.

J. MARTEN : But that was all after trial?

MR. GANDHI : No. It was while the case was going on. I followed the proceedings in the case from day to day throughout the many months that it was going on.

J. MARTEN : It did not go on, Mr. Gandhi, for many months. It went on for some days.

MR. GANDHI : Of course here I am speaking subject to correction, but I am quite sure that while the case was going on, the newspaper

Press was so full with all sorts of innuendoes, insinuations and aspersions, that I am sure I, as a journalist, would not even at this day be able to go the length they went.

Mr. Desai stated that he entirely associated himself with the sentiment expressed by Mr. Gandhi. He was sure he was infinitely more incapable of arguing the case than Mr. Gandhi and he would not presume to do that. He was prepared to cheerfully and respectfully abide by whatever decision their Lordships were pleased to give. The judgment was reserved.¹

Young India, 10-3-1920

284. LETTER TO M. R. JAYAKAR

SABARMATI ASHRAM,

March 10, 1920

I sent you the balance from Amritsar and the bulk² from Lahore. I have endeavoured to go through everything as carefully as possible. I have considered all the suggestions you made on the margin and incorporated those that I thought fit could be so treated. Please let me know what progress is being made. Shall we be ready for the 16th of April?³

The Story of My Life, Vol. I, p. 332

285. LETTER TO MAHADEV DESAI

Wednesday [*March 10, 1920*]⁴

BHAI MAHADEV,

It seems you have adopted a rule in Matheran that, if I do not write, you also may not. I simply outdid myself today. I started work at two in the morning. I got fatigued in consequence but had

¹ The judgment, delivered on March 12, was summed up by Justice Marten as follows : "The Court finds the charges proved. It severely reprimands the respondents and cautions them both as to future conduct."

² Of the press copy of the report on the Punjab disorders of 1919; Jayakar saw it through the press at Bombay.

³ K. Santanam, secretary to the Congress Punjab Commission of Inquiry, had announced to the Press that the Report would be published on April 16; it was, in fact, published on March 25.

⁴ The references in the letter to the 'report' and the 'manifesto' suggest this date.

complete peace. When the revision of the report¹ is over, I would, if my heart were not broken, dance [with joy] as a schoolboy does on the closing of his school for holidays.

You are bound to keep good health there. Durga left for Navasari yesterday. Did you read my manifesto?² If not, see yesterday's *Times [of India]*.

Blessings from

BAPU

From a photostat of the Gujarati : S.N. 11411

286. *LETTERS TO M. R. JAYAKAR*³

March 11, 1920

(i)

By the courtesy of the postal authorities I am able to send you now the whole batch⁴, i. e., up to 24. You will please note where I have made any addition in the second batch. I hope to send you a fairly big batch.

(ii)

I send you some more today. Enough to satisfy me. The fact is I am now played out and I find that the revision work is most taxing. I have not had rest tonight.

I am anxious to make the work as thorough as I can.

(iii)

I have carefully studied Mr. Das's⁵ summary of evidence and the suggested addendum. I thought that he was going to put together the evidence of specific witnesses and enable me to study their statements. In any event, the summary before me leaves me not only unconvinced but a discussion along the lines suggested can only mar the Report which in my opinion is otherwise convincing. The points marshalled by Mr. Das appear to me like so many loose staples which

¹ Presumably the Congress report on the Punjab disorders, which was published on March 25, 1920

² Presumably the press statement on Khilafat; *vide* "Letter to the Press", 7-3-1920.

³ This item consists of three separate letters which Gandhiji wrote to Jayakar on the same day and on the same subject.

⁴ Of the press copy of the report on the Punjab disorders

⁵ C. R. Das, who was a member of the Commission appointed by the Punjab Sub-committee of the Indian National Congress

will not hang together. I want them like bricks cohering and making a roadway for you to walk to your goal. Much as I would like to discuss the suggested theory as such in the Report, I cannot do it unless I have *prima facie* evidence.¹

In arranging a discussion you please study the thing yourself and if you think otherwise I would have you to marshal the evidence on this point and discuss the theory. I would sign what you write provided that you go no further than Mr. Das has done. He has left it to us two. I do not want you to yield to my reasoning. What seems to me to be loose may appear coherent to you. I would gladly yield to you if you take a different view. I would conciliate Mr. Das if he can convince any one of us. If you consider the matter of sufficient importance for consultation, please come down for discussion. Will you please send his to Mr. Das with your remarks?

The Story of My Life, Vol. I, pp. 332-3

287. LETTER TO RABINDRANATH TAGORE

THE ASHRAM,

SABARMATI,

March 11, 1920

DEAR GURUDEO,

I have not been able before now to acknowledge your two telegrams, one addressed at Benares and redirected here and the other addressed here. We are all deeply grateful to you for your acceptance of the invitation². Every effort is being made not to overload you with engagements or tamashas. Will you please let me know, if necessary by wire, how long you will be able to give to Gujarat and whether you could visit one or two important centres. The second question is regarding your residence. Will you put up at the Ashram? Nothing would delight me more than to have you at the Ashram. I am most anxious that you should, during your stay, understand what it

¹ In connection with this letter, Jayakar says : "This had a reference to the question whether there was enough evidence to support the view that Dyer had laid a trap to drive the people into the Jallianwala enclosure with the view of giving them condign punishment. Motilal, Das and I were of opinion that there was enough evidence to justify our mentioning the matter in our Report. Gandhi violently differed from our view." *The Story of My Life*"Memorial to J.Chamberlain", 22-5-1896.

² To address the sixth session of the Gujarati Literary Conference to be held at Ahmedabad from April 2 to April 4, 1920

is and what it stands for. I am anxious, too, that you should give the benefit of your presence to the many at the Ashram who claim to have been your pupils. Apart from the Gujarati boys and girls and the Sindhi lad Girdhari¹ whom you may recall, Manindra is here still and Sarladevi's son, Deepak, is also at the Ashram. It is situated about four miles from the centre of Ahmedabad and stands on a ridge on the bank of the Sabarmati.

You can, then, either stay at the Ashram or at a private bungalow in Ahmedabad with all the modern appointments. I need not say that your health and comfort are the primary consideration and your wishes will be faithfully carried out. Will you please also let me know any special arrangements or things you will desire?

Yours sincerely,
M.K.GANDHI

[PS.]

The Parishad lasts 3 days—2nd April to 4th.

From a photostat : G. N. 4627

288. TELEGRAM TO GOKARAN NATH ²

AHMEDABAD,
March 12, 1920

HELD UP HERE FIRST WEEK APRIL.³

GANDHI

From the original as delivered : C.W. 5990

289. LETTERS TO M. R. JAYAKAR⁴

March 13, 1920

(i)

I have made an attempt to finish today but could not. Anyway, I hope I have not kept the composers⁵ waiting.

¹ Nephew of J. B. Kripalani

² The telegram was sent to the addressee at Lucknow. He was then the General Secretary of the Indian National Congress.

³ Presumably because of Tagore's visit in connection with the Gujarat Literary Conference which was to be held at Ahmedabad in the first week of April.

⁴ This item comprises three separate letters written on the same day, in regard to the press copy of the Congress report on the Punjab disorders.

⁵ Of Karnatak Printing Press, Bombay, where the report was being printed

I see a note in the margin about Kasur but I must tone down the remarks about the crowd's behaviour. I have not been able to do so. Every word I have written is justifiable but you may wish to take the responsibility of altering where I do not see my way clear. The Kasur crowd acted most mischievously and we must make that clear admission.

(ii)

I am sending you a very poor batch today but I think I have already sent enough for the compositors to cope with. I must finish tomorrow even if I have to keep awake the whole of the night.

(iii)

Thank God! I am sending the last. Please read everything very carefully.

I am sorry to hear from Dr. Parashram that you were ailing.

The Story of My Life, Vol. I, pp. 333-4

290. PRESS ACT AND HORNIMAN

The meeting¹ held in Bombay for demanding repeal of the Press Act was an important one. Sir Narayan Chandavarkar² was able to show that it was as much in the Government's interest as in the public's to repeal the Act. It is said of the ostrich that when it sees any danger, it buries its head in sand and imagines that there is no danger and gets caught in the end. Through the Press Act, the Government has put itself in the condition of the ostrich. If public feeling is against the Government, it can find expression only through the medium of newspapers. By suppressing the expression, one cannot change the feeling. To keep the Press Act alive is to behave like the meteorologist who, after smashing his barometer, would know the state of atmospheric pressure. By putting it on the statute-book, the Government has damaged the machine which indicates the direction and the state of the current of popular feeling, and consequently it can no longer keep itself informed about the exact state of public feeling. The only course for the Government, therefore, is to repeal the Press Act and it is the duty of the public to strive for its repeal.

¹ On March 5, 1920

² Narayan Ganesh Chandavarkar (1855-1923); Liberal leader of Bombay who presided over the meeting

Mr. Horniman, however, was a victim of the very same attitude which the Government displays in retaining the Press Act. It cannot tolerate a frank expression of public opinion and, therefore, it cannot tolerate Mr. Horniman who expressed it with such vigour. Very few men have shown Mr. Horniman's capacity for educating public opinion or inspired the people with the same spirit as he did. Even assuming that Mr. Horniman did not possess any such gift, from the point of view of simple justice also no charge has been proved against him. People ought not to tolerate it, if despite this, the Government should arbitrarily keep him out. It is not true at all that those alone who agree with Mr. Horniman's methods and ideas can work for the removal of the restrictions against him. We have plenty of grounds for differing with him. His language is sometimes harsher than it need be. Even so, we have not the slightest doubt that he should be as free as anyone else to enter India. Accordingly, we welcome the resolution passed at the foregoing meeting; not only this, we even believe that people should take effective steps to keep alive the agitation for his return and force the Bombay Government to cancel the orders against him.¹ The third resolution passed at the meeting was to the effect that the securities obtained from any of the presses should be returned to them.² We hope the Government will pay attention to all these three points.

[From Gujarati]

Navajivan, 14-3-1920

291. LETTER TO ESTHER FAERING³

THE ASHRAM,

March 14, 1920

MY DEAR CHILD,

Of course I will pray and I know I can do no better. Friends can help you little during the crisis you are passing through. May God protect you.

¹ When moving the resolution, K. Natarajan referred to the proceedings in the House of Commons where the Secretary of State for India had stated that the return of Horniman to India was dependent entirely on the Government of Bombay.

² The resolution, *inter alia*, offered thanks to the Government of Bombay for cancelling the securities deposited under the Press Act by certain presses and newspapers and requested that similar action be taken in the remaining cases.

³ This and the ten letters which followed it were written to help Esther Faering during the days when the announcement of her betrothal to Dr. E. K. Menon brought a storm of criticism, much of it harsh and ungenerous, upon her head.

Once to every man and nation
Comes the moment to decide,
In the strife of Truth with Falsehood,
For the good or evil side.
Some great cause, God's new Messiah,
Offering each the bloom or blight,
Parts the goats upon the left hand
And the sheep upon the right
And the choice goes by for ever,
'Twixt the darkness and that light.

I hope to pick out something like this, if I can, every day,
charged with my prayers. What I have sent you today is from Lowell.
With love,

Yours,
BAPU

[PS.]

My case¹ is decided. The court I understand has reproved us
both² but no penalty.

BAPU

From a photostat of the original in N.A.I.; also *My Dear Child*, p. 60

292. TELEGRAM TO GOKARAN NATH

AHMEDABAD,
March 15, 1920

GOKARAN NATH
LUCKNOW

SIR RABINDRANATH EXPECTED AHMEDABAD THAT TIME ³ CAN
MEETING BE HELD AHMEDABAD IF IMPOSSIBLE HOLD BOMBAY.

GANDHI

From the original as delivered : C.W. 5989

¹ Before the High Court, Bombay; *vide* "Was It Contempt of Court?", 10-3-1920.

² Gandhiji and Mahadev Desai.

³ Tagore was to arrive on April 1 and stay on till April 5. In the second week of April, both Gandhiji and Tagore were to be in Bombay.

293. TELEGRAM TO GIRDHARI LAL¹

March 16, 1920

YOU SHOULD OBSERVE HARTAL² AND PARTICIPATE PUBLIC
MEETING ACCORDANCE MY MANIFESTO³.

GANDHI

From a photostat : S.N. 7138

294. LETTER TO ESTHER FAERING

BOMBAY,

March 16, 1920

More things are wrought by prayer
Than this world dreams of.
Wherefore let thy voice
Rise like a fountain for me night and day.
For what are men better than sheep or goats
That nourish a blind life within the brain,
If knowing God they lift not hands of prayer
Both for themselves and those who call them friend?
For so the whole round earth is every way
Bound by gold chains about the feet of God.

TENNYSON

MY DEAR CHILD,

The above is my share in your sorrow for today. May it lighten
your burden.

With love,

Yours,

BAPU

From a photostat of the original in N.A.I.; also *My Dear Child*, p. 61

295. KHILAFAT

The Leader of Allahabad and *Young India* have drifted apart. I
entertain such sneaking regard for the former that I struggle hard to

¹ This telegram was in reply to one from Girdhari Lal which read : "Kindly wire
if Amritsar observe hartal and extent Hindus participation in resolution."

² On March 19, the Khilafat Day

³ Vide "Letter to the Press", 7-3-1920.

accept the view that may be put forth by *The Leader*. But in spite of the struggle of late I have invariably failed. The latest instance is the confusion into which *The Leader* has fallen over boycott and non-co-operation. I had thought that my meaning was clear and that there was no inconsistency. Boycott is a punishment and is conceived in a vindictive spirit. The idea of boycotting British goods is that although British goods may be better than, say, Japanese, I should not buy the former because I want to revenge myself upon the British people for a wrong done to me by British ministers, or for the utterly irresponsible and insolent language of some Englishmen regarding the Khilafat. I hold that boycott under such circumstances is a form of violence.

Non-co-operation stands on a different footing. If the Government do wrong I become a participator in its wrongdoing by co-operating with it and thus making it possible for them to do the wrong. It is my duty, not by way of punishment or by way of revenge but to the end that I may not make myself responsible for the wrongdoing, to withdraw my support off that Government. Indeed I should be justified in bringing that Government to a standstill. It is clear to me, therefore, that non-co-operation is as different from boycott as an elephant from an ass.

The Leader also sees ill logic in my disapproval of violence and approval of hartal. I see none because I feel that hartal does not necessarily lead to violence. One cannot always avoid doing the right thing because there are risks to be run. *The Leader's* difficulty arises perhaps from the belief that strong and definite action is not necessary and that it is possible for the Mohammedans of India to keep their peace even after an adverse decision¹ by the Allied Powers. In my opinion the movement² is bound to endorse violence unless a non-violent course of action is found that would lead to a just solution of the question. All strong action may bring about violence but we may not fear to do the right lest it may be misinterpreted and lead to wrong. All that is, humanly speaking, possible is to guard against mistakes and misunderstanding and with trust in God to go forward. I know that on the Khilafat question that course and that alone can avoid violence if, short of a proper solution of the question, anything is to avoid it at all. I therefore trust that Indians of all shades of opinion will join this movement. A firm and unanimous stand on

¹ In regard to the temporal and spiritual authority of the Sultan of Turkey

² The Khilafat movement

the part of the Hindus will certainly put courage and hope into Mohammedan hearts. Any lukewarmness or indifference will lead to loss of hope and desperation.

Much the same is to be said about the objection to satyagraha. I still believe that for the moment I consider that I am alone capable of offering satyagraha in its fine form. But if that belief were to deter me from making experiments, satyagraha would never make headway. But here, there is the further fallacy of the ambiguous middle. Satyagraha in the form of civil resistance has possibilities of mischief. But hartal is no new weapon and hartal may or may not be satyagraha. Nor need non-co-operation be necessarily satyagraha. When the Hon'ble Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya resigned his membership on the Imperial Council¹ or when Sir Rabindranath Tagore asked to be relieved of his distinction² they did not do so as satyagrahis. Of course there is danger in widespread non-co-operation. But that is merely stating a truism. The one thing to be remembered is that for the Mohammedans the Khilafat is a question of life and death. It is essential for them to secure a proper solution. It is the sacred duty of the Hindus to give their all for the sake of their brothers so long as they work along the lines of non-violence. And I know no better way of keeping them on that path save by all Hindus, Christians, Parsees and Jews, who have made India their own, whole-heartedly supporting them and suggesting to them forcible methods of attaining redress without resort to violence.

Young India, 17-3-1920

296. *LETTER TO ESTHER FAERING*

BOMBAY,
March 17, 1920

Teach me, my God and King,
In all things Thee to see,
And what I do in anything,
To do it as for Thee,
All may of Thee partake,
Nothing can be so mean

¹ On April 6, 1919

² Knighthood, on June 1, 1919

Which with this tincture, 'for Thy sake',
Will not grow bright and clean.
A servant with this clause
Makes drudgery divine;
Who sweeps a room as for Thy laws
Makes that and the action fine.
This is the famous stone
That turneth all to gold;
For that which God doth touch and own
Cannot for less be told.

GEORGE HERBERT

MY DEAR CHILD,

May there be some line, some word, some thought to soften
your grief.

With love,

Yours

BAPU

From a photostat of the original in N.A.I.; also *My Dear Child*, p. 62

297. LETTER TO MAGANLAL GANDHI

[*March 17, 1920*]¹

CHI. MAGANLAL,

You may extend the time limit for the spinning-wheel if you wish to;² but I think the reply you have given is all right. We will give the man something if his model is good. I think we are not using as much khadi in the Ashram as we should. Sarladevi also commented on this. I see no compelling reason why the women should have no garment of khadi on their bodies. Khadi may be dyed, if desired. Whether this is done or not, there seems nothing wrong in the girls wearing loose blouses made of khadi. The women, in any case,

¹ Gandhiji was in Delhi from March 21 to March 24, and in Sinhgadh from March 26 to March 30 in the year 1920. On March 17 and March 19, he was in Bombay from where this letter was evidently written.

² The reference evidently is to the announcement of a prize in *Navajivan*, 5-10-1919, for an improved model of the indigenous spinning-wheel : vide "Notes", 5-10-1919, The competition for the spinning-wheel prize was held at Ahmedabad on March 31, 1920

should have no objection to wearing such blouses. See if you can persuade Santok¹, Radha² and Rukhi.

I shall have to leave for Delhi on the 20th. I shall be in Delhi on the 22nd and leave for Bombay on the 23rd. I shall then probably go to Sinhgadh for a week. Meanwhile, collect all the post there and, if there are any important letters, you or Narahari³ may reply. See that I get all the letters together in Bombay on the 24th. Till then, keep them safe with you so that I can revise the directions if I wish to.

Blessings from

BAPU

From the Gujarati original : C. W. 5783. Courtesy : Radhabehn Chowdhari

298. *LETTER TO ESTHER FAERING*

BOMBAY

Thursday [March 18, 1920]⁴

Lord, it belongs not to my care
Whether I die or live;
To love and serve Thee is my share,
And this Thy grace must give.
If life be long I will be glad
That I may long obey;
If short, yet why should I be sad
To soar to endless day?
Christ leads me through no darker rooms
Than He went through before;
He that unto God's kingdom comes
Must enter by this door.
Come, Lord, when grace hath made me meet
Thy blessed face to see;
For if Thy work on earth be sweet,

¹ Wife of the addressee

² Daughter of the addressee

³ Narahari Dwarkadas Parikh, a member of Gandhiji's team of constructive workers in Sabarmati Ashram since 1917

⁴ Gandhiji wrote to Esther Faering on March 17, 1920 and on March 21, 1920. In between we have two undated letters. In his letter of March 21, Gandhiji says that he wrote no letter to the addressee on the previous day. These undated letters, of which this is one, must have therefore been written on March 18 and 19. The order in which they have been dated has been taken from the source.

What will Thy glory be?
My knowledge of that life is small;
The eye of faith is dim;
But 'tis enough that Christ knows all,
And I shall be with Him.

RICHARD BAXTER

MY DEAR CHILD,

Another evening has come to fill me with thoughts of you. I pass them to our common Maker to make of them such use as He will for your good.

With love,

Yours

BAPU

From a photostat of the original in N.A.I.; also *My Dear Child*, p. 63

299. LETTER TO MANLEY

[*March 18, 1920*]¹

DEAR MR. MANLEY,

I thank you for your note. You need have no fear about Ahmedabad. Miss Ansuya Sarabhai has remained in Ahmedabad to look after the mill-hands. Mr. Vallabhbhai Patel² is looking after the post-office men³. Indeed I fear no ill from any quarter for tomorrow. Please remember me to Mrs. Manley.

From a photostat : S. N. 7141

¹ This was in reply to a letter from Manley, Deputy Police Commissioner, C.I.D., Bombay, seeking Gandhiji's help for a correct assessment of the situation in Ahmedabad where March 19, the Khilafat Day, was to be observed, as elsewhere in India, as a day of general hartal.

² 1875-1950; Congress leader of Gujarat who later became the first Deputy Prime Minister of free India

³ Who were then on strike

300. LETTER TO V. S. SRINIVASA SASTRI¹

BOMBAY,
March 18, 1920

DEAR MR. SASTRI,

As I took an active part in the Congress affairs last year I have been asked to interest myself still more actively to the extent of joining an organization. The demand has come from those with whom I have had the privilege of working although I was not connected with their organization. They have asked me to join the All-India Home Rule League. I have told them that at my time of life and with views firmly formed on several matters I could only join an organization to affect its policy and not be affected by it. This does not mean that I would not keep or that I do not have an open mind to receive new light. I simply wish to emphasize the fact that any new light will have to be specially dazzling in order to entrance me. I placed before the friends the following points on which I hold decided views :

1. [The] highest honesty must be introduced in the political life of the country if we are to make our mark as a nation. This presupposes at the present moment a very firm and definite acceptance of the creed of Truth at any cost.

2. Swadeshi must be our immediate goal. The future aspirants after membership of the Council² should be asked to pledge them-selves to an out and out protection of the country's industries—spe-cially cloth manufacture.

3. Definite acceptance of Hindustani—a resultant of Hindi and Urdu—as a national language of intercourse in the immediate future. The would-be members will be therefore pledged so to work in the Imperial Council as to introduce Hindustani and in the Local Councils the respective vernaculars, at least as an optional medium for the time being till we are able to dispense with English for the conduct of national affairs. They will also be pledged to introduce Hindustani as a compulsory second language in our schools with Devanagari or Urdu as an optional script. English will be recognized as a language of Imperial intercourse, diplomacy and international commerce.

4. Acceptance of the principle of redistribution of provinces so far as possible on a linguistic basis at the earliest opportunity.

¹ Copies of this letter were also addressed by Gandhiji to other friends, like Natesan, for private circulation.

² Gandhiji presumably has in mind the Imperial Legislative Council, Delhi.

5. Hindu-Mohammedan unity in its essence and from a political and religious standpoint as an unalterable article of faith. This contemplates mutual help, mutual toleration and recognition of the sufferings of one section to be the sufferings of all. This will exclude, from the official programme of the League, the unity propaganda by means of inter-dining and intermarriage and will include vigorous co-operation on the Khilafat question. In my discussions amongst the friends I have also told them that I will not think of asking for official recognition of my creed of civil disobedience and that I do not belong to any party and would like to make the League a non-party organization helping all honest men if they are otherwise capable of doing justice to the service they may choose irrespective of party. The League, according to my opinion, cannot become an anti-Congress organization but it should work as it is now doing to further the interests of the Congress.

Do you advise me, knowing me as you do with my qualifications and limitations, to join the League?¹

Yours sincerely,

M. K. GANDHI

Letters of V. S. Srinivasa Sastri, pp. 69-71

301. LETTER TO MAZHARUL HAQUE²

LABURNAM ROAD,
GRAMDEVI BOMBAY,
March 18, 1920

DEAR SHRI HAQUE,

Because of my active participation in Congress work last year, I am being asked that I should take more interest and join this organization. This demand is from those people with whom I got the opportunity to work, though I had nothing to do with their organization. They say that I should join India Home Rule League. I have told them that at this stage of my life, when I have developed a firm viewpoint, I can join an organization only if I can influence their view

¹ Gandhiji joined the League and accepted its presidency on April 28, 1920.

² The letter has been translated from Hindi. The original letter was in English which is not available.

point rather than get influenced myself. It does not mean that I do not have an open mind to accept new ideas. I only want to emphasise the fact that a fresh idea, with some extraordinary relevance alone can impress me now. I want to place before my friends, my certain and firm views on the following subjects.

(1) If we want to build a better nation, the virtue of great honesty should constitute the polity of the country. Right now, we have to admit, we are not sure and certain in choosing the right path to adopt the principle of truth.

(2) Swadeshi should be our goal. It should be demanded from the members of the council that they take a pledge to save the cottage-industry, particularly the cloth-industry.

(3) Hindustani, i.e., a blend of Hindi and Urdu, should be accepted as the national language for future use. So, the future members of the councils will take a pledge that till the use of English is stopped in correspondence, etc., at the national level, Hindustani should be used in the Imperial Council and regional languages should be used in the Provincial Councils. They should resolve that Hindustani would be implemented as the compulsory co-language in middle schools with freedom to choose either the Devanagari or the Urdu script. English language will be accepted in the field of administrative matters, diplomacy, and international trade.

(4) Whenever a chance presents itself, the principle of re-division of provinces on the basis of language should be accepted.

(5) From the political and religious viewpoint, the quintessence of the Hindu-Muslim unity should be made an article of unfailing faith. In fact, this will be a viewpoint of mutual help, mutual tolerance and the feeling of mutual sharing of suffering by all. This will include the programme of co-operation on the question of Khilafat, leaving behind the propaganda of unity through the programmes of inter-caste marriage and inter-dining. During discussion with my friends, I also told them that I neither want the approval of my principle of civil-disobedience nor am I concerned with any party. But I would like to make the League a non-party organization which would help all honest persons. According to me, the League cannot be an anti-Congress organization but should work in the interest of the Congress as it is doing at

Keeping in view my capabilities and my helplessness, do you suggest that I should join Home Rule League?

Yours,

M. K. GANDHI

[From Hindi]

Ashiyana Ki Awaz, pp. 40-41

302. *LETTER TO ESTHER FAERING*

BOMBAY,

Friday [March 19, 1920]¹

Oh I could go through all life's troubles singing,
Turning each night to day,
If self were not so fast around me, clinging
To all I do or say.
My very thoughts are selfish, always building
Mean castles in the air,
I use my love of others for a gilding
To make myself look fair.
I fancy all the world engrossed with judging
My merit or my blame.
Its warmest praise seems an ungracious grudging
Of praise which I might claim.
Alas! no speed in life can snatch us wholly
Out of self's hateful sight,
And it keeps step, whene'er we travel slowly
And sleeps with us at night.
O Lord that I could waste my life for others,
With no ends of my own,
That I could pour myself into my brothers
And live for them alone.

MY DEAR CHILD,

You have forgotten your promise. Do not keep me without any-thing from you for so many days. The above is my selection for the day.

With love,

Yours,

BAPU

From a photostat of the original in N.A.I., also *My Dear Child*, p. 64

¹ Vide "Letter to Esther Faering", 18-3-1920.

303. SPEECH ON KHILAFAT, BOMBAY¹

March 19, 1920

It gives me the greatest pleasure to be able to move the only resolution² of this great conference.

I beg to congratulate the organizers and the volunteers on the splendid success of the peaceful demonstration of today. We had many warnings given to us as to the consequences that were likely to follow from suspension of business. Bombay at least has, thanks to the effort of the Khilafat Committee, behaved nobly in the matter. The hartal was spontaneous and voluntary. No pressure whatever was used. It was a matter of great satisfaction to me to note that the Committee followed the advice tendered by me that mill-hands should not be called upon to participate in the hartal.

¹ Made on the occasion of the Khilafat Day at a mass meeting consisting of about thirty thousand Muslims, Hindus and other citizens, presided over by Mia Mahomed Haji Jan Mahomed Chhotani

² The next of the resolution read :

This meeting of Hindus, Muslims and other citizens of Bombay hereby enters its emphatic protest against the violent and irresponsible agitation going on in the United Kingdom calculated to wound the deepest susceptibilities of the Muslims and therefore the whole of India, and trusts that not only will His Majesty's Ministers and other statesmen who desire the retention of India in the Empire as a free partner dissociate themselves from that agitation but will reassure the inhabitants of India of the fellow-feeling of the people of the United Kingdom by securing a settlement of the Khilafat question compatible with the just and religious sentiments of millions of the Muslim subjects of His Majesty.

This meeting further records its deep conviction that any other solution of the question must eventually result in complete withdrawal of co-operation from the Government and therefore appeals to all the statesmen of the Empire to prevent such a severe strain being put upon India's loyalty.

This meeting at the same time wishes to place upon record the fact that, whatever joint steps it may be necessary to take in order to give effect to the just sentiments of Indians, there shall be no resort to violence whether in speech or deed and is firmly of opinion that any violence practised in connection with the movement will seriously injure it and cause irreparable harm.

In the event of the failure of the joint movement, the Muslims reserve to themselves the right of taking such steps as the exigencies of the situation might dictate.

That the President of this meeting be authorized to send a copy of this resolution to His Excellency the Viceroy with a request to convey the same to His Majesty the King Emperor. *Amrita Bazar Patrika*, 24-3-1920.

In these days of tension between employers and employees in the various industrial concerns¹ of the country, we may not encourage labourers to absent themselves from work without the willing consent of the employers.

Our resolution divides itself into four parts. The first part consists of a protest and a prayer. It protests against violent and irresponsible agitation² set up in England in connection with the Khilafat question, and appeals to the Ministers and other statesmen to dissociate themselves from this agitation and reassure us of the fellow-feeling of the people of the United Kingdom by securing an honourable settlement consistent with the just religious sentiments of the Mussulmans of India. The second part warns those concerned that an adverse solution is likely to eventuate in complete withdrawal of co-operation from the Government and will put an undue strain upon Indian loyalty,³ and if such a step unfortunately becomes a necessity there is likely to be excitement. The third part of the resolution warns the people in the most emphatic language against violence of speech or deed and gives it as the opinion of this great meeting that any exercise of violence is calculated to injure the sacred cause and to do irreparable harm. So far the resolution is a joint transaction between the Hindus, Mohammedans and others to whom this great land is their mother country or their adopted home.

And it commits the joint movement to a policy of non-violence in the course of the struggle. But Mohammedans have special Koranic obligations in which Hindus may or may not join. They, therefore, reserve to themselves the right, in the event of the failure of non-co-operation *cum* non-violence, in order to enforce justice, to resort to all such methods as may be enjoined by the Islamic scriptures. I venture heartily to associate myself with this resolution. I consider the resolution to be thoroughly respectful and moderate in tone. I see on

¹ For example, the Tata Iron Works at Jamshedpur, where the strikers were fired on by the police and troops on March 15

² This presumably refers to the propaganda carried on in England against the Turks who were accused of crimes against humanity.

³ Gandhiji's programme of non-co-operation was placed before the public for the first time at the Khilafat Conference held in Meerut on January 26, 1920. At the second Khilafat Conference held in Calcutta on February 29, 1920, Maulana Azad, in his presidential address, recommended this programme "for the acceptance of the Muslims".

the platform Shias and Sunnis,¹ Hindus and Parsis, all joined together in a respectful demonstration. Complete closure of the great Hindu cloth market and Hindu business houses is an eloquent testimony of Hindu agreement with the Muslim demand. The unholy agitation set up in London has evoked an outburst of feeling in India which will never die until justice is done. It is a matter of painful surprise that even Lord Curzon, with all his knowledge and experience of India, should have allied himself with the ignorant agitation.

There is, however, a silver lining to the cloud that has gathered overhead. Mr. Montagu has been our uncompromising advocate. Mr. Lloyd George has at last reaffirmed his memorable declaration² though in a somewhat halting form. I believe that the Government of India is pressing forward our claim with great firmness. The Anglo-Indian Press has not been hostile. *The Times of India* and the Bengal Chamber of Commerce have even warmly espoused our cause. The resolution invites all Englishmen to rally round the banner of Truth and vindicate British honour and the pledged word of the British Premier. I yield to no one in my loyalty to the British connection but I must refuse to buy that loyalty at the price of honour and at the sacrifice of the deeply seated religious sentiments of one section of my countrymen. A loyalty that sells its soul is worth nothing, and if in spite of acknowledged services of Indian soldiers, both Hindu and Mohammedan, during the late War,³ the promises made by British statesmen are broken, the reasons that evoke the loyalty of India will have ceased to exist. I do not lose hope, but if the hope is disappointed and the worst happens, God alone knows what will happen to this fair land of ours. We know this that there will be neither peace nor rest for the Government or the people until the wrong is righted and the feelings of eight crores of Mohammedans are respected.

I hope it is unnecessary to show why it is obligatory on Hindus to march side by side with their Mohammedan countrymen. So long as the means and the end are honourable, I can imagine no

¹ Two sects of Mohammedans

² On February 26, 1920, Lloyd George declared in the House of Commons : "The pledge given in January 1918 was given after full consultation with all parties. It was specific, unqualified and deliberate . . . The effect of the statement in India was that recruiting went up appreciably from that very moment."

³ On January 30, 1920, Queen Alexandra's tribute to the Indian Army was read by the Commander-in-Chief in the Council-chamber.

better cement for perpetually binding us both than our complete association with Mohammedans. But in a cause so sacred as this there can be, there should be, no violence either of speech or of deed. We must conquer not by hate but by love. I admit the difficulty of loving the un-just, but victory consists not in marching along a smooth surface but in conquering obstacles in a resolute and undaunted way. And in a just and sacred cause, firmness of purpose and unconquerable will are the least qualities required of us. Moreover violence can only damage this great cause. It may create a sensation but we shall never reach the goal through a series of sensations. The non-violence clause of the resolution, therefore, definitely recognizes the wisdom of self-restraint and enjoins upon all speakers to refrain from making wild or exaggerated speeches which can only lead to bloodshed, ruthless repression and humiliation of both the Government and the people. But the Mohammedans want to play a perfectly honourable game.

They wish to reserve or suppress nothing. Some of them have, therefore, insisted upon the insertion of a proviso to the resolution, meaning that if non-violence fails, they are at liberty to resort to the other methods enjoined upon them by the Koran and these are that when their religion is assailed, they should leave the country in which it is assailed or war against the assailant. And so the resolution undoubtedly foreshadows, in the most honourable and unmistakable manner, the stages through which this great movement will pass, the last stage being a bloody revolution. God forbid that this country should have to pass through such a revolution and all its horrors but the feeling on this Khilafat question runs so high and goes so deep that an unjust solution may, if peaceful means fail, land this country in a revolutionary movement the like of which we have not seen before, and if it comes responsibility will rest with Englishmen, the Hindus and the timid Mohammedans. If Englishmen will only recognize the existence of the deep feeling and the necessity of a just decision, all would be well. If the Hindus will understand the neighbourly duty and actively co-operate with the Mohammedans, they can, by united and perfectly peaceful effort, force a just solution. Timid Mohammedans by shedding their timidity at this critical moment of their history will also prevent bloodshed by letting the party of violence understand that there are no deserters of the flag of Islam. If, then, revolution is to be our lot, it will come through sheer despair

staring honest, honourable, high-souled Mohammedans in the face and giving them a feeling of being neglected by Englishmen, Hindus and their co-religionists. I hope, therefore, that the whole of India will unite in a prayer to the Almighty and in a cry of justice that shall not be denied. I venture finally to hope that the Government will not anticipate revolution by thoughtless and angry repression. They will recognize that India is no longer an infant and that Indians have the same feelings that actuate Englishmen in similar circumstances.

Young India, 24-3-1920

304. LETTER TO L. FRENCH

SATYAGRAHA ASHRAM,
SABARMATI,
March 20, 1920

L. FRENCH, ESQ.
CHIEF SECRETARY TO
THE PUNJAB GOV[ERNMENT]
LAHORE
DEAR MR. FRENCH,

I hope you will please pardon me for not sending you the Sargodha statements earlier.¹ I had not brought them with me to Ahmedabad, and more were being taken by a local worker. And then, I have been travelling. I now send you a selection out of the numerous statements I have received. I shall hope to hear from you in due course. Will you please let me know whether the punitive police has been withdrawn?

Yours sincerely,

From a photostat : S. N. 7126

305. LETTER TO V. S. SRINIVASA SASTRI

March 20, 1920

DEAR FRIEND,

I hope you have read my proposal² about the observance of what may be called the Satyagraha Week from the 6th to the 13th April. I am hoping that during the week there will be no difficulty about collecting ten lacs of rupees. If there are volunteers

¹ *Vide* "Letter to L. French", 29-2-1920.

² *Vide* "The 6th April and the 13th", 10-3-1920.

of known respectability and unquestionable honesty we need have no receipts but simple collection from all and sundry. Monied men and women can go out and collect in the quarters best known to them. But it is not so much the manner as the matter which I wish to emphasize. I hope that there will be no difference of opinion as to the desirability of passing the week in the manner suggested by me or of having a memorial in connection with massacre¹ of the 13th. In presenting the case to the people I would advise that the memory of the dead and not of the atrocity be treated as the impelling motive.

I trust that those who do not approve of the method of satyagraha will not on that account refrain from participating in the collection. This should be a truly national memorial.

But there is fasting and prayer too on which I myself lay even greater stress than on the memorial; for if there is universal fasting and prayer I know that money and whatever we want will rain down from heaven without further effort. I wish to give you my experience in this direction as a specialist *par excellence*. I do not know any contemporary of mine who has reduced fasting and prayer to an exact science and who has reaped a harvest so abundant as I have. I wish that I could infect the nation with my experience and make it resort to fasting and prayer with intelligence, honesty and intensity. We would thus, incredible as it may appear, do millions of things pertaining to the nation without elaborate organization and checks upon checks, but I know that fasting and prayer, to be as effective as I have found them to be in my own experience, have to be not mechanical things but definite spiritual acts. Fasting then is crucifixion of the flesh with a corresponding freedom of the spirit and prayer is a definite conscious longing of the soul to be utterly pure—the purity thus attained being dedicated to the realization of a particular object which is in itself pure. I hope therefore that if you believe in the ancient institution of fasting and prayer you will dedicate the 6th and the 13th to the purpose and induce your neighbours to do likewise.

Then there remain the three meetings² which I doubt not you will organize and make them a thorough success.

Yours sincerely,

M. K. GANDHI

Letters of V. S. Srinivasa Sastri, pp. 74-5

¹ At Jallianwala Bagh

² These were held on April 6, April 9 and April 13.

306. LETTER TO MATHURADAS TRIKUMJI

Saturday, March 20, 1920

I should tell you that I slept only half an hour last night and I am sure, therefore, that you will forgive me for not writing to you. I ask your forgiveness because, though I always remember you, and wanted to write to you to share your dilemma¹, I could not do so. I shall arrive there on Tuesday morning.

[From Gujarati]

Bapuni Prasadi

307. LETTER TO MAZHARUL HAQUE²

March 20, 1920

DEAR FRIEND,

I hope you have read my proposal to observe 'Satyagraha Week' from April 6 to April 13. I hope that there will be no problem in collecting Rs. 10 lakh during the week. If we have honest and trustworthy volunteers, then there is no need of any receipt book. We can take the subscription from the public. Rich men and their wives can collect money from their acquaintances. But I want to put more emphasis on the subject than on the method of working. I hope there will be no difference of opinion about how to celebrate the week which I have already explained, or about the position on erecting a memorial in connection with the massacre of April 13. While putting my arguments before the public, I will advise them to work not with the feeling of revenge but with inspiration drawn from the memory of martyrs.

I believe that those who do not accept the principle of Satyagraha will not, for that reason alone, keep themselves away from the act of collecting subscriptions. In fact, it should be a real national memorial.

However, I lay greater stress on fasting and prayer than on memorial, because I know that wherever collective fasting and prayer

¹ Regarding the choice of a permanent field for active service. In March 1920, Gandhiji entrusted to him some work in connection with the printing of Part II of the Congress report on the Punjab disorders.

² This and the following letters to the addressee have been translated from Hindi. The original letters were in English and are not available.

is held, we will get in abundance the money or whatever we want even without any effort. I as a specialist, want to tell you my experiences in this particular field. I do not think that I have any such contemporary who has made fasting and prayer a science and has been a beneficiary of it like me. I wish to make the country a beneficiary of my experience and with wisdom and sincerity, want to take it on the path of fasting and prayer. Thus we can accomplish hundreds of thousands of jobs without having any big organization or a controlling agency. But I know from my experience that fasting and prayer are not mere ceremonial or mechanical things but spiritual acts. Fast drives out the physical and is closely attached to liberation of the soul and prayer is the conscious effort of the process of purification of soul. The purity thus gained can be utilized to accomplish a pure end. Therefore, I hope that if you believe in the ancient method of fasting and prayer, you will definitely come forward on April 6 and 13 and encourage your neighbours also to accompany you. Then remains the programme of the three meetings which you will undoubtedly organize with success.

Yours,

M. K. GANDHI

[From Hindi]

Ashiyana Ki Awaz, pp. 42-3

308. *KHILAFAT*

The Khilafat issue is a splendid opportunity as much as a grave problem. It is the latter because on it hangs the future peace of eight crores of Muslims and therefore of the whole of India. It is a splendid opportunity because, if the Muslims use wisdom in solving the problem, their moral power will increase and India will come to enjoy a moral empire; Hindu-Muslim unity will increase, both Hindus and Muslims will grow stronger, their moral level will rise and the English will stop looking down upon us as an inferior race. Friendship is possible only between equals. The English do not regard us as their equals; even we consider ourselves as their inferiors. And, therefore, we, Hindus and Muslims, should solve this problem and ensure that the three become equals.

The sword makes men equal. After fighting with one another like so many bulls, till they all get exhausted, the opponents salute

each other and become friends. Anyone who shows weakness will humiliate himself. The other method is, instead of using physical force against the opponent, to employ soul-force and win ascendancy over him. This ascendancy is accepted not out of fear but out of love, and so both become equals. One does not consider it humiliating to admit another's moral superiority. The other takes no pride in being morally superior. Hence both behave respectfully towards each other. We must give up the very thought of overcoming the English by the sword.

I do not want to argue that it would be impossible for us to employ such force; only, in order to use it we shall have to resort to hypocrisy, falsehood, treachery and so on, and even for employing these we shall have to acquire various other unprofitable abilities. We shall have to put forward all our strength against them and fight on till both of us are out of breath. They will not, naturally, let matters go so far; that is human nature. Even in ancient times the arts of fighting were guarded secrets. A proud man does not easily part with the means of gratifying his pride. Strength of arms necessarily carries pride with it. Therefore, if we wish to be the equals of our enemies through force of arms, we shall have to press on till the point of their defeat and, at the end of it all, we shall for ever remain enemies. Can the Khilafat problem be solved in this way?

Leaving aside the question whether or not it is right to fight, if we think merely of the result, we shall see that military strength will never solve the problem. The fight for the Khilafat is not solely against the English; it is a fight between Christians and Muslims.¹ The Christians are very well united and well-versed in the art of war; the Muslims are not equipped, the Muslims of India evidently are not, today at any rate, to try their strength against them; and the Hindus cannot stand shoulder to shoulder with the latter in a trial of strength. Under these circumstances, it is well-nigh impossible, from a practical point of view, for the Muslims to seek a settlement of the Khilafat issue by force.

One who tries his strength in fighting cannot say : 'God's will be done.' He alone can say this who believes in fighting with moral force, for in such a contest defeat is out of the question. He who

¹ Influential sections of English and American opinion had demanded that the Turks should be expelled from Constantinople and reduced to the status of a fourth-rate Power.

employs pure means may put his trust in fate, but he who uses impure means has no right to do so. The man who knowingly jumps into a well, blaming God as he does so, will instantly receive his punishment; he will die an untimely death. If a man, drinking to the last drop in the bottle, prattles, 'If it be God's will that I should get drunk, be it so,' the world will laugh at him. In moral experiments, we may maintain unswerving faith in God, because we know that the outcome of such an experiment is always happy. The military man trusts to his weapons as the alcoholic trusts to the property of his drink to produce intoxication and, when the weapons break, he is like wax.

If, however, Hindus and Muslims equip themselves with the divine weapon of satyagraha, victory is certain. If they both refuse to be a party to the injustice being done by the Christians, who on earth can defeat them? If Muslims refuse to be a party to any injustice perpetrated on them, it is God's promise to them that they will never be defeated; this is why I have said that it is our right and our duty to refuse to help the British in their unjust acts. It is only by discharging this duty that the Muslims can defend their religion against the present attack on it.

Let us now examine the views expressed by the British Labour Party on the Khilafat issue. We summarize them elsewhere.¹ This party declares that the Islamic Empire² must be split up, that the Muslims themselves demand this. How can Indian Muslims oppose it? If the Arabs do not want to remain with the Ottomans,³ should they be kept with them by force? As a satyagrahi, I can answer this question straightaway. I do not wish to deprive the Arabs of their freedom; let them be free, but let them recognize the suzerainty of the Khalifa and let the holy places remain under the control of the Khalifa. I need not fight if this is not done, but I would not co-operate either to bring about the opposite result. This injustice cannot be perpetrated without my co-operation. If every Hindu and every Muslim resigns from the service of the Government, what will be the result? The British will either have to leave India or respect our wishes. And so in my view all that is necessary is to have patience and wait for public opinion to be educated along the right lines. Will Muslims use the present

¹ Not reproduced here

² Of the Sultan of Turkey who as Khalifa claimed supreme authority over the Islamic world

³ Under the Ottoman Empire of Turkey

awakening to good purpose or ill? They will prove themselves their own friends or foes. May God give them wisdom and may they maintain conditions in which Hindus can go all out to help them.

[From Gujarati]

Navajivan, 21-3-1920

309. *LETTER TO ESTHER FAERING*

Sunday, March 21, 1920

I say to thee, do thou repeat
To the first man thou mayest meet
In lane, highway or open street—
That he and we and all men move
Under a canopy of love,
As broad as the blue sky above;
That doubt and trouble, fear and pain,
And anguish all are shadows vain.
That death itself shall not remain,
That weary deserts we may tread,
A dreary labyrinth may thread,
Through dark ways under ground be led,
Yet, if we all one Guide obey,
The dreariest path, the darkest way
Shall issue out in heavenly day;
And we on diverse shores now cast,
Shall meet, our perilous voyage past,
All in our Father's house at last.

TRENCH MY DEAR CHILD,

I am on the train to Delhi.¹ I could not go out for rest.² I sent you nothing yesterday. I could not. This may be my last for some days because I shall not know what will happen from day to day. Do let me have a line from you.

With love,

BAPU

From a photostat of the original in N.A.I.; also *My Dear Child*, p. 65

¹ On March 21 Gandhiji left Bombay for Delhi.

² Gandhiji needed rest as he had some trouble with one of his legs. In the last weeks of March and April he went to recuperate at Sinhgadh.

310. LETTER TO ESTHER FAERING

Monday [March 22] 1920

MY DEAR CHILD,

Here is my selection for today :

He that is down needs fear no fall
He that is low, no pride,
He that is humble ever shall have
God to be his guide.
I am content with what I have
Little be it or much
And Lord! contentment, still, I crave
Because Thou savest such.
Fullness to such a burden is
That go on pilgrimage,
Here little and hereafter bliss,
Is best from age to age.

J. BUNYAN

With love,

Yours,

BAPU

From a photostat of the original in N.A.I.; also *My Dear Child*, p. 66

311. REFLECTIONS ON THE SATYAGRAHA WEEK¹

This national week will soon be upon us. We trust that it will be worthy of the occasion which it is to commemorate. The chief item of work which can be measured and which will be an acid test of our genuineness and feeling for the Punjab will be the collection of a fund² to pay for the memorial site for commemorating the memory of the martyrs of the 13th April last. To collect ten lacs from a population of thirty crores is not a difficult task if suitable workers can be found. If rich and well-known ladies and gentlemen could be persuaded to take up the work, it could be finished inside the week. The proper thing no doubt will be to collect *pro rata* from every

¹ The Gujarati translation of this article appeared in *Navajivan*, 28-3-1920, and has been included in *Gandhijinu Navajivan*, a collection of Gandhiji's articles published in *Navajivan*.

² Jallianwala Bagh Memorial Fund

province. We hope to give such a list next week. But each province should try to collect as much more as it can, than its share. It would not matter if we succeed in collecting more. Ten lacs is not the highest sum required. It is the minimum. Everyone therefore is expected to subscribe liberally.

* * *

Then there is the fasting and prayer. This is a hoary institution. A genuine fast cleanses body, mind and soul. It crucifies the flesh and to that extent sets the soul free. A sincere prayer can work wonders. It is an intense longing of the soul for its even greater purity. Purity thus gained when it is utilized for a noble purpose becomes a prayer. The mundane use of *gayatri*, its repetition for healing the sick, illustrates the meaning we have given to prayer. When the same *gayatri jap* is performed with a humble and concentrated mind in an intelligent manner in times of national difficulties and calamities, it becomes a most potent instrument for warding off danger. There can be no greater mistake than to suppose that the recitation of the *gayatri*, the *namaz* or the Christian prayer are superstitions fit to be practised by the ignorant and the credulous. Fasting and prayer therefore are a most powerful process of purification and that which purifies necessarily enables us the better to do our duty and to attain our goal. If therefore fasting and prayer seem at times not to answer, it is not because there is nothing in them but because the right spirit is not behind them.

* * *

A man who fasts and gambles away the whole of the day as do so many on *Janmashtami* day¹, naturally not only obtains no result from the fast in the shape of greater purity but such a dissolute fast leaves him on the contrary degraded. A fast to be true must be accompanied by a readiness to receive pure thoughts and determination to resist all Satan's temptations. Similarly a prayer to be true has to be intelligible and definite. One has to identify oneself with it. Counting beads with the name of Allah on one's lips whilst the mind wanders in all directions is worse than useless. We therefore hope that the coming week of dedication to national fasting and prayer will become a universal reality and not merely a formal observation.

* * *

¹ The eighth day of the dark fortnight of the *Shravana* month, the birthday of Lord Krishna

The magnificent spectacle¹ of tens of thousands of Mohammedans going to Jumma Masjids in different parts of India and offering heart-felt prayers for the triumph of truth did more than anything else to bring a just solution within the bounds of possibility. We would have no hesitation in guaranteeing a proper solution of the Khilafat question purely on the strength of prayer. We need not be told that the argument in favour of prayer cuts both ways, as it is open as much to our enemy as to us to pray. But that would be an argument not against prayer but against allowing the result to affect our valuation of prayer. One may not make terms with God. It is enough to know that prayer has played from times immemorial a most important part in the evolution of nations as well as individuals. May the Satyagraha Week witness a revival of the institutions of fasting and prayer in all their original glory and splendour.

Young India, 24-3-1920

312. VIOLENCE VERSUS NON-VIOLENCE

The Khilafat day has come and gone. It was a great success and a complete triumph of satyagraha, i.e., not civil disobedience but truth and non-violence. No hartal has been so voluntary as that of the 19th March in that all the canvassing that ever took place was before the 19th.² It was an example of wonderful self-restraint on the part of the Committee³ not to have called out the mill-hands. The Committee deserves the highest praise for its efficient management and for the definite recognition of voluntarism. If the people continue to show the discipline and self-restraint shown on the 19th and add thereto in an equal measure the spirit of self-sacrifice, nothing can prevent the full fruition of our hopes regarding Khilafat. Nobody could have believed a year ago the possibility of peace being observed by the fanatical element among the Mohammedans on a matter of life and death to them and on a day of no business for the idlers. But there can be no idleness when there is prayer. All were enjoined not to quarrel, not to be angry but to pray for the right to be done. It is true that all did not definitely pray, but the spirit of prayer was abroad and it dominated the people rather than the spirit of revenge,

¹ On March 19, the Khilafat day

² The Hindu shopkeepers of Bombay had voluntarily observed the hartal on the Khilafat day.

³ The Khilafat Committee, Bombay

anger, excitement, and so we had the amazing spectacle of the hartal day passing off like an ordinary day when everybody expects peace to be observed. The vast meeting of Bombay attended perhaps by thirty thousand men was a sight worth seeing. There was firmness in the faces of those thousands of people who listened to the speeches, yet without applause or any other effusive demonstration. The organizers deserve the warmest praise for having introduced into our meetings the ancient peacefulness, quiet, determination and orderliness in the place of modern fluster, excitement and disorderliness. The one develops just the qualities that make for satyagraha, the other inevitably leads to violence. And the message of the great meeting and the very successful hartal is not violence but non-violence. I hope that the authorities will not misread the situation. They will not fail to understand the admirable spirit of the whole demonstration or the equally admirable spirit of the resolution—a resolution to which, in my humble opinion, it is impossible for any honest lover of this country or the Empire to take exception. I hope, too, that they will read the spirit of the movement in the manner in which it is developing. I hope that the exemplary patience, self-restraint and orderliness that are evolving in our midst will have their due weight with them and that they will inform the Imperial Government that whilst there is this admirable peace in the land there is also a grim determination behind it which will not take “no” for an answer. I hope that Government will not repeat the sin of last April and entertain any false hope of tyranny and unquenchable spirit that has come into being and that will suffer everything but humiliation, dishonour and defeat [*sic*].

It is a matter of deep regret that so respected a body as the Liberal League should have hastily and in advance condemned the hartal. Surely a people so stricken with grief and with disappointment probably staring them in the face must have an outlet for orderly manifestation. It was because not very long ago we were afraid to speak or write what we thought that our sentiments burrowed under and became foul with stench because of the absence of the fierce sun and the open air of public opinion playing upon them. Hence we had a secret revolutionary movement. Today, thank God, we seem to have outlived the evil day. We dare to think, speak and write openly, without fear, but under restraint that openness imposes upon mankind. I appeal to the members of the Liberal League and those who think with them to recognize this plain fact and to

appreciate the superiority of boldness over timid caution. If they desire to harness all the innumerable forces that are coming daily into being for the uplift of the nation, if they wish to become privileged participators in the throes of the new birth, let them not ignore the signs of the time, let them not reject the advances of the younger generation, let them not chill their ardent hopes and aspirations, but let them head this growing party of young, enthusiastic, self-sacrificing dare-devil men. Sympathize with them, respond to the heart's throb, regulate it, for they are amenable to reason or an appeal to their high-souledness—and you have a disciplined party, obedient to the call of the country. But if they feel neglected, if they feel that the older heads will not patiently listen to their wants, will not give them a helping hand, they may despair and despair may lead to desperation resulting in a catastrophic destruction. I can recall no time so magnificently suitable for leading India to the method of satyagraha—not necessarily civil disobedience, but truth and non-violence—in which there is no defeat and in which if there is any error it hurts but those who err.

Young India, 24-3-1920

313. CONTEMPT OF COURT

The long expected hearing of the case against the editor and the publisher of *Young India* in connection with the publication of a letter of the District Judge of Ahmedabad regarding satyagrahi lawyers and my comments thereon has been heard and judgment has been pronounced.¹ Both the editor and the publisher have been severely reprimanded. But the Court did not see its way to pass any sentence upon either of us. If I dwell upon the judgment it is only because I am anxious as a satyagrahi to draw a moral from it. I wish to assure those friends who, out of pure friendliness, advised us to tender the required apology, that I refused to accept their advice not out of obstinacy but because there was a great principle at stake. I had to conserve a journalist's independence and yet respect the law. My own reading of the law was that there was no contempt committed by me. But my defence rested more upon the fact that I could not offer an apology if I was not prepared not to repeat the offence on a similar

¹ It was pronounced on March 12, 1920; for Gandhiji's account of the hearing, vide "Was It Contempt of Court?", 10-3-1920.

occasion. Because I hold that an apology tendered to a Court to be true has to be as sincere as a private apology. At the same time I owed a duty to the Court. It was no light thing for me to refuse to accept the advice of the Chief Justice especially when the Chief Justice was so very considerate in the correspondence with me. I was on the horns of a dilemma. I therefore decided not to offer any defence but simply to make a statement frankly and fully defining my position, leaving it to the Court to pass any sentence it thought fit in the event of an adverse decision. In order to show that I meant no disrespect of the Court and that I did not desire to advertise the case I took extraordinary precautions to prevent publicity and I venture to think that I succeeded eminently in convincing the Court that behind my disobedience—if it was disobedience—there was no defiance but perfect resignation; there was no anger or ill will but perfect restraint and respect; that, if I did not apologize, I did not because an insincere apology would have been contrary to my conscience. I hold that it was about as perfect an instance of civil disobedience as it ever has been my privilege to offer. And I feel that the Court reciprocated in a most handsome manner and recognized the spirit of civility that lay behind my so-called disobedience. The luminous judgment of Justice Marten lays down the law, and decides against me. But I feel thankful that it does not question the propriety of my action. Justice Hayward's judgment recognizes it as an instance of passive, i.e., civil, resistance and practically makes it the reason for not awarding any sentence. Here then we have an almost complete vindication of civil disobedience. Disobedience to be civil must be sincere, respectful, restrained, never defiant, must be based upon some well-understood principle, must not be capricious and above all must have no ill will or hatred behind it. I submit that the disobedience offered by Mr. Desai and myself contained all these ingredients.

Young India, 24-3-1920

APPENDICES

APPENDIX I

ROWLATT PETITION

TO

THE RIGHT HONOURABLE THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA

THE HUMBLE MEMORIAL OF THE UNDERSIGNED INDIAN

SUBJECTS OF HIS MAJESTY THE KING-EMPPEROR

HUMBLY AND RESPECTFULLY SHOWETH AS FOLLOWS:

(1) Your petitioners have learnt with great concern the announcement recently made by you in answer to a question in the House of Commons that you would not advise His majesty to signify his disallowance of the Anarchical and Revolutionary Crimes Act being Act XI of 1919 (generally known as the Rowlatt Act).

(2) Your petitioners submit that the said Act contains provisions which are highly prejudicial to the liberties of His Majesty's Indian subjects, among others those which empower the Indian Executive to assume at its own discretion practically uncontrolled powers of depriving His Majesty's Indian subjects of their right to be tried by the Ordinary Tribunals of the land and those which deprive the offenders placed for trial under the said Act of many privileges which have been recognized by civilised jurisprudence as absolutely necessary for safeguarding their innocence.

(3) Your petitioners further submit that on account of the aforesaid and other objections to which the principle and the provisions of the said Act are open it has met with universal disapprobation and opposition in India and has given rise to an agitation the like of which in extent and intensity has never been known or heard of before in India.

(4) Your petitioners feel that constitutional reforms inaugurating responsible Government in India can have no value or meaning if the said Act is retained on the Indian Statute Book in open and deliberate defiance of public opinion in India.

(5) Your petitioners, therefore, submit that under the circumstances aforesaid, you will be pleased to reconsider your decision and advise His Majesty to signify through you his disallowance of the said Act.

(6) And for this act of kindness your petitioners as in duty bound will ever pray.

Your most obedient servants,

Serial No.

Signature

Place of Residence

Signature [of] Volunteer

Supplement to *Navajivan*, 13-11-1919

APPENDIX II

LETTER FROM SECRETARY, HUNTER COMMITTEE, TOMALAVIYA

In his reply to Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya, Mr. Stokes writes that Lord Hunter's Committee feel that it is not within their province to review the discretion of the local Government. If in the course of their inquiry, it should appear that the evidence of any person, now in custody, is necessary to throw light on the causes of disturbances or measures taken to deal therewith, such persons will be called before the Committee and in the event, the Committee do not doubt that the Government of the Punjab will place no obstacle in the way of their appearance. The Committee observe, "Indeed, from the communication of the Private Secretary to His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor of which a copy is annexed to your letter, it is seen that an assurance has been conveyed to you on this point and also an undertaking that proper facilities will be allowed for consultation between persons in custody and counsel engaged in the inquiry which has been entrusted to the Committee and Lord Hunter's Committee would expect that. In this matter, Government would afford the fullest reasonable facilities. Lord Hunter has independently suggested to the Punjab Government that this should be done. Beyond this Lord Hunter's Committee feel that they cannot properly make any further suggestions. If the Congress Subcommittee still should feel unable to co-operate in the inquiry and should adhere to their decision to forgo the opportunity for full investigation which it is the desire of Lord Hunter's Committee to make, His Lordship's Committee, I am to say, can only acquiesce with regret in that decision."

The Leader, 19-11-1919

APPENDIX III

STATEMENT ON THE PUNJAB BY CONGRESS ENQUIRY COMMITTEE

LAHORE,

November 17, 1919

The following statement has been issued by the Punjab Inquiry Sub-committee of the All-India Congress Committee:

It is necessary that the public should have a connected narrative of events that have led to the decision of the Congress Sub-committee to withdraw its co-operation from Lord Hunter's Committee. It will be remembered that, within ten days of regrettable occurrences in the Punjab, the All-India Congress Committee met at Bombay on the 20th and 21st April and, while it deplored and condemned all acts of violence, it urged upon the Government to deal with the situation in a sympathetic and conciliatory manner, immediately reversing the policy of repression. In

accordance with a resolution passed by the Congress Committee, a representation was submitted on the 28th April last to the Prime Minister and the Secretary of State for India in which the Committee most earnestly urged His Majesty's Government to intervene and put an end to the methods of repression and to order the appointment of a commission of officials and non-officials to investigate the causes of discontent and allegations of excesses by authorities in repressing popular disturbances.

Mr. Montagu announced in the House of Commons in the last week of May that His Majesty's Government and the Viceroy have recognized the necessity for such inquiry as has been referred to above. Shortly after, a second meeting of the All-India Congress Committee took place at Allahabad on the 8th June last, dealing with the situation which then existed. It passed among others the following resolution: The Committee note with satisfaction that the Viceroy and Mr. Montagu have recognized the necessity of an inquiry into the causes of the unrest and into the complaints against authorities of use of excessive and unlawful force in relation to the view of the fact that the policy of the Government of India and the Government of the Punjab is inseparably connected with such unrest and complaint and must form a subject of investigation, this Committee earnestly request His Majesty's Government to constitute a Parliamentary Committee or a commission of persons wholly unconnected with the formulation, sanction or carrying out of the said policy. The Committee urge the following among other matters be included within the scope of the inquiry: (1) Policy of the Government of India and the Government of the Punjab in dealing with recent disturbances; (2) Sir Michael O'Dwyer's regime in the Punjab with special reference to methods of recruitment for the Indian Army and labour corps, raising of war loan, administration of martial law and complaints of excessive and unlawful use of force by the authorities; (3) recent occurrences in Delhi and other places. The Committee further urge that interests of justice and good government demand that an inquiry should begin at an early date. At the same meeting the Committee appointed the Sub-committee consisting of gentlemen whose names are noted below: (a) to arrange for the conduct of an inquiry into the recent occurrences in the Punjab and other places through such agency as they may determine, (b) take such legal or other proceedings in relation thereto in India or England as may be necessary and (c) to collect funds for the purpose by public subscriptions:—Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya, President ex-officio; Sir Rash Behary Ghosh, Pandit Motilal Nehru, Syed Hasan Imam, Mr. B. Chakravarty, Mr. C.R. Nath, Mr. Kasturi Ranga Aiyangar, Mr. Umar Sobani and Pandit Gokaran Nath Mistra, Secretary ex-officio, with power to co-opt others as members. The Sub-committee co-opted the following members at its meetings held on the 16th October 1919: Mr. Gandhi, Swami Shraddhanand, Mr. Purushottam Das Tandon, Mr. Jawaharlal Nehru, Mr. Ganpat Rai, Sheikh Umar Baksh, Bakshi Tekchand, Mr. Gokulchand Narang, Mr. Santanam, Badr-ul-Islam Ali Khan and Lal Girdhari Lal.

We the undersigned went to the Punjab shortly after withdrawal of martial law and began our investigations on the 25th June last. We need hardly say that at every step we felt the need of the assistance of the leaders of people who had occupied a prominent position in the public life of their respective towns and none of whom had taken an important part in the events which followed disturbances. We found that many people who knew what had happened would not come forward to give evidence because of fear, real or imaginary, of police. Whilst we were going on with our inquiry, the appointment of Lord Hunter's Committee was announced and we redoubled our efforts to collect evidence for the purposes of the inquiry. But, as we proceeded, we realised more than ever that the presence of principal Punjab leaders was necessary to guide and help us in collecting some of the most valuable evidence, to hearten those who were still keeping back from fear and to show to profit that Government wanted the inquiry to be carried on fairly and that they wanted the whole truth to be told to Lord Hunter's Committee.

We had also expressed the desire that the Committee should have power to revise the sentences passed by the Martial Law Commission and summary courts through whose agency, it is our firm belief, an amount of permanent and prolonged injustice has been possible. But the Government of India restricted the scope of Lord Hunter's Committee and appointed special judges for such revision. The judges appointed were both Punjab judges and rightly or wrongly (we think more rightly than wrongly), the public objected to this work being entrusted to the Punjab judges. It was therefore necessary that this tribunal should be so composed as to inspire confidence and that to that end one judge at least should be from outside the Punjab and that the tribunal should have power to admit fresh evidence where records were found to be insufficient or material evidence was, in the first instance, shut out. We had also some apprehension that our counsel might not be allowed to appear before the Committee and that, even if they were allowed, the right of cross-examination might not be extended to them. We may mention here parenthetically that it was our desire to hasten the inquiry and to avoid bitterness that led us to waive our substantial objection that the inquiry should be made by a Royal Commission appointed independently of the Government of India.

Early in October we wrote to the Government of India informing them that our Sub-committee engaged lawyers to put the case of the people before Lord Hunter's Committee and desired to know the terms of reference of the Committee and the procedure to be adopted by them. Having been referred by the Government of India to Lord Hunter's Committee for information regarding procedure, we wrote to Lord Hunter's Committee for permission to lead evidence through our counsel and to cross-examine witnesses of the other side.

In the same letter we informed Lord Hunter's Committee that we considered it equally essential for a proper and fair investigation of recent events in the Punjab that

the Punjab leaders who are undergoing imprisonment should be released on parole or bail for the period of the enquiry. We thought, however, that this was a matter on which proper authority to be approached was the Punjab Government, the Government of India and the Secretary of State. In this view, so far back as the 12th September last, at a meeting of the Indian Legislative Council, one of us had urged upon the Government of India and the Punjab Government the release of the Punjab leaders on such security, personal or pecuniary, or both, as may seem adequate to His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor of the Punjab in order that they should be able to give evidence before the Committee and have the people's case properly put before it. A cablegram was sent to the Secretary of State on the 27th ultimo praying for the right of appearance by counsel and for the release of the Punjab leaders for purposes of inquiry when time came for leading evidence before Lord Hunter's Committee. The Punjab Government was approached regarding all three points mentioned above.

There were protracted negotiations and appearance by counsel with right of cross-examination was allowed and status of the Congress Sub-committee recognized. Mr. Justice Mullick of the Patna High Court was appointed as one of two revision judges and we have reason to believe that the judges have power to admit fresh evidence in the circumstances already referred to. But the third equally fundamental need was left unsatisfied. The Lieutenant-Governor of the Punjab rejected our request for the temporary release of principal leaders under due security in the following terms : "As regards the suggestion that certain prisoners convicted in connection with disturbances should be released from jail in order to ensure satisfactory presentation of case, I am to say it will not be possible to comply with this suggestion. If, however, the Committee desire to hear evidence of any prisoner, this will be duly arranged and if it is found necessary for counsel engaged in inquiry to visit prisoners for consultation in connection with inquiry, proper facilities for such consultation will be given." We considered the reply to be highly unsatisfactory. Lord Hunter's Committee was approached with a view to the wrong being righted. We were all to cite the precedent of the Solomon Committee of 1913 of South Africa for the suggested action of His Lordship's Committee, but our suggestion was rejected. Then followed Mr. Gandhi's interview with the Lieutenant-Governor and His Honour was prepared to allow the principal leaders to be released on parole for the day or days they had to give evidence before Lord Hunter's Committee, and His Honour was willing also that counsel should visit in jail all prisoners whose evidence was to be tendered before the Committee. But it was clear that, while the demand for the release of the leaders was being granted in principle by advance made by His Honour upon previous position, the substantial and most practical part of the request stood rejected.

By securing release of the principal leaders and their presence in Committee room, we desired to get valuable assistance from them for our counsel in examination

of witnesses. Those who know anything of law will at once recognize the force of this remark—the presence of party interested, provided he is intelligent, is most helpful whilst his case is going on. No trials can take place in absence of the accused. Lord Hunter's Committee is in a way trying these leaders as conspirators in a political conspiracy to wage war against the King. They have been held by the Government to be responsible for the so-called rebellion. We hold the Committee cannot do justice to the matter before them if they do not have at least the leading prisoners before them. It may be mentioned here that we had asked Lord Hunter's Committee at Delhi to be supplied with a list of official witnesses and their printed statements to enable the Sub-committee's counsel to cross-examine witnesses punctiliously, but this request was not granted. Thus it is not possible for our counsel to take instructions from prisoners beforehand by visiting them in jail. Some of our colleagues that those prisoners who were principally interested in events then being examined by the Committee would be permitted to appear before the Committee as prisoners under custody and that they would be able, then, to help counsel in course of examination of witnesses, but we wanted to take nothing for granted. Mr. C.F. Andrews, therefore, kindly offered to go to the Lieutenant-Governor and had the point made definitely clear. He told us on return that His Honour would not allow the prisoners to appear before the Committee except as witnesses and on the day or days that they were actually required for that purpose. There was, then, nothing left for the Congress Sub-committee to do, but to abide by its manifesto not to participate in the proceedings of Lord Hunter's Committee.

The Congress Sub-committee arrived at this decision after the greatest and most anxious consideration. It weighed every consequence, but it felt that if it was to discharge the trust laid upon it, if it was to vindicate national honour and honour of the great Punjab leaders, if it was to see truth and innocence established, it could not possibly engage in an inquiry in which the people's party was so heavily handicapped. It must be remembered that officials are as much upon their trial as leaders. But not only are Government officials free to appear before Lord Hunter's Committee but also to instruct Government counsel. In the words of the Congress Committee's letter to Lord Hunter, it cannot be expected to be party to a position under which Government officials whose acts are under review can freely appear before Committee, when people's representatives whose acts are equally under review are not allowed to appear even as prisoners under custody. We have to come to the conclusion that our work of collecting evidence must continue. We have already in our possession most valuable evidence. It needs to be supplemented and checked. The Congress Committee have therefore appointed Mr. Gandhi, Pandit Motilal Nehru, Mr. C.R. Das, Mr. Abbas Tyabji, Ex-judge, Baroda High Court, and Mr. Fazlul Haq as Commissioners, with Mr. Santanam, Bar-at-law, as Secretary for work, and the Committee hope before long to place before the public a full and accurate statement of events. The first undersigned begs to state in order to avoid any misunderstanding

that he has purposely refrained from allowing himself to be appointed a Commissioner as, being the Chairman of Committee, he should be free to guide the work of the Committee as a whole.

MADAN MOHAN MALAVIYA,
CHAIRMAN
MOTILAL NEHRU.
VICE-CHAIRMAN

The Amrita Bazar Patrika, 19-11-1919

APPENDIX IV
LETTER FROM E. CANDLER

LAHORE,
December 12, 1919

DEAR MR. GANDHI,

In a conversation with a Professor of a Lahore College yesterday, a Hindu and very old friend, I came to know that the article published in the *Haq* (29th November 1919) might, in view of Indian etiquette and tradition, appear deliberately offensive and in bad taste as regards the reference to the possible marriage of a daughter of yours to a Mussalman. I do not know if you have any children, but I feel sure that you will accept it from me that, in any case, the point was impersonal or only personal in so far as your individual attitude was concerned. I had no idea, when I wrote the article, except in the case of an ultra conservative, that a reference to a daughter or a wife was considered indecent or offensive. If there is anything in the passage in the nature of a personal affront, I beg that you will forgive and believe me when I tell you that nothing would give me more pain than to discover that I had unwillingly offended in this way and more especially in *Haq* which I wish to keep clean from my taint of unfairness or bad taste. I need not point out that the political intention of the article was to put these questions to you squarely. Are you, with a view to embarrassing the Government, working up an anti-British campaign to modify the terms for the Turk? Are the claims of the Turks really as dear to you that you would jeopardise the peace of your own country for their sake, and this in the face of the verdict of men like Gladstone, Morley, Bryce, men, whose opinion, I am sure, you value and whose disinterestedness you cannot doubt, men who, long before this agitation, denounced the treatment of the subject races by the Turk as the gravest infringement of modern civilisation, and who devoted a large part of their lives to their efforts in redressing it? Please make use of this letter, if you wish to do so, privately or publicly, in any way you deem fit.

I remain,
Yours sincerely,
EDMUND CANDLER

New India, 18-12-1919

APPENDIX V

GENERAL SMUTS REPLY TO DEPUTATION

The Minister in his reply said that he was out for fair play and justice for all in the Union. The Indian community ought also to realise that there was a very strong and powerfully backed up movement afoot to curtail the progress of the Indian community. It would be inadvisable in the interest of the community to rake up all the past matters and have them included in terms of reference of the proposed Commission. It would be better if the trading matter alone is once for all gone into thoroughly. As the Indians are not anxious to acquire any fixed property, that matter should be left out. He also pointed out that Sir Benjamin Robertson is coming out to watch the interest and assist the Indian community and it would, therefore, be to the interest of the Indians themselves to render all the assistance they can both to Sir Benjamin and the Commission. He concluded by saying that he was very anxious to be on the best of terms with the Indian Government and those settled in the Union. He would endeavour under his Government to give fair play to all. Being in a great hurry to meet another deputation, he regretted that he could not give the time he desired to the deputation, but the facts will not slip his memory. The Commission may give us a couple of years' rest until another agitation breaks out and we shall see then what could be done.

Young India, 24-12-1919

APPENDIX VI

KHILAFAT DEPUTATION'S ADDRESS TO VICEROY

[DELHI,

January 19, 1920]

WITH NAME OF ALLAH THE MOST MERCIFUL AND THE MOST
COMPASSIONATE

TO HIS EXCELLENCY THE RT. HON. BARON CHELMSFORD, P.C., G.M.S.I.,
G.C.M.G.,

G.M.I.E., VICEROY AND GOVERNOR-GENERAL OF INDIA
MAY IT PLEASE YOUR EXCELLENCY,

We the members of the Khilafat deputation, authorised in this behalf by the Khilafat Conference at the very important session recently held at Amritsar, beg to approach Your Excellency with a view to enlist the sympathy and secure the fullest assistance of Your Excellency's Government in a matter of vital importance in which we are confident neither the one nor the other will be withheld. The Khilafat Conference has more than once resolved that a deputation should proceed at an early

we are confident neither the one nor the other will be withheld. The Khilafat Conference has more than once resolved that a deputation should proceed at an early date to England and lay before His Majesty the King-Emperor and his Ministers a full and clear statement of the obligations imposed on every Muslim by his faith and of the united wishes cherished by Indian Mussalmans regarding the Khilafat and cognate questions, such as those relating to Muslim control over every portion of the *Zazirat-ul-Arab*, the Khilafat's wardenship of the Holy Places, and the integrity of the Ottoman Empire. Such a desire would have been both natural and laudable at any time, but in view of the grave situation that exists to-day and is fast developing into an unmistakable menace, it has acquired an urgency and an insistence that have compelled us to give respectful expression to it, with Your Excellency's permission, through the agency of such a representative deputation as ours. After a protracted war in which almost the entire civilized world was engaged on one side or the other, in which each nation vied with its neighbours in pouring out its blood and treasures on the most lavish scale in order to secure victory, and of which the ravages and horrors have been without precedent, it was natural that even those indirectly yet powerfully affected thereby should experience extreme war-weariness at its close and feel intense abhorrence of the ancient method of settling the vital affairs of mankind through the arbitrament of the sword. Nor was it less natural that the world should cry with one voice for a lasting peace to be concluded with the utmost rapidity and yet, although more than a year had elapsed since the Treaty of Peace was signed by Germany, peace seems almost as far as ever from resuming its sway over mankind and our own continent of Asia is not without reason apprehensive of grave developments of which no one can pretend to foresee the final end. The world seems once more to be approaching a grave crisis and, although it is not possible to speak with any degree of certainty of the regions and the races likely to be affected by the storm that is obviously brewing, it requires no great perspicacity to foretell that, when it comes to burst, the Muslim world will not be left unaffected. We may suggest without disrespect that it is of paramount importance at such a juncture that the authorities at the centre of this composite Empire should be fully alive to all that transpires in remotest corners of His Majesty's world-wide Dominions, and the least that we may reasonably expect from the statesman of the Empire is that, in concluding any settlement to which they attach any degree of finality, they should take into the fullest consideration the most binding religious obligations and the most highly cherished sentiments of 70 millions of Indian Mussalmans and the no less ardent sympathies of 250 millions of their compatriots. For one reason or another, sufficiently forcible expression had not been given to these sentiments and sympathies during the War, and we regret more than we can tell that even the religious obligations to which we have referred were not set forth with that degree of clearness and emphasis that is essential for the purpose of communicating the religious

doctrines of one set of people to the ruling classes of another of alien faith.

This is neither the time nor the place to enter into any lengthy discussion of the reasons that swayed the Mussalmans of India nor into any such exposition of the doctrines that they hold to be absolutely essential for their salvation. It suffices to say that, since the armistice was concluded more than a year ago, they have not spared themselves in the task of a clear exposition of these essential doctrines of their faith and they are not unmindful of the fact which is becoming clearer every day that Your Excellency's Government, various local Governments and those Englishmen who had held responsible offices in India before their retirement have gradually come to realise and appreciate in a daily increasing measure the deep concern of the Mussalmans of India and of their compatriots in the settlement to be concluded with the Ottoman Khilafat. Realising at the same time their own responsibility for the peace and good governance of India and tranquillity on her borders, Your Excellency's Government and the Right Hon. the Secretary of State have, we may thankfully acknowledge, made representations to His Majesty's Government, but that Government is obviously so far removed from us, both in point of distance and political and religious surroundings, that neither our own voice nor the representations of this Government have apparently affected the opinion, view point, and preconceived ideas of His Majesty's ministers to an appreciable degree, and a number of ministerial utterances can be cited to prove, if proof was necessary, that they are inclined to insist on a settlement of such world-wide interest and importance as if it was solely, or at any rate mainly, the concern of the small section of His Majesty's subjects of British birth and Christian faith. From the rest they seem to expect impassive acquiescence, if not willing submission, to the dictates of their narrowly conceived and far from Imperial statesmanship. Need we say that such an estimate of the situation that a sectional and sectarian settlement will create will prove disastrously incorrect. Deeply apprehensive as we are of the calamitous consequences of such an estimate and still more deeply anxious to prevent them while we can, we have been driven to the conclusion that one final effort must be made to give timely warning to the Imperial authorities of the dangers we so clearly foresee and respectfully entreat them to avoid the evil consequence of a settlement sought to be forced on the Mussalmans of the world contrary to the clearest commandments of their creed and the united wishes of so large a portion of humanity. Recent experience as well as the inherent difficulties of discussing such grave matters over the wires at the distance of seven thousand miles of land and sea have forced us to resolve that, with Your Excellency's assistance, a deputation of ours should proceed at the earliest possible opportunity to England and place directly our humble but frank submissions before His Majesty and his ministers, and since we have been repeatedly asked to remember that, in arranging such a settlement Great Britain, whatever her position among her Allies and associates, could not leave their interests and wishes out of

consideration, we trust that our deputation will be enabled to explain to the Allied and associated nations and their Governments the nature and binding force of Islamic obligations and the true character and scope of Muslim aspirations. We need not repeat here the clear conditions of future peace as set forth by the President of the United States of America on the basis of which the Khilafat concluded the armistice, not the unmistakable pledges of the British Premier regarding Constantinople, Thrace and the homelands of the Turks. We respectfully submit that no prospective territorial or political gains, whether real or only imagined, can compensate Great Britain or her Allies and associates for the loss of moral credit if their pledged word is left unredeemed, and the ingenious interpretations suggested now as an afterthought by irresponsible persons will in no way prove helpful to the responsible authorities. The shock of this blow to the moral prestige of the Empire will be felt all the more severely in consequence of the sad disillusionment with regard to the pledge of His Majesty's Government proclaimed by Your Excellency's predecessor at the commencement of the war with Turkey.

But it is not because the Mussalmans of India take their stand on British and Allied pledges, any more than they expect that a settlement with such extended and intricate ramifications can be governed by their own interests and sentiments alone, that they are so deeply agitated to-day when they apprehend a breach of these solemn pledges and an almost complete disregard of these universally cherished sentiments. The Mussalmans of India will entirely fail in their purpose if they cannot make it clear to those who have made themselves responsible for preserving to them their religious freedom in its entirety that their deepest concern today is that settlement of the Khilafat and cognate questions is apparently being outlined by His Majesty's Government and their Allies which no Mussalman can accept or acquiesce in without jeopardising eternal salvation. This is the one governing consideration on which attention must be focussed and so intent is it that, even if the Ottoman Turks could be made to acquiesce in such a settlement, it would remain as unacceptable as ever to every believing Mussalman. The preservation of the Khilafat as a temporal no less than a spiritual institution is not so much a part of their faith as the very essence thereof and no analogies from other creeds that tolerate the lacerating and devitalizing distinction between things spiritual and things temporal, between the Church and the State, can serve any purpose save that of clouding and befogging the clearest of issues. Temporal power is of the very essence of the institution of the Khilafat, and Mussalmans can never agree to any change in its character or to the dismemberment of its Empire. The no less important question of the Zazirat-ul-Arab, over no portion of which can any kind of non-Muslim control be tolerated, is equally clearly not one of Muslim sentiment but of Islamic faith. Similarly, Islam also declares and defines the sanctity of the holy places of Islam and places this and similar matters beyond the uninformed interpretation of people of alien faiths. Mussalmans insist, and with perfect reason, that the Khalifa alone shall be the warden of the holy places. As regards the integrity of the Khalifa's dominions, we are

painfully aware that some sections of the Mussalmans of Arabia have in clear defiance of the laws of Islam stood out from the solid mass of the rest of the Muslim world. But instead of this being any argument against the latter, it furnishes it with one more compelling reason for proclaiming the truth and in accordance with the divine declaration that all Mussalmans are brother, one to another, and the divine injunction to make peace between brothers, Indian Mussalmans must seek to remove every existing misunderstanding and eliminate every cause of friction that may tend to separate Arab from Ajam, and Turk from Tajik. And it is the logical consequence of Islamic brotherhood that all Mussalmans should share the sorrows and sufferings of their brothers in every corner of the world and should see to it that principles of such universal application as that of self-determination should be applied to the Muslim no less than to the Christian and to the Asiatic no less than to the European. It is true that a great part of Europe and Christendom charges the Ottoman Turks with religious injustice and political ineptitude, but it is permissible to argue that those who do so are neither free from old-standing prejudices nor from a bitterness of latter growth, and we are confident that the verdict of history would be pronounced in due course with full regard for the difficult position in which the Ottoman Turks have stood for centuries and that it would vindicate alike the basic toleration of Islam and the essential humanity of the Turk. The loyalty of Indian Mussalmans no less than that of other communities of India to their Sovereign has been an abiding asset acknowledged as well as proclaimed throughout the history of British rule in India. It is also admitted that it depends and is mainly based on the preservation of their religious freedom in its entirety. If it has not been necessary to remind Government of this aspect of Muslim loyalty, and, in fact, of the loyalty of every Indian community, it is because we thankfully acknowledged that until lately no question had arisen in which it appeared likely to be forgotten or ignored; but now that the policy of the Allied and associated powers and the dictates of Islam seem to run counter to each other, we respectfully submit that justice and expediency alike demand that what is unalterable by human hand and has never been so altered throughout the thirteen centuries of Islam shall remain unaltered, and what is susceptible to change and is essentially changeable with every change in circumstances and surroundings should, when necessary, change. Even the most cherished Muslim sentiment may be sacrificed in subservience to Imperial demands though we humbly submit that true Imperialism should give proportionate consideration to the wishes and sentiments of every member of the Empire, but the requirements of Islamic law are so definite and of such a binding nature that they cannot be reduced by a hair's breadth to suit the desires of Allied and associated powers any more than they can be enlarged to further the mundane ambitions of Mussalmans themselves. These are the limits set by Allah and none shall transgress them, but while the Mussalmans take their stand firmly on their credal obligations, they respectfully submit that true Imperial interests point to the same path as Islamic commandments. The War may be over but peace is still distant and doubtful and we shall beseech the Imperial authorities not to underrate the worth and value of Islamic friendship and Indian loyalty. A settlement unacceptable alike to

Muslim and non-Muslim Indians, now happily reunited and standing shoulder to shoulder, will bring no peace because it will bring no sense of justice and no contentment. No Mussalman who hopes and prays for salvation would henceforward know any rest and he could only aspire to salvation by following the dictates of Islam, however the consequences may be. But if on the contrary, the heart of India is won by a generous recognition of her fitness for managing her own affairs as a member of the British Commonwealth and the Muslim world is reconciled by a just appreciation of Islamic responsibilities and obligations, Muslim sentiments of half the world would be at the back of Great Britain and no Power in the world could dare to deny to her the rights that are hers and her Empire's. The menace that now looms so large would then shrink into nothingness without a blow being struck in wrath or a drop of human blood being shed in vain warfare. The world would then be truly not only for democracy but for God and the truth, and it is in this spirit that we desire to send our mission, with Your Excellency's assistance, to great Britain and Allied and associated countries. We also feel confident that, once the success of our mission is assured, it would set itself with equal zeal to reassure the Muslim world and reconcile those who have parted, maybe in anger, maybe in sorrow, but in any case through misunderstanding of their common interests which everyone anxious to promote the peace of the world should endeavour to remove. May it be given through the grace of merciful Providence to us and to Your Excellency's Government to accomplish this humane and sacred purpose.

We beg to subscribe ourselves Your Excellency's most obedient servants.

The Amrita Bazar Patrika, 24-1-1920