The Way to Communal Harmony

M. K. GANDHI

Compiled
and Edited by
U. R. Rao

THE WAY TO COMMUNAL HARMONY

M.K. Gandhi

Compiled and Edited by U.R. Rao

Foreword by Prof. Humayun Kabir

Introduction by Dr. Rajendra Prasad

First Edition, January 1963

Navajivan Publishing House, Ahmedabad 380 014

FOREWORD

Mahatma Gandhi wrote his autobiography under the title—*The Story of My Experiments with Truth*. This perhaps strikes the keynote to his life. In all that he said and did, he was continually striving to realize truth for himself and express it to those around him. From one point of view, this was essentially a pragmatic approach and depended on circumstances. That is why one finds many statements in his writings which, taken in isolation, are inconsistent with one another. At the same time, his pragmatic approach to problems was inspired by certain basic and unchanging principles. He clung to his ideals with intense force and passion. We can therefore find a deep underlying unity in all his statements in spite of their superficial inconsistencies.

The Way to Communal Harmony is a compilation of Gandhi's reflections on certain problems which divide mankind. Though they deal immediately with India, their validity extends beyond the circumstances of our country. Everywhere in the world, individuals and groups are divided because of fear, suspicion and hatred. It depends on local conditions whether the division expresses itself along religious, economic, political, caste or colour lines. Whatever be the form, insecurity is perhaps the major cause of individual and social dissensions. A person who is integrated and sure of himself fears none and consequently provokes no fear. We have occasional examples of such heroic individuals, but we have not till now had instances of societies or communities that are fully integrated and therefore fearless. The theme of Gandhi's teachings is that the individual must rise above fear, jealousy and hate. When such individuals combine themselves into a community, the problem of communal jealousy and discord will disappear.

In reading through this selection of Gandhi s writings and speeches, one is struck again and again by the passion and sincerity with which he pleaded the cause of better understanding among individuals and communities. He came to politics from an ethical urge. Quite early in life, he realized that men will not feel secure till the physical causes of conflict—insufficiency of food, shelter and other necessities—have been removed. Neither will they feel secure till the mental and moral strength of the individual has been developed. U. R. Rao has earned our gratitude by collecting in one

volume many of the most significant thoughts of Gandhi on the way to achieve individual and social harmony.

Throughout his long life, Gandhi worked for toleration based on understanding and respect. He pitted all his strength against the forces of evil let loose on the Indian sub-continent during the critical years when independence was achieved. His whole life was a saga of sacrifice, but perhaps the last six months outshine even the magnificent deeds of his earlier years. He wrote: "I am striving to become the best cement between the two communities. My longing is to be able to cement the two with my blood, if necessary." These words proved prophetic and he laid down his life to establish understanding and respect not only between the two major communities of India but among all communities in this sub-continent and, by implication, among all communities throughout the world.

New Delhi, August 15, 1962

INTRODUCTION

It was rather at an early stage of his public life in South Africa that Mahatma Gandhi felt the necessity of communal unity. There were people from different parts of India living there and in fact, it was to some extent, an India in miniature, with its differences of language, religion, custom, etc. In the course of his struggle in South Africa, he had to secure the willing co-operation and sacrifice of all Indians residing there. He returned to India with a conviction that, if the struggle for Swaraj had to succeed, it could do so only with the co-operation of all the communities living within this vast sub-continent. Thus, he became keen to establish communal harmony.

The principal communal question was one of harmony between Hindus and Musalmans who inhabited this country. Mahatma Gandhi felt that, if Hindu-Muslim unity was established, unity with other communities—which was already there—could easily be strengthened. He never found any serious differences between the Hindus and other minority communities like the Christians and the Sikhs, not to speak of the small community of the Parsis. Naturally, therefore, he turned to the question of Hindu-Muslim unity. Events so happened that they made special joint efforts, particularly of the Hindus and the Muslims, necessary. After the First World War, there was great agitation among the Muslims against the British Government on account of what they considered to be a breach of faith. It was also on account of the attitude which the British Government had taken at the time of the Peace Treaty in disregarding the promises hitherto made concerning the position of the Sultan of Turkey, who was regarded as Khalifa by the Muslims in India and thus, charged with the duty of and clothed with authority for protecting the holy places of Islam. About the same time, the British Government roused to indignation other Indian communities by its attempt to perpetuate the emergency laws which had been passed and enforced with rigour during the War period. This led Mahatma Gandhi to voice the nation's feeling of bitterness and, particularly, forced him to think of Satyagraha against the Government. The tragic massacre of Hindus, Muslims and Sikhs collectively at Jalianwalla Bagh and the subsequent atrocities and humiliations, heaped upon members of all communities in the Punjab during he Martial Law days, had created an intense resentment amongst all classes. Thus, when the general resentment of all communities over the Punjab atrocities combined with the resentment of the Muslims

on account of the Khilafat wrongs, an agitation of a most intense type was the result. The Hindus as a community took up the question of the Khilafat with the same zeal and vigour as the Muslims, and Mahatma Gandhi seemed to have become the leader of both Hindus and Muslims. He toured throughout the country with the Ali brothers and Muslim leaders like Maulana Abul Kalam Azad and many others, and carried the message of resistance to the Government for what came to be known as the Khilafat and the Punjab wrongs. For about a year it seemed almost as if a permanent unity had been achieved. One cause for differences between the Hindus and the Muslims used to be the sacrifice of cows by Muslims on the day of Bakr-Id. In that particular year, the number of cows sacrificed on the day of Bakr-Id was almost negligible as compared with that in the previous years. Mahatma Gandhi was never tired of preaching that the Hindus should leave it to the Muslims to protect the cow, as they (the Hindus) had been doing their best to help the Khilafat. Fraternization became common all over the country. Those amongst the Hindus who did not have faith in Mahatma Gandhi's policy of unity and the Muslims who did not trust the Hindus seemed to have lost their influence for the time being and were more or less out of action. Mahatma Gandhi's idea of unity, like all of his other ideas, was based on the principle of Ahimsa which teaches us not to give even mental pain to anyone, not to speak of physical injury. He insisted that the Hindus who were in a majority in the country should help the Muslims and should never entertain any idea of enforcing their rights by brute majority, but try to win the hearts of the minority community. The Non-co-operation movement, which had been originally conceived only for the redress of the Khilafat and the Punjab wrongs, was at the Calcutta special session of the Congress enlarged in scope to include also the attainment of Swaraj. Mahatma Gandhi's idea was that, if the country succeeded in obtaining redress of the Khilafat and the Punjab wrongs through force of public opinion, supported by people's sacrifices, that itself would be tantamount to obtaining Swaraj—which could not thereafter be held up by the British. But to make the position clear and to make the appeal of the Congress most forcible so far as all communities in India were concerned, he added to its objectives the achievement of Swaraj.

As I have said above, everything went on well for about a year. But, probably there were forces working behind the scenes. Hindu-Muslim riots were started on a large scale in Kerala and, in subsequent years, in many places all over the country. The

Khilafat movement also lost its motive force when the Khalifa himself was deposed by the Turks. In spite of these setbacks in the early days, however, Mahatma Gandhi remained firm in his faith in Hindu-Muslim unity. In his view it was synonymous with communal unity or unity amongst all the communities of India, and he continued to fight bravely for this unity till the end of his life.

When the Hindu-Muslim riots broke out in 1924 and the situation became intolerable to him, he undertook a fast for 21 days—not aimed against any individual or any community—but with a view, as he said, to purifying himself so that his words and his actions could be better understood and appreciated. One immediate result of his fast was that an All-Party Conference was held in which Hindus, Muslims, Christians and other communities participated and adopted a resolution for achieving and maintaining communal unity and laid down the procedure which was to be followed in removing the causes of friction and distrust.

After the first flush of its enthusiasm for Non-co-operation had waned, the Congress divided its activities into two: work in the legislatures and the constructive programme. The first activity was entrusted to the Swaraj Party of which the most distinguished leaders were Deshbandhu C. R. Das, Pandit Motilal Nehru, Shri Vithalbhai Patel, Shri N.C. Kelkar, Shri Govind Vallabh Pant and others. The Congress itself took up constructive work for the spread of spinning and Khadi, reorganization of national education and general village uplift work. Mahatma Gandhi was at the head of this movement and, amongst his colleagues and associates the most prominent were Shri C. Rajagopalachari, Shri Vallabhbhai Patel, Shri Jamnalal Bajaj and others. Things went on for some years, each group giving as good an account of itself as possible in those difficult tasks. Ultimately, a time came when not only Hindus and Muslims but all communities became once more united against the British Government. On this occasion also, an act of the British Government brought about unity. The Government appointed a commission, known as the Simon Commission, under the chairmanship of Sir John Simon, for making proposals for giving a larger share to the people of India in the governance of their country. There was no Indian on this Commission and this created resentment not only among Congressmen—both Hindu and Muslim- but also among those who had till then kept themselves out and opposed the Congress movement of Non-co-operation. However, Mahatma Gandhi continued to work for his constructive programme and communal unity. The Non-co-operation movement had

exhibited its strength but had to be stopped or withdrawn by Mahatma Gandhi on account of the unpreparedness of the country for the final struggle and chiefly because, in his view, the kind of unity which he had hoped for and the degree of non-violence which he had tried to inculcate amongst the people at large had not been achieved. Muslims, however, gradually drifted away from the Congress and the Congress movement, and with the exception of a small group of stalwarts amongst whom the most prominent was Maulana Abul Kalam Azad, practically the whole community became indifferent, if not hostile, to what the Congress was doing. A Muslim League had been in existence and it offered a platform for those Muslims who did not find themselves in agreement with the Congress. Before the Muslim League emerged as a power demanding division of India into Muslim and non-Muslim India, there were some who had been working in their own silent way and carrying on propaganda among Muslim intellectuals. But Mahatma Gandhi did not lose faith and continued to work for unity, especially Hindu-Muslim unity. The time came, however, when India became more or less divided into two; the Muslims on one side and all the rest on the other side. There may have been forces, working under the instigation of the British Government, trying to widen the gulf and setting one community against the other in all possible ways. The Non-co-operation movement was succeeded by Civil Disobedience or Satyagraha; thousands and thousands of people, including quite a good number of Muslims, disobeyed laws and sought imprisonment. The rise of the Muslim League held out before the Muslims the picture of a divided India and a separate Muslim State on the basis of the theory that the Muslims and the Hindus constituted two different nations and that the Muslims were consequently entitled to an independent home for themselves within the territory of India but separate from the rest of the country. This demand of the League attracted more and more Muslims to its side. The Congress never accepted the theory that the Hindus and the Muslims were two different nations. They had been born in the same country; their ancestors for many generations had lived and died in this country; they were sharing jointly all the sorrows of a common life, especially the burden of a foreign rule which had been established on the ashes of the Muslim empire. The Muslim League, on the other hand, propagated its two nation theory and, later, laid claim to a separate homeland for the Muslims. Mahatma Gandhi was prepared to go a very long way to satisfy the Muslim demand, short of partition of the country. But he who had worked shoulder to shoulder

with prominent Muslims during the Khilafat movement came to be regarded as enemy No. 1 by many of them. Even some of those who had been among his closest associates also joined the Muslim League and supported all that it stood for. All that had been done for Hindu-Muslim unity was in a way wiped out by the acceptance and propagation of the two-nation theory.

But the most tragic time came when, in anticipation of the advent of Swaraj and the establishment of Pakistan, large-scale killings were started and thousands and thousands of Hindus and Muslims lost their lives. There was a large, forced exodus of Hindus and Sikhs from the Punjab, Sindh, the North-West Frontier Province and a similar exodus of Muslims from Eastern Punjab and the adjoining areas. In Bengal, also, there was a large exodus of Hindus from Eastern Bengal, an exodus that has not completely ceased even today. A joint cabinet in the Government of India with representatives of both the Congress and the League was formed, but the experience of joint working even for a short time forced the belief on those Congressmen who were in the Government that there was no other way but to accept partition. And so partition came.

It was hoped by the Congress members of the Government that with the withdrawal of the objection to partition by the Congress, there would be peace in both parts of the country; and the Hindus and the Sikhs in Pakistan and the Muslims in Hindustan would be able to live in peace and harmony in their respective places carrying on their normal business; but that was not to be. There were massacres in many places. West Pakistan for all practical purposes became a country exclusively for Muslims except for a small group of the minority communities, and, similarly, East Punjab and some other adjoining areas became a non-Muslim region except for pockets which were, and still are, of a sizable character. In East Bengal, however, the Hindu population was large and in spite of the forced exodus of nearly 50 lakhs of people, there is still a large population of Hindus left.

The most prominent feature of Mahatma Gandhi's life was that, when wholesale massacres and arson and loot were being carried on on a large scale; he tried his utmost to stop the holocaust and to bring about some sort of reconciliation. In his writings and speeches of this period particularly, the essential and more significant part of which is presented in the following pages, is evidence of his burning desire to

establish communal unity and to shed ill-will. He rushed to Noakhali where the Muslims were in a majority, forming nearly 90% of the population, and where innumerable atrocities had been committed against the Hindu minority. There not only did he live amongst the Muslims but also walked from village to village on his mission of peace and asked his companions and followers to do the same in different parts of the district. When riots broke out in Bihar, in which Hindus had the upper hand and committed horrible crimes against the Muslims, his heart wept. But on that occasion at least the love of the people of Bihar for him asserted itself and at the news of the threat that he would undertake a fast, the riots subsided in no time. Thereafter he came to Bihar and tried to heal the wounds of the Muslim sufferers. He would have gone to the Punjab on a similar mission of mercy but was held up in Delhi where, too, communal fury was brought under control by his fast. Similarly, in Calcutta, where both Hindus and Muslims had suffered terribly at each other's hands, he exposed himself to the utmost risk and achieved what was described at the time as a marvel, by re-establishing peace between the communities.

Mahatma Gandhi had never accepted in principle the theory of the Hindus and the Muslims being two distinct nations, and he tried hard to convince both of them of its pernicious character. He continued to the last day of his life to instil the lesson of unity among the communities of India. It is remarkable how by his honest and fearless advocacy of communal unity he had enraged many of the Muslims and a negligible few among the Hindus; the Muslims as a body, with a few exceptions, looked upon him as an enemy, while some Hindus felt that, by showing humility, respect and regard and "partiality" for Muslims, he was jeopardizing the cause of the Hindus. This had been, in a way, going on from the days of the Khilafat movement but reached its acme after the partition. Those Hindus who did not like his indefatigable efforts to give protection to the Muslims from murder, arson and loot conceived the idea of getting rid of him, and so, one evening while he was on his way to his prayers, he was shot on the prayer ground. He died, with *He Ram* on his lips and a smile on his face.

This is the long and tragic history of Mahatma Gandhi's attempts to establish Hindu-Muslim unity which ended with the establishment of Pakistan on the one side and his supreme sacrifice on the other. The problem has, however, not been solved in spite of the creation of Pakistan. We have still some 40 millions of Muslims in this country, spread all over the vast area of what is called India today. There are, moreover, other

problems which are cropping up now. They are not of the type and intensity of the Hindu-Muslim problem of the earlier days, but they are important enough to be viewed with concern by all lovers of the country. The advent of Swaraj has brought its own problems and not the least amongst them is the psychological and moral integration of all the elements living in this country into one, unified whole, for which everyone living in this territory has not only to develop love and affection, but for whose protection and prosperity, he has also to be prepared to make sacrifices. In this connection, it is worthwhile to recall some of the salient features of Mahatma Gandhi's teachings. The fundamental thesis which he developed and propagated was based on his faith in Ahimsa and Truth. He believed and preached that unity was a vital need of this country—and we may add, today it is an equally vital need of the world—and that it should be based on love, not fear, on trust and good faith, not hatred and distrust. It should be the aim and object of all to achieve at least peace and goodwill if not unity, not by force, nor by aggression, but by love and sacrifice. It was the duty, in his view, of the stronger party to behave not only justly but even generously towards the weaker party. It had not to show condescension towards the other but to win the other's love and affection. He wanted to replace exploitation of the weak by the strong by a spirit of mutual respect and surrender by the stronger to the weaker.

Science and technology have brought the different countries of the world to a position in which they can and must live in co-operation with one another or perish. In this atomic age—an age of atomic weapons of mass destruction—there is no other way. The 'Big Powers' must come to terms and cat off fear and distrust of one another and thus prepare the way for the establishment of that One World wherein all will be politically free, all will be economically well provided for and each will be contributing to the prosperity and happiness of all.

Camp: Hyderabad

August 15, 1962

EDITOR'S NOTE

In undertaking this work, I have been impelled by a growing conviction that, as the days pass and Gandhiji recedes more and more from us into history, the Truth which he put before us assumes a more crucial and compelling validity to contemporary problems. We stand today in the heart of the Nuclear Age and are already reaching out into the Space Age. Never before in the known annals of the human race has man gained such mastery over the forces of the physical universe. Yet, if we look at the parochialism and the pettiness, the jealousy and the intolerance, the hatred and the violence that divide man from man and nation from nation, it is evident that our moral and spiritual growth has not kept pace with our intellectual and material progress. This may sound platitudinous, but is nevertheless true.

The social, political, racial and international tensions and conflicts which threaten the very existence of mankind today have all their seeds in the soil of our minds. The soil therefore needs to be dug up down to the very roots and turned over to the seeds of mutual understanding and respect, love and co-operation. Else, humanity will perish.

Gandhiji showed us the way not only to retrace our steps but also to reach unity of life. This he did not do through mere abstractions and aphorisms, precepts and sermons. The road to communal harmony is marked with the imprints of his life-long pilgrimage for peace among men, and sanctified by his supreme sacrifice. So was it in the case of Jesus Christ. We shall ignore the one—as we have ignored the other—at our peril.

Freedom for us in India has been won through the sufferings and struggle of countless men and women, turned into heroes by the alchemy of Gandhiji's touch. Today we have to ask ourselves: Will the people be finally welded into one nation? Will unity of hearts and community of purpose be achieved? And will they merge into a joining of hands for raising the edifice of the India of Gandhiji's dreams? The unity pledge that he and the people took over 40 years ago has great relevance today. We are in search of a code of conduct for national integration. Shall we see, strewn among significant utterances and writings of Gandhiji and the doings of his life, strands which can be woven into a bond of abiding unity of hearts?

In the following pages, I have endeavoured to present the truths which Gandhiji enunciated—in his own words. There is no substitute for them because they are words

born out of the depths of his own rich and intimate experience, and possess, on that account, a spiritual vigour and impact which no mere intellectual effort can ever attain.

It is no accident that more than half the material in this compilation relates to the years 1946-48, the crowning period of Gandhiji's life. Then, more than ever, he had transcended politics and risen to the heights of humanity's loftiest religion. During this time of unprecedented fraternal strife, when men's minds everywhere were tortured and torn up by anguish, bitterness, disillusionment and suspicion, Gandhiji had many heart-searching, and indeed, searing, questions to face, both in his correspondence and at his prayer meetings. Yet when he wrote or spoke in response to them, he did so, sometimes with his self confidence shaken, but always with unwavering faith in the validity of the truths he had preached and practised throughout his life. True, they were ancient, eternal truths, as 'old as the hills', but he resurrected and revitalized them and made them throb with the pulse of his own life, working them into his own living words and deeds. The miracles he had wrought in Calcutta, Bihar and Delhi bore unmistakable testimony to the innate vitality of those truths. It was not that he failed us; rather, *we* failed *him*.

Gandhiji's thoughts and reflections put together in this compilation have been culled from almost a couple of thousand pages of his writings, speeches and letters, spread over three decades of his active public life. The task of selection has been no easy one. Despite my anxiety and effort to omit nothing that is relevant and valuable, it is more than likely that something significant has been overlooked. Limitations of space were there: the book had to be kept within reasonable dimensions. Liberty had to be taken to render the reported, indirect versions of Gandhiji's prayer-time utterances—except in the case of the written texts of his 'silence-day' messages and statements—into direct speech. Every endeavour has been made to keep as close to the original as possible. The paragraph headings are very largely mine. Again, shorn of detail and context, there is a risk that stray passages may acquire a shade or turn of meaning not wholly warranted by the original from which they are extracted. Gandhiji's apparent inconsistency—he considered foolish consistency the hobgoblin of little minds—may sometimes seem accentuated because of separation from surrounding material. Thus there are defects and shortcomings of the method, added to those of my own. For all these I plead the indulgence of the reader and take consolation in the hope that, when

in doubt, he will go to the original sources from which I have drawn and which I have listed at the end. The notes, mostly the bare minimum, I trust, will help. The glossary is intended for readers unfamiliar with classical Indian terms, allusions, characters etc.

I must record here my deep indebtedness - to Dr. Rajendra Prasad for the introduction, which provides, among other things, an almost complete and touching historical perspective to Gandhiji's thoughts on the communal problem; to Prof. Humayun Kabir for the foreword, which constitutes a brief but eloquent assessment of Gandhiji's contribution to humanity's heritage; to Shri Kaka Kalelkar, Shri Jairamdas Daulatram and Shri R. R. Diwakar for their interest in this undertaking and advice and encouragement to me in carrying it out; and finally, to Shri Jivanji D. Desai of Navajivan Trust for his patience and understanding in regard to the production of the book, which has not been altogether easy and without impediments.

If this effort of mine contributes in however small a measure to the understanding and promotion of "that unity without which life itself will not be worth living", I shall consider myself amply rewarded.

October 2, 1962 U.R. Rao

CONTENT

Foreword

Introduction

Editor's Note

I. Approach to Communal Unity

1. Early Background
2. Character of Communal Unity
3. Hindu-Muslim Unity
4. Equal Servant of All
5. Communalism

II. Achievement of Communal Unity

1. Common Interests
2. Arbitration: Key to Solution
3. Mutual Tolerance
4. The Unitary Method
5. Pacts
6. Interdining and Intermarriage
7. Oneness of Costume
8. The Vow of Unity
9. The Meaning of Unity
10. Work for Unity

III. Religious Aspects of the Communal Problem

1. Religion and Communal Unity
2. Hinduism and the Communal Problem
3. Islam and The Communal Problem
4. Conversion
5. The Scriptures
6. Temples and Mosques
7. 'Music Before Mosques'
8. Congregational Prayer
9. Cow-slaughter and Cow-protection

10. Untouchability and Caste
11. Communal Slogans

IV. Problem of Minorities

1. Muslims a Minority?
2. The Congress and The Minority Problem
3. The Congress and The Muslims
4. The Sikhs
5. Communal Settlement and Swaraj
6. Separate Electorates

V. Communal Disturbances

1. Tragedy of Riots
2. Riots and Independence
3. Partition Riots

VI. The Causes of Communal Riots

1. Specific Causes
2. Psychology of Fear
3. Distrust
4. Tiredness of Non-violence
5. Propaganda of Vilification
6. The Third Party

VII. Social Implications of Communal Riots

1. The Goondas and Riots
2. Communal Crime and Truth
3. Crimes Against Women
4. Restoration of Peace

VIII. Personal Reaction To Communal Riots

1. Religion and Riots
2. Fasts for Communal Peace
3. Desire to Live for 125 Years
4. Readiness For Martyrdom

IX. Non-violent Approach to Communal Unity and Peace

1. Unity Through Non-violence
2. Self-defence: The Violent Way
3. Self-defence: The Non-violent Way
4. Use of The Military and The Police
5. The Way of Non-retaliation
6. Non-violence of The Brave
7. Martyrdom During Riots
8. Peace Brigades
9. Duty of a Satyagrahi

X. Partition and Pakistan

1. The Religious Basis of Partition
2. The 'Two-nation' Theory
3. The Demand for Pakistan
4. The Setting-up of Pakistan
5. Partition of Bengal and The Punjab
6. Frontier Province
7. Pakistan Established
8. The Boundary Commission
9. The Refugee Problem

XI. India-Pakistan Relations

1. Treatment of Minorities
2. Non-Muslim Minorities in Pakistan
3. Muslim Minority in India
4. Post-partition Relations

XII. Communal Relations in Free India

1. The Coming of Independence
2. Resort to Force
3. Equality of All
4. Socialistic Equality
5. Franchise

6. Use of Military in Civil Disturbances
7. Conduct of The Majority
8. Status of Muslim Minority
9. The Two Scripts
10. Political Parties
11. Secular State
12. Religion and Nationalism
13. Religious Festivals
14. Minorities in The Services
15. Separatism
16. Synthesis of Culture
17. Communal Life in Villages
18. 'India of My Dreams'

Sources

Notes

Glossary

I. Approach to Communal Unity

1. Early Background

From My early youth, I had made friends with people of all communities. I had never made any distinction between Hindu, Muslim, Parsi and others. When as a boy I attended the High School at Rajkot, I do not remember a single occasion of a quarrel with a Muslim or Parsi boy in the school.[1] Even as a boy at school, I had many Muslim friends.[2]

I have, ever since the days of my youth, had a longing to see the differences between Hindus and Mohammedans obliterated.[3]

In South Africa

I went to South Africa in charge of a case for Muslim friends of my brother. I went to South Africa to earn my living, but I soon put service first. I became a 'coolie' barrister in order to serve my labourer friends there and I really served Hindus through Muslims whose employee I was. Hindu-Muslim unity was part of my very being.

The memory of those days is full of fragrance for me. Even today, although alas! Communal differences have raised their head there too, all are fighting as one man for Indian rights. I recall stalwart Muslims who had joined the Satyagraha movement; especially Sheth Cachalia, now gone, who said he would rather die than remain a slave.[4]

At a meeting of all the Indians in Pretoria... principally attended by Meman merchants, ... I laid stress on the necessity of forgetting all distinctions such as Hindus, Musalmans, Parsis, Christians, Gujaratis, Madrasis, Punjabis, Sindhis, Kachchhis, Surtis and so on.[5]

When I was in South Africa, I came in close touch with Moslem brethren...There I was able to learn their habits, thoughts and aspirations. [6]

I had lived in the midst of Muslim friends for twenty years. They treated me as a member of their family and told their wives and sisters that they need not observe purdah with me. [7]

Indeed, I had put forth the claim in South Africa to be a good Musalman simultaneously with being a good member of the other religions of the world.[8]

I espoused the Hindu-Muslim cause long before I joined the Congress.[9]

I had realized early enough in South Africa that there was no genuine friendship between the Hindus and the Musalmans. I never missed single opportunity to remove obstacles in the way of unity.

It was not in my nature to placate anyone by adulation, or at the cost of self-respect. But my South African experiences had convinced me that it would be on the question of Hindu-Muslim unity that my Ahimsa would be put to its severest test, and that the question presented the widest field for my experiments in Ahimsa. The conviction is still there. Every moment of my life I realize that God is putting me on my trial.[10]

In 1914, I sailed from South Africa, reaching London on the 6th of August, i.e., two days after the declaration of war between England and Germany. Soon after, I read a series of articles in *The Times,* speculating on Turkey's choice. I found the Mohammedans residing in London equally agitated. One morning, we read the news that Turkey had joined Germany. I had not leisure then to study the Turkish question, and pronounce judgment on the Turkish action. I simply prayed that India might be saved from the turmoil. Having had to explain to the Mohammedan friends in South Africa the events of the Tripolitan War and having understood their sentiments, I had no difficulty in gauging Mohammedan sentiment over the Turkish choice. Theirs became a very difficult position.

Back in India

I landed next year in India with ideas of Hindu-Mohammedan unity and the Turkish question, and I felt when I landed that I would like to assist in securing a proper solution of these questions. There are two things to which I am devoting my life—permanent unity between Hindus and Mohammedans, and Satyagraha; to Satyagraha probably more, for it covers a much wider field. It is an all-embracing movement and, if we accepted the law of Satyagraha, unity will come of itself.[11]

I had met them [the Ali Brothers] only once or twice, though I had heard much about them. Everyone had spoken highly of their services and their courage. I had not then come in close touch with Hakim Saheb, but Principal Rudra and Dinabandhu Andrews had told me a deal in his praise. I had met Mr. Shuaib Qureshi and Mr. Khwaja at the Muslim League in Calcutta. I had also come in contact with Drs. Ansari and Abdur

Rahman. I was seeking the friendship of good Musalmans, and was eager to understand the Musalman mind through contact with their purest and most patriotic representatives. I therefore never needed any pressure to go with them wherever they took me, in order to get into intimate touch with them.[12]

But I must labour to discover the Musalman mind. The closer I come to the best of Musalmans, the juster I am likely to be in my estimate of the Musalmans and their doings. I am striving to become the best cement between the two communities. My longing is to be able to cement the two with my blood, if necessary. But, before I can do so, I must prove to the Musalmans that I love them as well as I love the Hindus. [13]

2. Character of Communal Unity

Perpetual enmity?

Many believe that an ingrained and ineradicable animosity exists between Hindus and Mohammedans.[14]

"For over five hundred years the relation between Hindus and Musalmans was that of foes. After the advent of British rule, both the Musalmans and the Hindus were compelled out of policy to forget that racial hatred, and the acrimony of that bitter enmity is now no more. But the permanent difference in the constitution of these two races does even now exist. I believe the present cordial relation is due to British rule and not to the catholicity of modern Hinduism."

I regard this statement as pure superstition. The two races lived at peace among themselves during the Muslim rule. Let it be remembered that many Hindus embraced Islam before the advent of Muslim rule in India. It is my belief that had there been no Muslim rule, there would still have been Musalmans in India, even as there would have been Christians had there been no British rule. There is nothing to prove that the Hindus and the Musalmans lived at war with one another before the British rule.[15]

Were the Hindus and Musalmans and Sikhs always at war with one another when there was no British rule, when there was no English face seen in India? We have chapter and verse given to us by Hindu historians and by Musalman historians to say that we were living in comparative peace even then. And the Hindus and Musalmans in the villages are not even today quarrelling. In those days, they were not known to quarrel at all. The late Maulana Mahomed Ali often used to tell me, and he was himself a bit of a historian, "If God"—Allah, as he called God—"gives me life, I propose to write the history of Musalman rule in India; and then I will show, through documents that British people have preserved, that Aurangzeb was not so vile as he has been painted by the British historian; that Moghul rule was not so bad as it has been shown to us in British history", and so on. And so have Hindu historians written. This quarrel is not old; this quarrel is coeval with the British advent.[16]

Voice of unity

That was the time when Hindus and Muslims for the time forgot all their differences. The Ali Brothers and I used to go all over the country together like blood-brothers. We

spoke with one voice and delivered the message of Hindu-Muslim unity and Swaraj to the masses. We resolved that thereafter we should address our prayers to God alone instead of the British Government, and so satyagraha was born in India. The Ali Brothers readily fell in with the programme of a national day of fasting and prayer. People fasted on the 6th and 13th of April. They realized that they were all children of the one God, destined to live together and die together in the land of their birth, which was India. They assembled together in their thousands and offered prayers in temples, churches and mosques. The climax was reached when in Delhi a monster gathering consisting of both Hindus and Musalmans was held in the Jumma mosque and was addressed by the late Swami Shraddhanand. It was a glorious day in India's history, the memory of which we shall always treasure.[17]

Peaceful co-existence

My experience of all India tells me that the Hindus and the Muslims know how to live at peace among themselves. I decline, to believe that people have said goodbye to their senses so as to make it impossible to live at peace with each other, as they had done for generations.[18]

The enmity cannot last forever. They are brothers and must remain so in spite of temporary insanity. But perpetual feud is not an impossibility between communities as it is not between two individuals. I hope that this would not happen, for I prophesy that in this case they will bury the two religions in India and will sell their freedom for a mess of pottage.[19]

3. Hindu-Muslim Unity

A consummation

If the Hindu and the Muslim communities could be united in one bond of mutual friendship, and if each could act towards the other even as children of the same mother, it would be a consummation devoutly to be wished. [20]

The union that we want is not a patched-up thing but a union of hearts based upon a definite recognition of the indubitable proposition that Swaraj for India must be an impossible dream without an indissoluble union between the Hindus and the Muslims of India. It must not be a mere truce. It cannot be based upon mutual fear. It must be a partnership between equals, each respecting the religion of the other.[21]

And Hindu-Muslim unity is nothing if it is not a partnership between brave men and women.[22]

Hindu-Muslim unity means not unity only between Hindus and Musalmans but between all those who believe India to be their home, no matter to what faith they belong. [23]

I am fully aware that we have not yet attained that unity to such an extent as to bear any strain. It is a daily growing plant, as yet in delicate infancy, requiring special care and attention.[24]

Both the Hindus and the Musalmans must learn to stand alone and against the whole world, before they become really united. This unity is not to be between weak parties, but between men who are conscious of their strength.[25]

With me the conviction is as strong as ever that, willy-nilly, the Hindus and the Musalmans must be friends one day. No one can say how and when that will happen. The future is entirely in the hands of God. But He has vouchsafed to us the ship of Faith which alone can enable us to cross the ocean of Doubt.[26]

For, I believe with the late Poet Iqbal that the Hindus and the Muslims, who have lived together long under the shadow of the mighty Himalayas and have drunk the waters or the Ganges and the Yamuna, have a unique message for the world. [27]

Disunity a phase

As members of a family, we shall sometimes fight, but we shall always have leaders who will compose our differences and keep us under check. [28]

Taking even the Hindu-Muslim disturbances in that light, I do not despair of the future. Order must come out of the present chaos. We would expedite the advent of order by watching, waiting and praying. If we do so, the evil that has come to the surface will disappear much quicker than if, in our haste and impatience, we would disturb the surface and thus send the dirt to the bottom again instead of allowing it to throw itself out. [29]

This, however, is no cause for the slightest despair. I know that the demon of disunion is at his last gasp. A lie has no bottom. Disunion is a lie. Even if it is sheer self-interest, it will bring about unity. I had hoped for disinterested unity. But I will welcome a unity based even on mutual interest... It will come when it does come, in a way perhaps least expected by us. God is the Master Trickster. He knows how to confound us, frustrate our 'knavish tricks'. He sends death when one least expects it. He sends life when we see no sign of it. Let us admit our abject helplessness, let us own that we are utterly defeated. Out of the dust of our humility will, I feel sure, be built up an impregnable citadel of unity.[30]

Hindus and Muslims are going more and more away from each other. But this does not disturb me. Somehow or other, I feel that the separation is growing only to bring them all closer later on.[31]

The Hindu-Muslim quarrels are, in a way, unknown to us, as a fight for Swaraj. Each party is conscious of its impending coming. Each wants to be found ready and fit for Swaraj when it comes. The Hindus think that they are physically weaker than the Musalmans. The latter consider themselves to be weak in educational and earthly equipment. They are now doing what all weak bodies have done hitherto. This fighting, therefore, however unfortunate it may be, is a sign of growth. It is like the Wars of the Roses. Out of it will rise a mighty nation. A better-than-the-bloody-way was opened out to us in 1920, but we could not assimilate it. But even a bloody way is better than utter helplessness and unmanliness.[32]

We may think we are living, but disunited we are worse than dead. The Hindu thinks that in quarrelling with the Musalman he is benefiting Hinduism; and the Musalman thinks that in fighting a Hindu he is benefiting Islam. But each is ruining his faith. And the poison has spread among the members of the communities themselves. And no

wonder. For one man cannot do right in one department of life whilst he is occupied in doing wrong in any other department. Life is one indivisible whole.[33]

It is a matter of shame to me to confess that we are a house divided against itself. We fly at each other's throats in cowardice and fear. The Hindu distrusts the Musalman through cowardice and fear, and the Musalman distrusts the Hindu through equal cowardice and imaginary fears. Islam throughout history has stood for matchless bravery and peace. It can, therefore, be no matter for pride to the Musalmans that they should fear the Hindus. Similarly, it can be no matter for pride to the Hindus that they should fear the Musalmans, even if they are aided by the Musalmans of the world. Are we so fallen that we should be afraid of our own shadows? [34]

When Britain goes

Immediately this relationship, the unfortunate, artificial, unnatural relationship between Great Britain and India is transformed into a natural relationship, when it becomes, if it does become, a voluntary partnership to be given up, to be dissolved at the will of either party, when it becomes that, you will find that the Hindus, Musalmans, Sikhs, Europeans, Anglo-Indians, Christians, and 'untouchables' will all live together as one man.[36]

4. Equal Servant of All

Partiality to Muslims?

You may say I am partial to the Musalmans. So be it, though the Musalmans do not admit it. But my religion will not suffer by even an iota by reason of my partiality. I shall have to answer my God and my Maker if I give any one less than his due, but I am sure that He will bless me if He knows that I gave some one more than his due. I ask you to understand me.[36]

If my hand or heart has done anything more than was any one's due, you should be proud of it, rather than deplore it. It should be a matter of pride to you as Hindus to think that there was amongst you at least one mad Gandhi who was not only just to the Musalmans, but even went out of his way in giving them more than their due. Hinduism is replete with instances of tolerance, sacrifice and forgiveness. Think of the sacrifice of the Pandavas, think of the forgiveness of Yudhishthira. Should it be a matter for sorrow for you that there is at least one man who has tried to carry out the precept of Hinduism to the letter? [37]

I would not sell my soul to buy India's freedom. And if I want Muslim friendship, it is not for personal gratification but for India’s sake.[38]

I consider myself as good a Muslim as I am a Hindu and for that matter I regard myself an equally good Christian or Parsi. That such a claim will be rejected, and on some occasions was rejected, I know. This, however, does not affect my fundamental position.[39]

The Muslims look upon me as their arch-enemy and the Hindus accuse me of partiality for the Muslims. My advice to the Hindus to be honourable and just to the Muslims in the Union of India, irrespective of what is done in Pakistan, is also looked upon in that light. I do not plead guilty to the charge.[40]

I am believed to be the arch-enemy of Islam and Indian Muslims. If I was at one time acclaimed as their greatest friend and suffered the praise, I must suffer, too, to be described as an enemy. Truth is known only to God. I am confident that in nothing that I am doing, saying or thinking, I am their enemy. They are blood-brothers and will remain so, though they may disown me ever so much. [41]

The true religion

You may be astonished to learn that I continue to receive letters charging me that I have compromised the interests of the Hindus by acting as a friend of the Muslims. How can I convince people by mere words, if the sixty years of my public life have failed to demonstrate "that, by trying to befriend the Muslims, I have only proved myself a true Hindu and have rightly served the Hindus and Hinduism? The essence of true religious teaching is that one should serve and befriend all. I learnt this in my mother's lap. You may refuse to call me a Hindu. I know no defence except to quote a line from Iqbal's famous song: *Majhab nahin sikhata apasmen bair rakhana* (मजहब नहीं सखाता आपसमें बैर रखना), meaning, religion does not teach us to bear ill-will towards one another. It is easy enough to be friendly to one's friends. But to befriend the one who regards himself as your enemy is the quintessence of true religion. The other is mere business.[42]

I believe in the sovereign rule of the law of love which makes no distinctions.[43]

I am told that I am a friend of the Muslims and an enemy of Hindus and Sikhs. It is true that I am a friend of the Muslims, as I am of the Parsis and others. In this respect, I am the same today as I have been since the age of twelve. But those who call me an enemy of Hindus and Sikhs do not know me. I can be enemy of none, much less of Hindus and Sikhs.[44]

I claim to be the equal servant of all.[45]

5. COMMUNALISM

Whilst ... I can make room in my mind for...various schools of thought, for me there is only one way. I have no faith in communalism even as a stage; or perhaps, better still, I have no fitness for work on that stage.[46]

It would be wrong always to think in communal terms. I know that we may not shut our eyes to hard facts. But to attribute everything to the communal spirit is a sign of inferiority complex. It may well perpetuate what is yet a temporary distemper in the national life.[47]

Communalism of the virulent type is a recent growth. The lawlessness is a monster with many faces. It hurts all, in the end, including those who are primarily responsible for it.[48]

One human family

The golden way is to be friends with the world and to regard the whole human family like members of one family. He who distinguishes between one's own family and another's miseducates the members of his own and opens the way for discord and irreligion.[49]

[We have] the example of England, Russia and other countries where every family had sent as many able-bodied men and women as possible for the defence of their country. This is how unity of heart is actually achieved in the world, and I hope that we, in our country, will be able to rise above small, selfish considerations and create that unity without which life itself will not be worth living.[50]

A man whose spirit of sacrifice does not go beyond his own community becomes selfish himself and also makes his community selfish. In my opinion, the logical conclusion of self-sacrifice is that the individual sacrifices himself for the community, the community sacrifices itself for the district, the district for the province, the province for the nation and the nation for the world. A drop torn from the ocean perishes without doing any good. If it remains a part of the ocean, it shares the glory of carrying on its bosom a fleet of mighty ships.[51]

II. Achievement of Communal Unity

1. Common Interests

What... 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. [1]

The points of contact referred to by me is a phrase intended to cover all social, religious and political relations alike as between individuals and masses. Thus, for instance, instead of accentuating the differences in religion, I should set about discovering the good points common to both. I would bridge the social distance wherever I can do so consistently with my religious belief. I would go out of my way to seek common ground on the political field. [2]

Pax Britannica

'What is common to us except *Pax Britannica?*' is the question that has been often put to me. The last time it was put to me was by the editor of the *Daily Gazette* of Karachi. I was sorry I had not the time to answer the question in full detail, though my answer was comprehensive enough. I suggested that birth, manners, distress and bondage were more common than *Pax Britannica*. But what is this *Pax Britannica?* Does it not mean that it more often keeps us from fighting against one another than protects us from foreign invasions? And do we not see that even that condition is more often observed in the breach than in the performance? *Pax Britannica* is unable to prevent Hindu-Muslim feuds. What it successfully does is to ensure the protection, by means of extraordinary military and other disposition, of the Europeans who are exploiting the country. *Pax Britannica,* therefore, in so far as it is common to the whole of the country, is not a blessing calculated to advance the nation either economically or politically. It has emasculated the people and reduced them to a state of helplessness. My suggestion, therefore, is that common birth, common distress, common manners and common bondage are, each in itself and all collectively, a real cohesive force, not *Pax Britannica.* Consciousness of distress and consciousness of bondage are unifying the people in a manner in which they have never before been unified. And

when these become a thing of the past as they are bound to, common birth will prove a force that will make the nation irresistible. [3]

Order out of chaos

Apparently yes, perhaps [the Hindu-Muslim situation is getting worse]. But I have every hope that ultimately we are bound to come together. The interests that are common to us and that bind us together are so tremendous that the leaders of both the sections must come to terms. Force of circumstances will compel them to do so. That we appear to be farthest apart from one another today is a natural outcome of the awakening that has taken place. It has emphasized the points of difference and accentuated prejudices, mutual suspicions and jealousies. Fresh demands that are coming into being every day with the new leadership have further made confusion worse confounded. But I hope that out of chaos order is going to emerge.[4]

2. ARBITRATION: KEY TO SOLUTION

The master-key to the solution is the replacement of the rule of the sword by that of arbitration. Honest public opinion should make it impossible for aggrieved parties to take the law into their own hands, and every case must be referred to private arbitration or to law courts if the parties do not believe in non-co-operation.

Ignorant fear of cowardly non-violence, falsely so-called, taking the place of violence should be dispelled.

Growing mutual distrust among the leaders must, if they believe in unity, give place to trust.

Hindus must cease to fear the Musalman bully, and the Musalmans should consider it beneath their dignity to bully their Hindu brothers.

Hindus must not imagine that they can force Musalmans to give up cow-sacrifice. They must trust, by befriending Musalmans, that the latter will of their own accord give up cow-sacrifice out of regard for their Hindu neighbours.

Nor must Musalmans imagine they can force Hindus to stop music or *arati* before mosques. They must befriend the Hindus and trust them to pay heed to reasonable Musalman sentiment.

The Hindus must leave to the Musalmans and the other minorities the question of representation on elected bodies, and gracefully and whole-heartedly give effect to the findings of such referee.

Employment under national government must be according to merit to be decided by a board of examiners representing different communities.

Shuddhi or Tabligh as such must not be disturbed, but either must be conducted honestly and by men of proved character. It should avoid all attack on other religions. There should be no secret propaganda and no offer of material rewards.

Public opinion should be so cultivated as to put under ban all the scurrilous writings principally in a section of the... Press.

Nothing is possible without the Hindus shedding their timidity. Theirs is the largest stake and they must be prepared to sacrifice the most.[5]

There are nasty Hindus, as there are nasty Musalmans, who would pick a quarrel for nothing. For these we must provide panchayats of unimpeachable probity and

imperturbability, whose decisions must be binding on both parties. Public opinion should be cultivated in favour of the decisions of such panchayats, so that no one would question them.[6]

The conception of Hindu-Muslim unity does not presuppose a total absence, for all time, of wrong by any of the parties. On the contrary, it assumes, that our loyalty to the unity will survive shocks such as the forcible conversions by Moplahs, that in every such case we shall not blame the whole body of the followers but seek relief against individuals by way of arbitration and not by way of reprisals.[7]

It is for the thoughtful few to make quarrels impossible by making arbitration popular and obligatory.[8]

But I would not hesitate to put the pen even in the hands of a Musalman who may be known for his prejudices and fanaticism. For, as a Hindu, I should know that I have nothing to lose even if the referee gave the Musalmans a majority of seats in every province. There is no principle at stake in giving or having seats in elective bodies. Moreover, experience has taught me to know that undivided responsibility immediately puts a man on his mettle and his pride, and God-fearingness sobers him.[9]

It will take some time before the average Hindu ceases to be a coward and the average Musalman ceases to be a bully. In the meantime, the thinking sections of both the communities should try their best, on all occasions of trouble, to refer matters to arbitration. Their position is delicate, but they should expend all their energy in keeping the peace.[10]

Let both the communities... hold mutual consultations and settle their differences amicably.[11]

The Hindus and the Musalmans, if they desire Swaraj, have perforce to settle their differences amicably. [12]

Differences we shall always have. But we must learn to settle them all, whether religious or other, by arbitration. Before the rulers we must be able to present a united front and demonstrate to the world our capacity for regulating our own manners, if we would have Swaraj.

The alternative

If, however, we have no leaders whom we can elect as arbitrators, who would give wise and impartial decisions, or, if we are too unruly and barbarous to wait for and abide by decisions of arbitration of our choice, we must fight till we are exhausted and come to our senses. The Government will no doubt always intervene, whether we will or no, either to keep the public peace or to preserve its own safety. But it will weaken us the least if the rival factions will courageously and straightforwardly refrain from courting the protection or assistance of the Government. Why should a murderer in such warfare be defended? Let him seek the gallows. Let breakers of places of worship come forth boldly and say, 'We have done this for the sake of religion, punish us if you like!' Let those who kill innocent passers—by deliver themselves to the police and say, 'We have done it all for God's sake!' All this may read heartless. But I have merely endeavoured to suggest a way that is straighter and less weak than the one we have hitherto adopted.

And if we cannot, after the manner of civilized men, resort to voluntary arbitration or, after the manner of brave, barbarous races, fight out differences without seeking the intervention of British justice or bayonets, all we may expect to get in the shape of reforms is an increased agent's share in the bureaucratic Government; in other words, an increasing share in the exploitation of the dumb millions. Let us take care that any agreement we may come to does not reduce us to that unenviable condition.[13]

Judicial tribunal

If the Government at all meant business, it would unhesitatingly accept my suggestion, viz., to appoint a judicial tribunal to decide the communal question at issue. If this is done, there is every possibility of an agreed solution being reached without the intervention of the judicial tribunal.[14]

I have suggested a judicial tribunal. There are some committals on the side of the Government in the Government of India and Provincial Government dispatches, though all Government solutions are tinged by political considerations. As for us, each party, though talking of justice, fights shy of arbitration, which shows that there is a good deal of expediency and it is a question of degree who is wrong and who is right. The judicial tribunal can certainly be trusted to adjudicate between the various claims.

They [the personnel] may be non-Hindu and non-Muslim judges of Indian High Courts or judges from the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council.

There can be no question of accepting the decision of a Court. I may confess that there is a trick at the back of the suggestion. If the Government will play the game and adopt my suggestion, the whole atmosphere will change, and before the Judicial Committee comes into being, the communities will come out with a solution. For, there is sufficient material in the advances already made to satisfy the politically-minded, and each one knows the flaws in his own claim.[15]

But the Congress has also suggested that there should be an impartial arbitration. Through arbitration, all over the world, people have adjusted their differences, and the Congress is always open to accept any decision of an arbitration court. I have myself ventured to suggest that there might be appointed by the Government a judicial tribunal which would examine this case and give its decision. But, if none of these things are acceptable to any of us, and if this is the *sine qua non* of any constitution—building, then, I say, it will be much better for us that we should remain without the so-called responsible government than that we should accept this claim.[16]

A civilized method

I repeat that, if Muslims want anything—no matter what it is—no power on earth can prevent them from having it. For, the condition of refusal will be to fight. Supposing Muslims ask for something which non-Muslims do not want to give or could not give, it means a fight. This applies to both the communities. If the Hindus want a thing and if they are all united in the demand, no non-Hindus can resist them, unless they want to fight. But my hope is that, some day or other, all parties will come to their senses and not insist on their demands being accepted, and consent to go to arbitration. It is an age long method and a civilized method, and I hope it will be accepted.[17]

You ought to remember Quaid-i-Azam Jinnah's advice and act up to it; for it is an advice confined not to any particular community but is of universal significance. The qualities which he has advised people to develop are not combativeness but a sense of justice and truth; and this implies that, whenever justice is at stake, people ought to appeal to reason instead of taking recourse to barbarous methods of settling disputes, whether private or public.[18]

If there were honest differences among the people of India, should it then mean that the forty crores should descend to the level of beasts, slaughter men, women and children, innocent and guilty alike, without the least compunction? Could they not agree to settle their differences decently and in a comradely spirit? If they failed, only slavery of an unredeemable type could await them at the end of the road.[19]

3. MUTUAL TOLERANCE

Before this unity becomes a reality, both the communities will have to give up a good deal and will have to make radical changes in ideas held heretofore.[20]

As with Hindus, so with Musalmans. The leaders among the latter should meet together and consider their duty towards Hindus. When both are inspired by a spirit of sacrifice, when both try to do their duty towards one another instead of pressing their rights, then and then only would the long-standing differences between the two communities cease. Each must respect the other's religion, must refrain from even secretly thinking ill of the other. We must politely dissuade members of both the communities from indulging in bad language against one another. Only a serious endeavour in this direction can remove the estrangement between us.[21]

...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 Mohammedan 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 Mohammedans have arisen from each wanting to *force* the other to his view.[22]

The cow is as dear as life to a Hindu. The Musalman should, therefore, voluntarily accommodate his Hindu brother. Silence at his prayer is a precious thing for a Musalman. Every Hindu should voluntarily respect his Musalman brother's sentiment. This, however, is a counsel of perfection.

Charity towards opponents

The unity we desire will last only if we cultivate a yielding and a charitable disposition towards one another.[23]

Evolution of democracy is not possible if we are not prepared to hear the other side. We shut the doors of reason when we refuse to listen to our opponents or, having listened, make fun of them. If intolerance becomes a habit, we run the risk of missing the truth. Whilst with the limits that nature has put upon our understanding, we must act fearlessly according to the light vouchsafed to us, we must always keep an open

mind and be ever ready to find that what we believed to be truth was, after all, untruth. This openness of mind strengthens the truth in us and removes the dross from it, if there is any.[24]

Those who do not like things that do not coincide with their notions need not patronize them but it is ungentlemanly to behave like less than men when things are not to their taste.[25]

Let me not be told, as I have often been, that it is all due to the misdeeds of the Muslim League. Assuming the truth of the remark, is our toleration made of such poor stuff that it must yield under some uncommon strain? Decency and toleration to be of value must be capable of standing the severest strain. If they cannot, it will be a sad day for India. Let us not make it easy for our critics (we have many) to say that we did not deserve liberty. Many arguments come to my mind in answer to such critics. But they give poor comfort. It hurts my pride as a lover of India, of the teeming millions, that our tolerant and combined culture should not be self-evident.[26]

Nationalism

When a Hindu or a Musalman does evil, it is evil done by an Indian to an Indian, and each one of us must personally share the blame and try to remove the evil. There is no other meaning to unity than this. Nationalism is nothing if it is not at least this. Nationalism is greater than sectarianism. And in that sense, we are Indians first and Hindus, Musalmans, Parsis and Christians after.

.. We should deplore the fact that one Indian does not see the obvious wrong that our other brethren have done. There is no unity, if we must continuously look at things communally.

Critics may say, 'All this is sheer nonsense, because it is so inconsistent with facts. It is visionary.' But my contention is that we shall never achieve solidarity unless new facts are *made* to suit the principle, instead of performing the impossible feat of changing the principle to suit existing facts.[27]

Welcome criticism

[We] should have our own house in perfect order, should always welcome criticism even when it is bitter and profit by it by becoming more exact (if possible) and correcting our errors whenever detected. We should never make the mistake of

thinking that we can never make any mistakes. The bitterest critic is bitter because he has some grudge, fancied or real, against us. We shall set him right if we are patient with him and, whenever the occasion arises, show him his error or correct our own when we are to be found in error. So doing, we shall never go wrong. Undoubtedly, the balance is to be preserved. Discrimination is ever necessary. Deliberately mischievous statements have to be ignored. I believe that, by constant practice, I have somewhat learnt the art of discrimination.

In the present disturbed atmosphere, when charges are hurled against one another, it would be folly to be in a fool's paradise and feel that we can do no wrong. That blissful state it is no longer possible for us to claim. It will be creditable if by strenuous effort we succeed in isolating the mischief and then eradicating it. We shall do so only if we keep our eyes and ears open for seeing and hearing our own shortcomings. Nature has so made us that we do not see our backs, it is reserved for others to see them. Hence, it is wise to profit by what they see. [28]

4 THE UNITARY METHOD

Large-heartedness

I know that Hindus are in a numerical majority, and that they are believed to be more advanced in knowledge and education. Accordingly, they should be glad to give way so much the more to their Mohammedan brethren. As a man of truth, I honestly believe that Hindus should yield up to the Mohammedans what the latter desire, and that they should rejoice in so doing. We can expect unity only if such mutual large-heartedness is displayed. When the Hindus and Mohammedans act towards each other as blood brothers, then only we can hope for the dawn of India.[29]

Love is the basis of our friendship as it is of religion. I seek to gain Musalman friendship by right of love. And if love persists even on the part of one community, unity will become a settled fact in our national life.[30]

It is as simple as it is pure. A contract or pact is between two parties. There is also consideration passing from one to the other. Such was the Lucknow Pact between the Congress and the Muslim League. The same thing could have been accomplished by the unitary method only. Then there would have been no compromise dictated by fear and distrust. The Congress could have done, according to its notion, absolute justice, i.e., yielded the maximum consistent with the welfare of the whole nation without the expectation of any consideration from the League.

In a well-regulated family the relations are governed by the unitary method. Thus, a father gives to his children not as a result of a pact. He gives out of love, a sense of justice without expecting any return therefore. Not that there is none. But everything is natural, nothing is forced. Nothing is done out of fear or distrust. What is true of a well-regulated family is equally true of a well-regulated society, which is but an extended family.[31]

Properly applied the method never fails. It disarms criticism and opposition. It presupposes a clean conscience and clean action.[32]

5 PACTS

What is a non-essential to a Hindu may be an essential to a Musalman. And in all non-essential matters a Hindu must yield for the asking. It is criminal folly to quarrel over trivialities.[33]

No resort to force

This [that we do not break one another's heads in respect of religious matters] is the only pact that is immediately necessary between the parties, and I am sure that everything else will follow.

Unless this elementary condition is recognized, we have no atmosphere for considering the ways and means of removing misunderstanding and arriving at an honourable lasting settlement.[34]

For political matters a pact or an understanding is certainly necessary. But, in my opinion, the restoration of friendly feeling is a condition precedent to any effectual pact. Are both parties sincerely willing to accept the proposition that no dispute, religious or otherwise, between the communities should ever be decided by an appeal to force, i.e., violence? [35]

I wish that the so-called alliance between the Musalmans and the Hindus will become a permanent reality based on a frank recognition of enlightened self-interest. It will then transmute the iron of sordid imperialism into the gold of humanitarianism. The Hindu-Muslim alliance is intended to be a blessing to India and to the world, for it is conceived in a spirit of peace and goodwill to all. It has adopted non-violence and truth as the indispensable means for achieving Swaraj in India. Its symbol—the Charkha, the spinning wheel—is a symbol of simplicity, self-reliance, self-control, voluntary co-operation among millions if such an alliance proves a menace to the world, then there is no God, or God is asleep.[36]

...I feel that any agreement between the component parts of the nation must be voluntary and must remain so for all time. It must not, if it is conceived in terms of Swaraj, depend for its final ratification or enforcement upon a legal enactment. Ratification by our respective organizations must be held to be final and binding. Enforcement must depend upon the honour of the leaders of the respective parties

and, ultimately, in the absence of reliance on non-violence, on the arbitrament of civil war fought decently or indecently, as the case may be.[37]

It cannot be that any party seeks to force a pact by violent means. Even if such a pact were a possibility, it would not be worth the paper on which it might be written. For, behind such a pact, there will be no common understanding. What is more, even after a pact is arrived at, it would be too much to expect that there would never be any communal riots.[38]

I cannot think in terms of narrow Hinduism or narrow Islam. I am wholly uninterested in a patchwork solution. [39]

Union of hearts

...Communal pacts, whilst they are good if they can be had, are valueless unless they are backed by the union of hearts. Without it, there can be no peace in the land. Even Pakistan can bring no peace, if there is no union of hearts. This union can come only by mutual service and co-operative work.[40]

6 INTERDINING AND INTERMARRIAGE

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 interdining or intermarrying is necessary for national growth is a superstition borrowed from the West.

Interdining

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 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

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 should 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.

Not essential

But interdining and intermarriage have never been a bar to disunion, quarrels and worse. The Pandavas and the Kauravas flew at one another's throats without compunction, although they interdined and intermarried. The bitterness between the English and the Germans has not yet died out.

The fact is that intermarriage and interdining 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 the Hindus and Mohammedans cannot be one unless they interdine or intermarry, we would be creating an artificial barrier between us which it might be almost impossible to remove. And it would seriously interfere with the growing unity between the Hindus and the Mohammedans if, for example, Mohammedan youths consider it lawful to court Hindu girls. The Hindu parents will not, even if they 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.

Problem of religion

I hold it to be utterly impossible for the Hindus and Mohammedans to intermarry and yet retain intact each other's religion.[41]

If that [intermarriage and interdining] is the radical transformation desired and if it is a condition precedent to the attainment of Swaraj, I very much fear that we would have to wait at least for a century. It is tantamount to asking the Hindus to give up their religion. I do not say that it is wrong to do so, but I do suggest that it is reformation outside practical politics. And when that transformation comes, if it is ever to come, it will not be Hindu-Muslim unity.[42]

So long as each is free to observe his or her religion, I can see no moral objection to intermarriage. But I do not believe that these unions can bring peace. They may follow peace. I can see nothing but disaster following any attempt to advocate Hindu-Muslim unions so long as the relations between the two remain strained. That such unions may be happy in exceptional circumstances can be no reason for their general advocacy. Interdining between Hindus and Muslims does take place even now on a

large scale. But that, again, has not resulted in promoting peace. It is my settled conviction that intermarriage and interdining have no bearing on communal unity. The causes of discord are economic and political, and it is these that have to be removed. There is intermarriage and interdining in Europe, but the Europeans have fought amongst themselves as we Hindus and Musalmans have never fought in all history. Our masses have stood aside.[43]

Inter-religious marriage

I am certainly in favour of inter-caste marriages. The question does not arise when all become casteless. When this happy event takes place, monopoly of occupations will go.

Though I admit that I have not always held the view, I had come to the conclusion long ago that an inter-religious marriage is a welcome event whenever it takes place. My stipulation is that such connection is not a product of lust. Marriage in my estimation is a sacred institution. Hence there must be mutual friendship, either party having equal respect for the religion of the other. There is no question in this of conversion. Hence the marriage ceremony will be performed by the priests belonging to either faith. This happy event can take place when the communities shed mutual enmity and have regard for the religions of the world.

I have no instances in mind where the parties have clung to their respective faiths up to death because these friends whom I know have not yet died. I have, however, under my observation men and women professing different religions and each clinging to his or her own faith without abatement.

But I will go so far as to say that you need not wait for the discovery of past instances. You should create new ones, so that timid ones may shed their timidity.

As to civil marriages, I do not believe in them, but I welcome the institution of civil marriage as a much-needed reform for the sake of reform. [44]

7 ONENESS OF COSTUME

> Now, more than ever before, I am convinced of the necessity that we should insist on every Indian wearing the same nationalist dress. As you may remember, I had broached the subject before, but at the time you had not approved of the idea. Why is it that none of the stabbings have been of people wearing a shirt and pants? This should be conclusive proof that the dress caused the difference in religion to be accentuated. Your reply to this through the *Harijan* for others like me, who think that communal riots would disappear within a short time on our wearing the same kind of dress, would be most appreciated.

I publish this as from a well-versed, well-meaning friend. These three qualities combined do not necessarily make for clearness of thought. What is wanted is not oneness of costume but oneness of hearts. We have only to look at Europe to demonstrate the emptiness of the idea that oneness of costume will enable us to get out of the mess we are in. Ill will is like an ill wind. It must go and be replaced by the fresh and bracing wind of good will. [45]

8 THE VOW OF UNITY

In the huge mass meeting of Hindus and Mohammedans held in the Sonapur Masjid compound on Sunday the 6th April, the day of humiliation and prayer, a vow of Hindu Muslim Unity was proposed to be taken as in the case of Swadeshi proposed at the Chowpaty meeting, and I had to utter a note of warning on both the occasions. At times, in a fit of joyous passion, we are spurred on to certain courses of action for which we have afterwards to repent. A vow is a purely religious act which cannot be taken in a fit of passion. It can be taken only with a mind purified and composed, and with God as witness. Most of what I have said whilst writing about the Swadeshi vow applies here. Acts which are not possible by ordinary self-denial become possible with the aid of vows which require extra ordinary self-denial. Hence vows can uplift us.

...But the object of taking the vow is speedily to bring about by the power of self denial a state of things which can only be expected to come in the fulness of time. How is this possible? Meetings should be called of Hindus—I mean the orthodox Hindus—where this question should be seriously considered...

Our vow would have value only when masses of Hindus and Musalmans join in the endeavour. I think I have now made sufficiently clear the seriousness and magnitude of this vow. I hope that on this auspicious occasion, and surely the occasion must be auspicious when a wave of Satyagraha is sweeping over the whole country, we could all take this vow of unity. For this, it is further necessary that leading Hindus and Mohammedans should meet together and seriously consider the question and then pass a unanimous resolution at a public meeting. This consummation will certainly be reached if our present efforts are vigorously continued. I think the vow may be taken individually even now and I expect that numerous people will do so every day. My warnings have reference to the taking of the vow publicly by masses of men. If it is taken by the masses, it should, in my humble opinion, be as follows:

With God as witness, we Hindus and Mohammedans declare that we shall behave towards one another as children of the same parents, that we shall have no differences, that the sorrows of each shall be the sorrows of the other and that each shall help the other in removing them. We shall respect each other's religion and religious feelings and shall not stand in the way of our respective religious practices. We shall always refrain from violence to each other in the name of religion.[46]

9 THE MEANING OF UNITY

Need for heart-unity

For me, the only question for immediate solution before the country is the Hindu-Musalman question. I agree with Mr. Jinnah that Hindu-Muslim unity means Swaraj. I see no way of achieving anything in this afflicted country without a lasting heart-unity between the Hindus and Musalmans of India. I believe in the immediate possibility of achieving it, because it is so natural, so necessary for both, and because I believe in human nature. The Musalman may have much to answer for. I have come in closest touch with even what may be considered a 'bad lot'. I cannot recall a single occasion when I had to regret it. The Musalmans are brave; they are generous and trusting the moment their suspicion is disarmed.[47]

No reservations

Hindu-Muslim unity will be a very cheap and tawdry affair, if it has to depend upon mere reciprocation. Is a husband's loyalty dependent upon the wife's, or may a wife be faithless because the husband is a rake? Marriage will be a sordid thing when the partners treat their conduct as a matter of exchange, pure and simple. Unity is like marriage. It is more necessary for a husband to draw closer to his wife when she is about to fall. Then is the time for a double outpouring of love. Even so, it is more necessary for a Hindu to love the Moplah and the Musalman more, when the latter is likely to injure him or has already injured him. Unity to be real must stand the severest strain without breaking. It must be an indissoluble tie.

And I hold that what I have put before the country in the foregoing lines is a simple, selfish idea. Does a Hindu love his religion and country more than himself? *If* he does, it follows that he must not quarrel with an ignorant Musalman, who knows neither country nor religion. The process is like that of the world-famed woman who professed to give up her child to her rival instead of dividing it with the latter—a performance that would have suited the latter admirably.[48]

We must trust each other always, but in the last resort we must trust ourselves and our God. [49]

Pre-requisite of freedom

We all now realize, as we have never before realized, that without that unity we cannot attain our freedom, and I make bold to say that without that unity the Musalmans of India cannot render the Khilafat all the aid they wish. Divided, we must ever remain slaves. That unity, therefore, cannot be a mere policy to be discarded when it does not suit us. We can discard it only when we are tired of Swaraj. Hindu-Muslim unity must be our creed to last for all time and under all circumstances.

Nor must that unity be a menace to the minorities—the Parsis, Christians, Jews or the powerful Sikhs. If we seek to crush any of them, we shall some day want to fight each other.[50]

Unity abroad

While we are all engaged in trying to quench the fire of communal strife in our own country, we must not forget our countrymen abroad. I refer to the Indian case which is being fought with such unity and gallantry by the Indian delegation before the U.N.O. What has pleased me immensely is Ispahani Saheb's and Zaffarulla Saheb's speeches reported in the Press today. They told their audiences in plain language how Indians are being discriminated against in South Africa and treated as outcastes. The Hindus and the Muslims in India have no different opinions on the question of the Indians overseas, which goes to prove that the two-nation theory is incorrect. The lesson I have learnt from this, and what I want you also to learn from what I said, is that love is the highest thing. If the Hindus and the Muslims can speak with one voice abroad, they can certainly do so here if they have love in their hearts. To err is human. It is also human to mend one's ways. To forgive and forget is always possible. If we can do that today and speak with one voice here as they did abroad, we will surely win through.[51]

10 WORK FOR UNITY

Leaders' responsibility

I am convinced that the masses do not want to fight, if the leaders do not. If, therefore, the leaders agree that mutual rows should be, as in all advanced countries, erased out of our public life as being barbarous and irreligious, I have no doubt that the masses will quickly follow them.[52]

Both [Hindus and Muslims] will act simultaneously [i.e., do the right thing without expecting reciprocation], as soon as the workers become true to themselves. Unfortunately, they are not. They are mostly ruled by passion and prejudice: Each tries to hide the shortcomings of his co-religionists and so the circle of distrust and suspicion ever widens.[53]

If we, the so-called leaders, have no control over our fighting elements, our agreement must be held to be unreal and useless. Before we think of real Swaraj, we must gain control over the masses. We must learn to behave ourselves.[54]

The test

Your cause, all the best opinion of the world has borne witness, is just. Are you just? Are you sincere? The test is simple. A sincere and true man is ready to sacrifice himself for a cause. Are you ready to sacrifice yourself for a cause? Are you ready to sacrifice your ease; comfort, commerce and even your life? Then, you are Satyagrahis and you will win.[55]

Workers of faith

For this consummation [that unity will be considered by the classes and masses 'as necessary as the breath of our nostrils'] we must, it seems to me, rely more upon quality than quantity. Given a sufficient number of Hindus and Musalmans with almost a fanatical faith in everlasting friendship between the Hindus and Musalmans of India, we shall not be long before the unity permeates the masses. A few of us must first clearly understand that we can make no headway without accepting non-violence in thought, word and deed for the full realization of our political ambition. I would, therefore, beseech you ... to see that our ranks contain no workers who do not fully realize the essential truth I have endeavoured to place before you. A living faith cannot be manufactured by the rule of majority.[56]

Only solution

But how is the cure [of Hindu-Muslim tension] to be effected? Who will convince the Hindu maniac that the best way to save the cow is for him to do his duty by her and not goad his Musalman brother? Who will convince the Musalman fanatic that it is not religion but irreligion to break the head of his Hindu brother when he plays music in front of his mosque? Or, again, who will make the Hindu see that he will lose nothing by the minorities being even over-represented on the elective public secular bodies? These are fair questions and show the difficulty of working out the solution.

But if the solution is the only true solution, all difficulties must be overcome. In reality, the difficulty is only apparent. If there are even a few Hindus and a few Musalmans who have a living faith in the solution, the rest is easy. Indeed, even if there are a few Hindus only, or a few Musalmans only, with that faith, the solution would be still easy. They have but to work away single-heartedly and the others will follow them.[57]

Freedom of action

As to the distraction caused by opposing advice by different leaders, the workers will make their selection of their leaders and follow them. But that is also only advisable when the advice of the leader appeals to their heart and head. In the case of conflict between the two, they must boldly follow their own heart and head. Such is the dictate of all religions. If it is so in religious matters, it is more so in mundane matters…[58]

The answer [as to what should a Hindu worker do when he is being deliberately misrepresented by interested parties ...] in terms of Ahimsa, generally, would be that acts should be allowed to speak for themselves. Whilst this is good as a general proposition, there are occasions when to speak and explain is a duty and not to speak will amount to a falsehood. Therefore, wisdom dictates that there are some occasions when speech must accompany action. Of course, there is an occasion when mere thought will take the place of speech and action. Such is the attribute of the Almighty and might be almost possible for one in a billion, but I know no such instance.[59]

The fact is that a leader is made by his followers. He reflects in a clearer manner the aspirations lying dormant among the masses. This is true not only of India but of all the world.

What I would, therefore, suggest to both the Hindus and the Musalmans is that they should not look to the Muslim League or the Congress or the Hindu Mahasabha for the solution of their daily problems of life. For that they should look towards themselves; and if they do that, then, their desire for neighbourly peace will be reflected by the leaders. The political institutions may be left to deal with specifically political questions, but how much do they know about the daily needs of individuals? If a neighbour is ailing, will they run to the Congress or the League to ask them what should be done? That is an unthinkable proposition.[60]

Let all political workers, be they Hindu, Muslim or any other, ponder well over what is happening before their eyes. Let it not be said by the future generations that we were trying to learn how to lose liberty before it was even gained.[61]

Women's role

In this mission of mine, I can count on the hearty and active co-operation of my sisters, who beat all previous records of suffering and sacrifice during the last heroic campaign. To them I say: If you are convinced that the Hindu-Muslim unity is a *sine qua non,* I ask you to use against your own countrymen the same weapon of Satyagraha that you used so effectively against the Government. Tell your men that you will non-co-operate with them, you will not cook for them, you will starve yourselves and them so long as they do not wash their hands of these dirty communal squabbles. Assure me of your co-operation, and you will add tremendously to my strength and to my power of pleading.[62]

Students and teachers

What can students do to bring about Hindu-Muslim unity? ... The way is simple. Even if all the Hindus turn rowdies and abuse you, you may not cease to regard them as your blood-brothers and *vice versa*. Is it impossible? No, rather the contrary. And what is possible for the individual is possible for the mass. [63]

I would ask all the school masters, now that they are no longer under the observation of the foreign masters, that they should recognize their true function, even at the risk

of their lives, to give the right bent to the minds of those whom it is their proud, privilege to mould.[64]

III. Religious Aspects of the Communal Problem

1 RELIGION AND COMMUNAL UNITY

There is nothing in either religion [Hinduism or Islam] to keep the two [Hindus and Muslims] apart.[1]

Fundamental unity

I write in the name and for the sake of the heart-unity which I want to see established among the people of this land professing different faiths. In nature, there is a fundamental unity running through all the diversity we see about us. Religions are no exception to the natural law. They are given to mankind so as to accelerate the process of realization of fundamental unity.[2]

As I was studying Christianity; Hinduism and other great faiths of the world, I saw that there was a fundamental unity moving amidst the endless variety that we see in all religions, viz., truth and innocence.[3]

If religion is allowed to be as it is, a personal concern and a matter between God and man, there are many dominating common factors between the two which will compel common life and common action. Religions are not for separating men from one another, they are meant to bind them. It is a misfortune that, today, they are so distorted that they have become a potent cause of strife and mutual slaughter.[4]

The master key

Some principal religions are still extant. After a study of those religions to the extent it was possible for me, I have come to the conclusion that, if it is proper and necessary to discover an underlying unity among all religions, a master key is needed. That master key is that of truth and non-violence.

When I unlock the chest of a religion with this master key, I do not find it difficult to discover its likeness with other religions. When you look at these religions as so many leaves of a tree they seem so different, but at the trunk they are one. Unless and until we realize this fundamental unity, wars in the name of religion will not cease. These are not confined to Hindus and Musalmans alone. The pages of world history are soiled with the bloody accounts of these religious wars.

Religion can be defended only by the purity of its adherents and their good deeds, never by their quarrels with those of other faiths.[5]

No unnatural divisions

Religion is a personal matter which should have no place in politics. It is in the unnatural condition of foreign domination that we have unnatural divisions according to religion. Foreign domination going, we shall laugh at our folly in having clung to false ideals and slogans.[6]

Should differences in religion, I ask, be sufficient to overshadow our common humanity? I pray that fundamental commonsense should reassert itself, so that all contrary forces may be overpowered in the end.[7]

'If there is only one God, should there not be only one religion?' This is a strange question. Just as a tree has a million leaves, similarly, though God is one, there are as many religions as there are men and women, though they are rooted in one God. We do not see this plain truth because we are followers of different prophets and claim as many religions as there are prophets. As a matter of fact, whilst I believe myself to be a Hindu, I know that I do not worship God in the same manner as any one or all of them.[8]

Equality of religions

I remind you ... of the folly of looking upon one religion as better than another.[9]

...For God-fearing men, all religious are good and equal, only the followers of different religions quarrel with one another and thereby deny their respective religions. [10]

One of them gave a striking verse from the Grantha Saheb wherein Guru Nanak says that God may be called by the name of Allah, Rahim and so on. The name does not matter if He is enshrined in our hearts. Guru Nanak's efforts, like those of Kabir, had been directed towards synthesizing the various religions.[11]

Some go on a pilgrimage and bathe in the sacred river, others go to Mecca; some worship Him in temples, others in mosques, some just bow their heads in reverence; some read the Vedas, others the Koran; some dress in blue, others in white; some call themselves Hindus, others Muslims. Nanak says that he who truly follows God's law knows His secret. This teaching is universal in Hinduism.[12]

Regard for other religions

The key to the solution of the tangle lies in everyone following the best in his own religion and entertaining equal regard for the other religions and their followers.[13]

Religious toleration

I got an early grounding in toleration for all branches of Hinduism and sister religions. For, my father and mother would visit the *Haveli* as also Shiva's and Rama's temples, and would take or send us youngsters there. Jain monks also would pay frequent visits to my father, and would even go out of their way to accept food from us ….non-Jains. They would have talks with my father on subjects religious and mundane.

He had, besides, Musalman and Parsi friends, who would talk to him about their own faiths, and he would listen to them always with respect, and often with interest. Being his nurse, I often had a chance to be present at these talks. These many things combined to inculcate in me a toleration for all faiths.[14]

Hindu Muslim unity requires the Musalmans to tolerate, not as a virtue of necessity, not as a policy, but as a part of their religion, the religion of others so long as they, the latter, believe it to be true. Even so is it expected of the Hindus to extend the same tolerance as a matter of faith and religion to the religions of others, no matter how repugnant they may appear to their (the Hindus') sense of religion. [15]

The need of the moment is not one religion, but mutual respect and tolerance of the devotees of the different religions. We want to reach not the dead level, but unity in diversity. Any attempt to root out traditions, effects of heredity, climate and other surroundings is not only bound to fail, but is a sacrilege. The soul of religions is one, but it is encased in a multitude of forms. The latter will persist to the end of time. Wise men will ignore the outward crust and see the same soul living under a variety of crusts.[16]

The struggle must ... be transferred to a change of heart among the Hindus and the Musalmans. Before they dare think of freedom, they must be brave enough to love one another, to tolerate one another's religion, even prejudices and superstitions, and to trust one another. This requires faith in oneself. And faith in oneself is faith in God. If we have that faith, we shall cease to fear one another.[17]

I should love all the men, not only in India but in the world, belonging to the different faiths, to become better people by contact with one another, and, if that happens, the world will be a much better place to live in than it is today.

I plead for the broadest toleration and I am working to that end. I ask people to examine every religion from the point of view of the religionists themselves. I do not expect the India of my dream to develop one religion, i.e., the wholly Hindu, or wholly Christian, or wholly Musalman, but I want it to be wholly tolerant, with its religions working side by side with one another.[18]

The virtue of toleration is never strained, especially in matters of religion. Differences of religious opinion will persist to the end of time; toleration is the only thing that will enable persons belonging to different religions to live as good neighbours and friends.[19]

Propaganda of vilification

No propaganda can be allowed which reviles other religions. For, that would be negation of toleration. The best way of dealing with such propaganda is to publicly condemn it.[20]

Abuse and caricature of the Prophet cannot wean a Musalman from his faith, and it can do no good to a Hindu who may have doubts about his own belief. As a contribution, therefore, to the religious propaganda work, it has no value whatsoever. The harm it can do is obvious.

Another friend sends me a sheet called *Shaitan* printed at Public Printing Press, Lahore. It contains untranslatable abuse of Musalmans. I am aware of similar abuse by Musalman sheets. But that is no answer to or justification for the Hindu or the Arya Samaj abuse. I would not have even noticed these prints but for the information given to me that such writings command a fair patronage. The local leaders must find a way of stopping these publications or at least discrediting them and distributing clean literature instead, showing tolerance for each other's faiths.[21]

To revile one another's religion, to make reckless statements, to utter untruth, to break the heads of innocent men, to desecrate temples or mosques, *is* a denial of God.[22]

They [the Musalman writers and speakers] neither enhance their own reputation nor that of the religion they profess by unrestrained abuse of the opponent. They can gain nothing, they cannot serve Islam, by swearing at the Samaj and the Samajists.[23]

Religion never suffers by reason of the criticism fair or foul or critics; it always suffers from the laxity or indifference of its followers.[24]

Religious instruction

If India is not to declare spiritual bankruptcy, religious instruction of its youth must be held at least as necessary as secular instruction. It is true that knowledge of religious books is no equivalent of that of religion. But, if we cannot have religion, we must be satisfied with providing our boys and girls with what is next best.[25]

Religious freedom

Everybody must be entitled to retain his or her own religion without interference. All worship the same God although under different names. "If I see my God in this tree and worship it, why should the Muslims object?" It is wrong for anyone to say that his God is superior to that of another's. God is one and the same for all. [26]

Martyrdom

Bluster is no religion, nor is vast learning stored in capacious brains. The seat of religion is in the heart. We Hindus, Christians, Musalmans and others have to write the interpretation of our respective faiths with our own crimson blood and not otherwise.[27]

No religion in the world can live without self-suffering. A faith gains in strength only when people are willing to lay down their lives for it. The tree of life has to be watered with the blood of martyrs, who lay down their lives without killing their opponents or intending any harm to them. That is the root of Hinduism and of all other religions.[28]

Nobody else can protect our culture for us. We have to protect it ourselves and can destroy it by our folly. Thus, if Bengal has one culture, as I believe it has, it is for the people of Bengal to protect it. [29]

I must repeat even at the risk of irritating you that it lies in one's own hands to protect one's religion. Every child should be educated to lay down his or her life for his or her religion. We all know the story of Prahlad and how he stood up against his own father at the age of 12 for the sake of his faith. Every religion is replete with such heroic

instances. I have given the same education to my children. I am not the custodian of my children's religion.[30]

It is the duty of the Government to offer protection to all who look up to it, wherever they are and to whatever religion they belong. Ultimately, the protection of one's faith lies with oneself.[31]

2 HINDUISM AND THE COMMUNAL PROBLEM

His Hinduism

I had practised Hinduism from early childhood. My nurse had taught me to invoke Rama when I feared evil spirits. Later on, I had come in contact with Christians, Muslims and others and, after making a fair study of other religions, had stuck to Hinduism. I am as firm in my faith today as in my early childhood.

I believe God would make me an instrument of saving the religion that I love, cherish and practise. In any case, one has to have constant practice and acquaintance with the fundamentals of religion before being qualified for becoming God's instrument.[32]

It has been whispered that by being so much with Musalman friends, I make myself unfit to know the Hindu mind. The Hindu mind is myself. Surely, I do not need to live amidst Hindus to know the Hindu mind when every fibre of my being is Hindu. My Hinduism must be a very poor thing if it cannot flourish under influences the most adverse. I know instinctively what is necessary for Hinduism.[33]

As my instinct is wholly Hindu, I know that what I am about to say will be acceptable to the vast mass of the Hindus.[34]

My Hinduism is not sectarian. It includes all that I know to be best in Islam, Christianity, Buddhism, and Zoroastrianism. I approach politics, as everything else, in a religious spirit. Truth is my religion and Ahimsa is the only way of its realization. I have rejected once and for all the doctrine of the sword.[35]

My position is and has been clear. I am proud of being a Hindu, but I have never gone to anybody as a Hindu to secure Hindu-Muslim unity. My Hinduism demands no pacts. My support of the Khilafat was unconditional. I am no politician in the accepted sense.[36]

So far as my own objective is concerned, my life is an open book. I claim to represent all the cultures, for my religion, whatever it may be called, demands the fulfilment of all cultures. I am at home wherever I go, for I regard all religions with the same respect as my own.[37]

Inspired religions

... I regard Hinduism, Christianity, Zoroastrianism as inspired religions. The names of many of them [the prophets] have been already forgotten, for the simple reason that those religions and those prophets related to the particular ages for which and peoples for whom they flourished. [38]

All-inclusive Hinduism

It is because I am a *Sanatani* (orthodox) Hindu that I claim to be a Christian, a Buddhist and a Muslim. Some Muslim friends also felt that I have no right to read Arabic verses from the Koran, but such [people] do not know that true religion transcends language and scripture. I do not see any reason why I should not read the *Kalma,* why I should not praise Allah and why I should not acclaim Muhammad as His Prophet. I believe in all the great prophets and saints of every religion. I shall continue to ask God to give me the strength not to be angry with my accusers, but to be prepared even to die at their hands without wishing them ill. I claim that Hinduism is all inclusive and I am sure that, if I live up to my convictions, I shall have served not only Hinduism but Islam also.[39]

Central teaching

There is mention of terrible punishments in the Bhagawata, the Manu Smriti and the Vedas. Yet the central teaching of Hindu religion is: "Mercy or kindness is the essence of all religion." I want you to bear in mind what Tulasidas has said:

"Good and bad, all men are the creation of God. The man of God picks up the good and discards the bad like the proverbial swan which is able to drink the milk and leave behind water, when a mixture of water and milk is placed before it." [40]

In spite of the many shortcomings of the Hindus, it can be safely claimed that Hinduism has never been known to be exclusive. Many persons claiming different faiths make us one, and an indivisible, nation. All these have an equal claim to be the nationals of India.[41]

I am proud to belong to that Hinduism which is all-inclusive, and which stands for tolerance. Aryari scholars swore by what they called the Vedic religion, and Hindustan is otherwise known as Aryavarta. I have no such aspiration. Hindustan of my conception is all-sufficing for me. It certainly includes the Vedas, but it includes also

much more. I can detect no inconsistency in declaring that I can, without in any way whatsoever impairing the dignity of Hinduism, pay equal homage to the best of Islam, Christianity, Zoroastrianism and Judaism. Such Hinduism will live: as long as the sun shines. Tulasidas has summed it up in one *doha:* "The root of religion is embedded in mercy, whereas egotism is rooted in love of the body. Tulasi says that mercy should never be abandoned, even though the body perishes." [42]

Origin of Hinduism

No one knows accurately the origin of the word Hindu. The name is given to us and we have characteristically adopted it.[43]

"What is a Hindu? What is the origin of the word? Is there any Hinduism?" These are pertinent questions for the time. I am no historian, I lay claim to no learning. But I have read in some authentic book on Hinduism that the word 'Hindu' does not occur in the Vedas, but when Alexander the Great invaded India, the inhabitants of the country to the east of the Sindhu, which is known by the English-speaking Indians as the Indus, were described as Hindus. The letter 'S' had become 'H' in Greek. The religion of these inhabitants became Hinduism and as we know it, it is a most tolerant religion. It gave shelter to the early Christians who had fled from persecution, also to the Jews known as Beni-Israel, as also to the Parsis.[44]

A lawyer friend asked me for a good definition of Hinduism. Though he was a *Sanatani* Hindu, he was unable to define Hinduism. [45]

I have forgotten my law for years. Nor am I learned in the science of religion. But as a layman I can say that Hinduism regards all religions as worthy of all respect.[46]

Hinduism has absorbed the best of all the faiths of the world and in that sense it is not an exclusive religion. Hence it can have no quarrel with Islam or its followers…[47]

Respect for other faiths

Hinduism is not an exclusive religion. In it there is room for the worship of all prophets in the world. It is not a missionary religion in the ordinary sense of the term. It has no doubt absorbed many tribes in its fold, but this absorption has been an evolutionary, imperceptible character. Hinduism tells every one to worship God according to his own faith or Dharma and so it lives at peace with all the religions.[48]

Though I call myself a *Sanatani* Hindu, I am proud of the fact that the late Imam Saheb of South Africa accompanied me to India on his return and died in the Sabarmati Ashram. His daughter and son-in-law are still at Sabarmati. Am I to throw them overboard? My Hinduism teaches me to respect all religions. In this lies the secret of Rama Raj.[49]

Message of Ahimsa

The die is cast for me. The common factor of all religions is non-violence. Some inculcate more of it than others, all agree that you can never have too much of it. We must be sure, however, that it is non-violence and not a cloak for cowardice.[50]

Hinduism with its message of Ahimsa is to me the most glorious religion in the world—as my wife to me is the most beautiful woman in the world—but others may feel the same about their own religion.[51]

Religion is outraged when an outrage is perpetrated in its name. Almost all the riots in this unhappy land take place in the name of religion, though they might have a political motive behind them. [52]

If Ahimsa disappears, Hindu Dharma disappears.[53]

There are two aspects of Hinduism. There is, on the one hand, the historical Hinduism with its untouchability, superstitious worship of stocks and stones, animal sacrifice and so on. On the other, we have the Hinduism of the Gita, the Upanishads and Patanjali's Yoga Sutras which is the acme of Ahimsa and oneness of all creation, pure worship of one immanent, formless, imperishable God. Ahimsa, which to me is the chief glory of Hinduism, has been sought to be explained away by our people as being meant for *Sannyasis* only. I do not share that view. I have held that it is the way of life and India has to show it to the world.[54]

There is no room for *goondaism* in any religion worth the name, be it Islam, Hinduism or any other. [55]

If religion dies, then India dies. Today the Hindus and the Muslims are clinging to the husk of religion. They have gone mad. But I hope that all this is froth, that all the scum has come to the surface, as happens when the waters of two rivers meet. Everything appears muddy on top; but underneath it is crystal-clear and calm. The scum goes to the sea of itself, and the rivers mingle and How clear and pure.[56]

[Hinduism permits killing] and it does not. One evil-doer cannot punish another. To punish is the function of the Government, not that of the public.[57]

3 ISLAM AND THE COMMUNAL PROBLEM

Early contacts

Contact with him [Abdulla Sheth] gave me a fair amount of practical knowledge of Islam.[58]

I purchased Sale's translation of the Koran and began reading it. I also obtained other books on Islam.[59]

I read Washington Irving's *Life of Mahomed and His Successors* and Carlyle's panegyric on the Prophet. These books raised Muhammad in my estimation.[60]

Oneness of God

Islam is not a denial of God. It is a passionate avowal of one supreme deity. Not even its worst detractors have accused Islam of atheism.[61]

Islam's distinctive contribution ... is its unadulterated belief in the oneness of God and a practical application of the truth of the brotherhood of man for those who are nominally within its fold. I call these two distinctive contributions. For, in Hinduism the spirit of brotherhood has become too much philosophized. Similarly, though philosophical Hinduism has no other god but God, it cannot be denied that practical Hinduism is not so emphatically uncompromising as Islam.[62]

Tolerance

The history of Islam, if it betrays aberrations from the moral height, has many a brilliant page. In its glorious days it was not intolerant. It commanded the admiration of the world. When the West was sunk in darkness, a bright star rose in the Eastern firmament and gave light and comfort to a groaning world. Islam is not a false religion.[63]

I share Justice Ameer Ali's view that Islam in the days of Harun-al-Rashid and Mamun was the most tolerant amongst the world's religions. But there was a reaction against the liberalism of the teachers of their times. The reactionaries had many learned, able and influential men amongst them, and they very nearly overwhelmed the liberal and tolerant teachers and philosophers of Islam. We in India are still suffering from the effect of that reaction. But I have not a shadow of doubt that Islam has sufficient

in itself to become purged of illiberalism and intolerance. We are fast reaching the time when the acceptance of the formula suggested by the friends will be a common thing among mankind.[64]

...Christianity and Islam are, after all, religions of but yesterday. They are yet in the course of being interpreted. I reject the claim of *Maulvis* to give a final interpretation to the message of Muhammad as I reject that of the Christian clergy to give a final interpretation to the message of Jesus. Both are being interpreted in the lives of those who are living these messages in silence and in perfect self-dedication.[65]

The law of Islam, in so far as a non-Muslim can speak of it, requires strict toleration. Nothing could have so deeply hurt the Prophet as the intolerance of the people of Mecca during the early period of his ministry towards the new faith he was practising.

He could not possibly, therefore, at any time have been party to intolerance. 'There shall be no compulsion in religion' must have descended to him when some of his new converts were more zealous than wise in the preaching of the new faith.[66]

The Prophet

A prophet's life, after he is acknowledged as one, cannot be our guide. Only prophets can weigh the works of prophets. If a civilian can judge the merits of a soldier, a layman or a scientist, an ordinary man may judge a prophet, much less imitate him. If I handled a motor car, I should surely run it and me into the danger zone and probably into the jaws of death. How much more dangerous would it be, then, for me to imitate a prophet? When the Prophet was asked why, if he could fast more than the prescribed times, the companions also could not, he promptly replied: "God gives me spiritual food which satisfies even the bodily wants; for you He has ordained the *Ramzan*. You may not copy me." I quote from memory. [67]

Is Islam inspired?

A writer in a Muslim paper has suggested that, if I regard Islam as an inspired religion and Muhammad as the Prophet of God, I should declare my belief, so that Musalmans' doubts may be dispelled and Hindu-Muslim unity may possibly be more easily achieved. I read the suggestion about a month ago, but I did not think it necessary to respond to it. But as, nowadays, I read as many Muslim papers as I can in order to acquaint myself with the Muslim mind, and as I find them so full of poison and conscious or unconscious

untruths, I feel it necessary to re-declare my opinion about Islam, though I think it is well-known. I certainly regard Islam as one of the inspired religions and, therefore, the Holy Koran as an inspired book and Muhammad as one of the prophets. [68]

Islam and Non-violence

...I had long discussions on the subject with the late Maulana Abdul Bari and the other *Ulemas,* specially with regard to the extent to which a Musalman could observe the rule of non-violence. In the end, they all agreed that Islam did not forbid its followers from following non-violence as a policy, and further, that, while they were pledged to that policy, they were bound faithfully to carry it out.[69]

Musalmans have an ordeal to pass through. There can be no doubt that they are too free with the knife and the pistol. The sword is no emblem of Islam. But Islam was born in an environment where the sword was, and still remains, the supreme law. The message of Jesus has proved ineffective because the environment was unready to receive it. So with the message of the Prophet. The sword is yet too much in evidence among the Musalmans. It must be sheathed if Islam is to be what it means peace. There is danger of Musalmans secretly endorsing the mad deed [the assassination of Swami Shraddhanand]. It will be a calamity for them and the world. For, ours is, after all, a world problem. Reliance upon the sword is wholly inconsistent with reliance upon God. There should be, on their part, unequivocal mass condemnation of the atrocity. [70]

But I do regard Islam to be a religion of peace in the same sense as Christianity, Buddhism and Hinduism are. No doubt there are differences in degree, but the object of these religions is peace. I know the passages that can be quoted from the Koran to the contrary. But so is it possible to quote passages from the Vedas to the contrary. What is the meaning of imprecations pronounced against the Anaryas? Of course, these passages bear today a different meaning, but at one time they did wear a dreadful aspect. What is the meaning of the treatment of 'untouchables' by us Hindus? Let not the pot call the kettle black. The fact is that we are growing. I have given my opinion that the followers of Islam are too free with the sword. But that is not due to the teaching of the Koran. That is due, in my opinion, to the environment in which Islam was born. Christianity has a bloody record against it, not because Jesus was found

wanting but because the environment in which it spread was not responsive to his lofty teaching. [71]

I may say that have reverently studied the works [the Koran and the life of the Prophet by Shebli Nowani and M. Sulaiman Nadwi] and also many other works on Islam. I have more than once read the Koran. My religion enables me, obliges me, to imbibe all that is good in all the great religions of the earth. This does not mean that I must accept the interpretation that my correspondent may put upon the message of the Prophet of Islam or any other Prophet. I must use the limited intelligence that God has given me to interpret the teachings bequeathed to mankind by the Prophets of the world. I am glad to find that my correspondent agrees that truth and non-violence are taught by the Holy Koran. Surely it is for him, as for every one of us, to apply these principles to daily life according to the light given to us by God.[72]

I do not propose to enter into any long argument about the interpretation of the Koran. Being a non-Muslim, I am at a disadvantage. If I began an argument, the natural retort would be: "How can you, a non-Muslim, interpret Muslim scriptures?" It would serve no purpose to answer back that I have the same reverence for Islam and the other faiths as I have for my own.

Interpretation of the Koran

I may, however, inform my correspondent that I had before my mind the battle of Badr and similar incidents in the Prophet's life. I was aware of verses in the Koran itself contradicting my interpretation. I suggest, nevertheless, that it is possible that the teaching of a book or a man's life may be different from isolated texts in a book or incidents in a life, however many the latter may be. The Mahabharata is the story of a bloody war. But I have maintained in the teeth of orthodox Hindu opposition that it is a book written to establish the futility of war and violence.

I have no right to speak for the Maulana Saheb. He is well able to take care of himself. I must confess that I have no recollection of the Maulana Saheb having given the evidence quoted. I do not question the veracity of my correspondent. Only that evidence does not affect the opinion I have held for many years about the central teaching of the Holy Koran. Opinions will differ to the end of time. I plead for mutual forbearance. [73]

I claim to have studied the life of the Prophet and the Koran as a detached student of religions. And I have come to the conclusion that the teaching of the Koran is essentially in favour of non-violence. Non-violence is better than violence, it is said in the Koran. Non-violence is enjoined as a duty; violence is permitted as a necessity. I must refuse to sit in judgment on what the Prophet did. I must base my conduct on what the great teachers of the earth said, not on what they did. Prophethood came not from the wielding of the sword, it came from years of wrestling with God to know the truth. Erase these precious years of the great life, and you will have robbed the Prophet of his prophethood. It is these years of his life which made Muhammad a prophet? [74]

Islam means peace. That peace cannot be confined to the Muslims. It must mean peace for the whole world.[75]

Hindus and Muslims

It will be an evil day for Musalmans if, where they are in a minority, they have to depend for the observance of their religion upon Hindu goodwill and *vice versa*. Non-co-operation is a process of self-realization.

But this self-realization is impossible, if the strong become brutes and tread upon the weak. Then, they must be trodden under by the stronger. Hence, if the Hindus and Musalmans really wish to live as men of religion, they must develop strength from within. They must be both strong and humble.[76]

The Koran and the Hindus

Let the Hindus study it reverently and they will love it even as I do. If it has become gross and fanatical here, let us admit that we have had no small share in making it so. If the Hindus set their house in order, I have not a shadow of doubt that Islam will respond in a manner worthy of its past liberal traditions. The key to the situation lies with the Hindus. We must shed timidity or cowardice. We must be brave enough to trust, and all will be well.[77]

Posterity will judge both the faiths by the manner in which the followers of each acquit themselves in the matter. However good Hinduism or Islam may be in the abstract, the only way each can be judged is by the effect produced by each on its votaries considered as a whole.[78]

"Why cannot the Hindus believe in the divinity of the Koran and say with us that there is no god but God and Muhammad is His Prophet? Ours is not an exclusive religion, but it is essentially inclusive."

...The formula ...might be good enough for the cultured few, but it would prove ineffective for the man in the street For the Hindus to expect Islam, Christianity or Zoroastrianism to be driven out of India is as idle a dream as it would be for the Musalmans to have only Islam of their imagination rule the world. But if belief in One God and the race of His Prophets in a never-ending chain is sufficient for Islam, then we are all Musalmans, but we are also Hindus and Christians.[79]

I hold that every Hindu believes in one and only God. Excrescences have grown round Hinduism and its votaries have not always been true to Hinduism undefiled. It is, therefore, up to an impartial man to understand Hinduism as its votaries like him understood it, just as it is the duty of an impartial Hindu to understand Islam as a good Muslim understands it. That, I hold, is the safest rule of interpretation for any faith. Then it will be found that all great religions spring from the same source and the fundamentals are common to them all.[80]

I am also a reader of the Koran like them [the Musalmans], and I will tell them that the Koran makes no distinction between Hindus and Musalmans. But if they feel that they should have Heaven without the Hindus, I will not grudge it to them.[81]

A friend has sent me some literature to prove that the Koran preaches killing of kafirs, i.e., non-believers. I have been in the midst of Musalmans all my life. No one has ever suggested that I should be killed as a Kafir. I had been in the midst of *Maulvis* in Noakhali. Learned Muslims have told me that the meaning of the particular verse of the Koran is that God will take to account the so-called non-believer. But that He will do to the Musalmans also. He judges men by their deeds and not by their words.[82]

In that book [which a Muslim friend has lovingly presented me with at Patna], the writer has propounded that, according to the Koran, Kafirs (i.e., Hindus) are worse than poisonous reptiles and fit only to be exterminated. Not only is there no sin in using every conceivable variety of force or fraud to compass that end, it was meritorious in the eyes of God. I am sure that no God-fearing Muslims can subscribe to or even secretly sympathize with that creed.[83]

4 CONVERSION

Are creeds such simple things like clothes which a man can change at will and put on at will? Creeds are such [things] for which people live for ages and ages. [84]

Religion is more than life. Remember that his own religion is the truest to every man even if it stands low in the scales of philosophic comparison.[85]

Opposition to conversion

I am against conversion, whether it is known as *Shuddhi* by Hindus, *Tabligh* by Musalmans, or proselytizing by Christians. Conversion is a heart-process known only to and by God. It must be left to itself...Those who believe in it have a perfect right to follow their own course without let or hindrance, so long as it is kept within proper limits, i.e., so long as there is no force or fraud or material inducement, and so long as the parties are free agents and of mature age and understanding.[86]

Progress of liberal study of religions of the world is bound to revolutionize the existing clumsy method of proselytizing, which looks to the form rather than the substance. It is the transference of allegiance from one fold to another and the mutual decrying of rival faiths which gives rise to mutual hatred.[87]

True fellowship

I am positive that with people not prepared to tolerate one another's religious belief, there can be no international fellowship.

I came to the conclusion long ago, after prayerful search and study, and discussion with as many people as I could meet, that all religions were true and also that all had some error in them, and that, whilst I hold by my own, I should hold others as dear as Hinduism, from which it logically follows that we should hold all as dear as our nearest kith and kin and that we should make no distinction between them. So we can only pray, if we are Hindus, not that a Christian should become a Hindu, or if we are Musalmans, not that a Hindu or Christian should become a Musalman, nor should we even secretly pray that any one should be converted, but our inmost prayer should be

that a Hindu should be a better Hindu, a Muslim a better Muslim and a Christian a better Christian. That is the fundamental truth of fellowship...

Cases of real honest conversion are quite possible. If some people for their inward satisfaction and growth change their religion, let them do so...

If I am perfect, I know that my thought will reach others.

Conversion and service go ill together... If we have spiritual truth, it will transmit itself. You talk of the joy of a spiritual experience and say you cannot but share it. Well, if it is real joy, boundless joy, it will spread itself without the vehicle of speech...[88]

Lure of materialism

It is tragic to see that religion is dragged down to the low level of crude materialism, to lure people into which the most cherished sentiments of millions of human beings are trodden under foot.[89]

I have, of course, always believed in the principle of religious tolerance. But I have even gone further. I have advanced from tolerance to equal respect for all religions. All religions are branches of the same mighty tree, but I must not change over from one branch to another for the sake of expediency. By doing so, I cut the branch on which I am sitting. Therefore, I always feel the change-over from one religion to another very keenly, unless it is a case of spontaneous urge, a result of inner growth. Such conversions by their very nature cannot be on a mass scale and never to save one's life or property or for temporal gain.

I had met a South Indian bishop who was a Harijan converted to Christianity and retained all his original weaknesses in spite of the change of religion. I had told the late Shri Charlie Andrews that, to my mind, he was no bishop at all.[90]

Proselytism in Hinduism

In my opinion, there is no such thing as proselytism in Hinduism, as it is understood in Christianity or, to a lesser extent, in Islam. The Arya Samaj has, I think, copied the Christians in planning its propaganda. The modern method does not appeal to me. It has done more harm than good. Though regarded as a matter of the heart purely and one between the Maker and oneself, it has degenerated into an appeal to the selfish instinct. The Arya Samaj preacher is never so happy as when he is reviling other

religions. My Hindu instinct tells me that all religions are more or less true. All proceed from the same God but all are imperfect because they have come down to us through imperfect human instrumentality. The real *Shuddhi* movement should consist in each one trying to arrive at perfection in his or her own faith. In such a plan, character would be the only test. What is the use of crossing from one compartment to another, if it does not mean a moral rise? What is the meaning of my trying to convert to the service of God (for, that must be the implication of *Shuddhi* or *Tabligh*) when those who are in my fold are every day denying God by their actions? "Physician, heal thyself!" is more true in matters religious than mundane. But these are my views. If the Arya Samajists think that they have a call from their conscience, they have a perfect right to conduct the movement. Such a burning call recognizes no time-limit, no checks of experience. If Hindu-Muslim unity is endangered because an Arya Samaj preacher or a Musalman preacher preaches his faith in obedience to a call from within, that unity is only skin-deep. Why should we be ruffled by such movements? Only they must be genuine. If the Malkanas wanted to return to the Hindu fold, they had a perfect right to do so whenever they liked. But no propaganda can be allowed which reviles other religions. For that would be negation of toleration. The best way of dealing with such propaganda is to publicly condemn it. Every movement attempts to put on the cloak of respectability. As soon as the public tear that cloak down, it dies for want of respectability.[91]

For my own part, I still remain unconvinced about the necessity of the *Shuddhi* movement, taking *Shuddhi* in the sense [in which] it is generally understood. *Shuddhi* of sinners is a perpetual inward performance. *Shuddhi* of those who can be identified neither as Hindus nor as Musalmans, or who have been recently declared converts but who do not know even the meaning of conversion and who want to be known definitely as Hindus, is not conversion but *prayashchitta* or penance. The third aspect of *Shuddhi* is conversion properly so-called. And I question its use in this age of growing toleration and enlightenment.[92]

Forcible conversion

It is ... true that Muslim rulers like Christian rulers have used the sword for the propagation of their respective faiths. But in spite of many dark things of the modern times, the world's opinion today will as little tolerate forcible conversions as it will

tolerate forcible slavery. That, probably, is the most effective contribution of the scientific spirit of the age. That spirit has revolutionized many a false notion about Christianity, as it has about Islam. I do not know a single writer on Islam who defends the use of force in the proselytizing process. The influences exerted in our times are far more subtle than that of the sword.[93]

The days of forcible conversion are gone.[94]

There is nothing in the Koran to warrant the use of force for conversion. The holy book says in the clearest language possible: 'There is no compulsion in religion.' The Prophet's whole life is a repudiation of compulsion in religion. No Musalman, to my knowledge, has ever approved of compulsion. Islam would cease to be a world religion, if it were to rely upon force for its propagation.

Secondly, historically speaking, the charge of conversion to Islam by force cannot be proved against its followers as a body. And whenever attempts have been made to convert by force, responsible Musalmans have repudiated such conversions [95]

I was delighted to be told that there were Hindus who did prefer the Moplah hatchet to forced conversion. If these have died without anger or malice, they have died as truest Hindus, because they were truest among Indians and men. And thus would these men have died even if their persecutors had been Hindus instead of Musalmans.[96]

Recitation of Kalma

In one sense, I and my audience who believe that God is one and that there is no other, and who believe that Muhammad is one of His messengers, are Muslims. But, if any one forces you or me to recite the *Kalma,* we will flatly refuse to obey and take the consequences.[97]

I have studied Islam. My Muslim friends in South Africa used to say to me: "Why not recite the *Kalma* and forget Hinduism?" I used to say in reply that I shall gladly recite the *Kalma,* but forget Hinduism never. My respect and regard for Hazrat Muhammad is not less than theirs. But authoritarianism and compulsion is the way to corrupt religion, not to advance it...[98]

Why should there be a public show of it, if anybody genuinely feels inclined to recite the *Kalma?* A heart conversion needs no other witness than God. Mere recitation of the *Kalma* while one continues to indulge in acts which are contrary to elementary

decency is not Islam but a travesty of it. This reminds me of the Plymouth Brothers who invited me to embrace Christianity because, then, I would be free to do anything I like, since Christ redeemed the sins of those who accepted Him. As against that, there was the conclusive verse of the New Testament: "Not everyone who says Lord, Lord, with his lips, comes to Me." It is, therefore, up to the leaders of the Muslims to declare that forcible repetition of a formula cannot make a non-Muslim into a Muslim. It only shames Islam.[99]

I had read a story about one of the earlier Caliphs. A man attacked the Caliph with a sword. The Caliph wrested the sword from the assailant's hands and was going to kill him when the assailant spat on his face. The Caliph, thereupon, let him go free because the indignity had filled him with personal anger. This produced a great impression upon the assailant and he embraced Islam. One who is forcibly converted to Islam ceases to be a man. To recite the *Kalma* through fear is meaningless.[100]

So far as I know, Islam does not permit forcible conversion and atrocities on women. What good can a mere repetition of the *Kalma* do to one whose heart does not accept Islam? [101]

I would never mind if a Hindu recites the *Kalma* willingly and with a full heart. But, if he does so out of fear of losing his life or possessions, then he takes the name of God in vain, for it is the voice of Satan which then speaks through him. As I understand Islam, it has never prospered nor can prosper by means of force. Any man who pretends to serve Islam in this manner only does a disservice to the noble religion.[102]

Re-conversion

Yes, ['unless those who have been converted are brought back to the Hindu fold quickly, the cleavage between the Hindus and the Muslims may become permanent.']. I admit the force of the argument. Many had returned. But all must.[103]

My object ever is to make Muslims better Muslims, Hindus better Hindus, Christians better Christians, Parsis better Parsis. I never invite anybody to change his or her religion. I have thought, therefore, that the questioners will be glad to find that my religion is so expansive as to include readings from the religious scriptures of the world.[104]

Islam and the Harijans

I had a plain talk with Khwaja Hassan Nizami Saheb also the other day. I told him: "Why do you try to convert the waifs and strays and the untouchables? Better follow me; if those poor people embrace Islam, they will not do so because they understand the beauty of Islam, but for other reasons. Islam will not be a whit richer for them."[105]

One reads reports of Muslim League speakers holding forth that the scheduled classes in Pakistan can have separate electorates. Is that to be a call for joining Islam of the Pakistan type? I do not wish to recall the tales of forcible conversions. But having heard so much from their own mouths, I shudder to contemplate the worst. What is the answer to this fear or threat? [106]

But the crores [of Muslims] are converts from Hinduism. I shall not mind intelligent conversion. The so-called untouchables and Shudras are not converted by an appeal to reason. The responsibility is our own. By giving place to untouchability in Hindu religion and by oppressing the so-called untouchables, we have forced them into the arms of Islam. It is unbecoming on our part to kill or oppress those brothers and sisters.[107]

The logical consequence of this, in my opinion, will be that those Harijans who do stay there, will ultimately have to embrace Islam. I have nothing to say against change of faith out of heart-felt conviction and spiritual urge. Having become a Harijan by choice, I know the mind of the Harijans. There is not a single Harijan today who can fall in that category. What do they understand of Islam? Nor do they understand why they are Hindus. This is true of the followers of all faiths. They are what they are because they are born in a particular faith. If they change religion, it would be merely from compulsion or some temptations held out to them in return. In the present atmosphere, no voluntary change of faith should have any validity. Religion should be dearer than life itself. Those who act up to the truth are better Hindus than one well versed in Hindu scriptures, but whose faith does not hold out at the time of a crisis.[108]

Conversion of Muslims

I have protested against forcible conversions of the Hindus and the Sikhs to Islam. I shall expect them to prefer death to forcible conversions. The same thing applies to

the Muslims. I have no use for people who can change their religion like their clothes. They will not be an asset to any religion.[109]

Religion cannot be forced upon an unwilling heart. Every so-called convert to Hinduism or Sikhism should feel sure that the conversion is not to be recognized and that every such 'convert' is free to follow his original faith. This applies equally to so-called converts to Islam. If it is to be otherwise, it will mean death to the three religions.[110]

Abduction of women

I have no hesitation in maintaining that forcible conversion is no conversion at all nor abduction a bar to the return to her home of the abducted girl. I hold that no purification or penance is necessary in such cases. Hindu society is wrong when it imposes penance on such persons. They have not erred. I have lived for years among Muslims and Christians. They have all assured me that there can be no compulsion in religion. Those who resort to it do not deserve to be called men of religion.[111]

To change one's religion under threat of force is no conversion but rather cowardice. A cowardly man or woman is a deadweight on any religion. Out of fear they may become Muslims today, Christians tomorrow, and pass into a third religion the day after. That is not worthy of human beings.[112]

I am clear that no conversion or marriage of a woman to a member of the opposite community can be recognized as valid on the plea of consent or free will. It is abuse of words to talk of free consent when terror reigns.[113]

5 THE SCRIPTURES

Conflict of Scriptures and Reason

I reject any religious doctrine that does not appeal to reason and is in conflict with morality. I tolerate unreasonable religious sentiment when it is not immoral.[114]

Indeed, I would reject all authority if it is in conflict with sober reason or the dictates of the heart. Authority sustains and ennobles the weak when it is the hand-work of reason, but, it degrades them when it supplants reason sanctified by the still small voice within.[115]

Scriptures cannot transcend reason and truth. They are intended to purify reason and illuminate truth.[116]

Every formula of every religion has, in this age of reason, to submit to the test of reason and universal justice if it is to ask for universal assent. Error can claim no exemption even if it can be supported by the scriptures of the world.[117]

I plead not for the suppression of reason but, for due recognition of that in us which sanctifies reason itself.[118]

Rationalists are admirable beings, rationalism is a hideous monster when it claims for itself omnipotence. Attribution of omnipotence to reason is as bad a piece of idolatry as worship of stock and stone believing it to be God.[119]

To me it is as plain as a pike staff that, where there is an appeal to reason pure and undefiled, there should be no appeal to authority, however great it may be. [120]

The spirit

I am not a literalist. Therefore, I try to understand the *spirit* of the various scriptures of the world. I apply to them the test of Truth and Ahimsa laid down by those very scriptures for interpretation. I reject what is inconsistent with that test, and appropriate all that is consistent with it.[121]

Spirit giveth life; the letter killeth. A Ganapati with an elephant's head is a monster, but as a representation of *Om* is an uplifting symbol. Ravana with ten heads is a fabled fool, but if it means a man who carries no head about him and is tossed to and fro by the fleeting passions, he is a many-headed demon.[122]

Divinity of Scriptures

I do not believe in the exclusive divinity of the, Vedas. I believe the Bible, the Koran and the Zend Avesta to be as much divinely inspired as the Vedas. My belief in Hindu scriptures does not require me to accept every word and every verse as divinely inspired. Nor do I claim to have any first-hand knowledge of these wonderful books. But I do know and feel the truths of the essential teaching of the scriptures. I decline to be bound by any interpretation, however learned it may be, if it is repugnant to reason or to moral sense.[123]

In fact, it is the average Musalman who will not accept the divinity of the Vedas and the other Hindu scriptures, or Krishna or Rama as prophets or incarnations of the Deity. With the Hindu, it is a new-fangled notion to revile the Koran and the Prophet. I have known the Prophet spoken of with reverence in Hindu circles. There are even Hindu songs paying tribute to Islam.

...God is certainly one. He has no second. He is unfathomable, unknowable and unknown to the vast majority of mankind. He is everywhere. He sees without eyes, and hears without ears. He is the formless and indivisible. He is uncreated, has no father, mother or child; and yet, He allows Himself to be worshipped as father, mother, wife and child. He allows Himself even to be worshipped as stock and stone, although He is none of these things. He is the most elusive. He is the nearest to us if we would but know the fact. But He is farthest from us when we do not want to realize His omnipresence. There are many gods in the Vedas. Other scriptures call them Angels. But the Vedas sing of only one God.

I have no hesitation in regarding the Koran as revealed, as I have none in regarding the Bible, the Zend Avesta, the Granth Saheb and any other clean scriptures as revealed. Revelation is the exclusive property of no nation, no tribe. If I know Hinduism at all, it is essentially inclusive and ever-growing, ever-responsive. It gives the freest scope to imagination, speculation and reason. I have found not the slightest difficulty in Hindu circles about evoking reverence for the Koran and the Prophet. But I have found difficulty in Musalman circles about evoking the same reverence for the Vedas or the incarnations. I had a very good Musalman client, in South Africa. He is, alas, dead now. The relation of client and counsel developed into one of close companionship and mutual regard. We often had religious discussions. My friend,

though not learned in any sense of the term, had an intellect as sharp as a razor. He knew everything of the Koran. He knew something of other religions also. He was interested in my accepting Islam. I said to him: "I can pay full respect to the Koran and the Prophet. Why do you ask me to reject the Vedas and the incarnations? They have helped me to be what I am. I find the greatest consolation from the Bhagawad Gita and Tulasidas's Ramayana. I frankly confess that the Koran, the Bible and the other scriptures of the world, in spite of my great regard for them, do not move me as do the Gita of Krishna and the Ramayana of Tulasidas." The friend despaired of me and had no hesitation in saying that there must be something wrong with me. His, however, is not an exceptional case because I have since met many Musalman friends who have held the same view. I do, however, believe that this is a passing phase...

Truth is the exclusive property of no single scripture.[124]

Study of Scriptures

I hold that it is the duty of every cultured man or woman to read sympathetically the scriptures of the world. If we are to respect others' religions as we would have them respect our own, a friendly study of the world's religions is a sacred duty. We need not dread upon our grown up children the influence of scriptures other than our own. We liberalize their outlook upon life by encouraging them to study freely all that is clean.

...For myself, I regard my study of and reverence for the Bible, the Koran and the other scriptures to be wholly consistent with my claim to be a staunch *Sanatani* Hindu. He is no *Sanatani* Hindu who is narrow, bigoted and considers evil to be good if it has the sanction of antiquity and is to be found in any Sanskrit book.

I claim to be a staunch *Sanatani* Hindu because, though I reject all that offends my moral sense, I find the Hindu scriptures satisfy the needs of the soul. My respectful study of other religions has not abated my reverence for or my faith in the Hindu scriptures. They have, indeed, left their deep mark upon my understanding of the Hindu scriptures. They have broadened my view of life. They have enabled me to understand more clearly many an obscure passage in the Hindu scriptures.[125]

I have come to the conclusion, in my own experience, that those who, no matter to what faith they belong, reverently study the teachings of other faiths, broaden their

own instead of narrowing their hearts. Personally, I do not regard any of the great religions of the world as false. All have served in enriching mankind and are now even serving their purpose. A liberal education to all should include a reverent study of other faiths.[126]

It is the duty of everyone to study the scriptures of religions other than his own. This enables people to keep their religion pure and rid it of blemishes. Moreover, we have Christians, Muslims, Parsis and followers of other religions amongst us. It behoves the Hindus to study their religious books if they regard them as their brothers.[127]

Let the Hindus decide once for all that they will not quarrel. I will advise the Hindus and the Sikhs to read the Koran as they read the Gita and the Granth Saheb. To the Muslims I will say that they should read the Gita and the Granth Saheb with the same reverence with which they read the Koran. They should understand the meaning of what they read and have equal regard for all religions. This is my life-long practice and ideal.

I claim to be a *Sanatani* Hindu, though I am not an idolater in the accepted sense. But I cannot despise those who worship idols. The idol worshippers see God in the stone image. God is omnipresent. If it is wrong to seek God in a stone, how is it right to seek Him in a book called the Gita, the Granth Saheb or the Koran? Is not that also idol worship? By cultivating tolerance and respect, they will be able to learn from all.[128]

Interpretation of the Koran

As for the Holy Koran, it was my Muslim clients and friends in South Africa who invited me to read it. They furnished me with Islamic literature. On my return to India, Muslim friends sent me copies of translations of the holy book. Among the senders was Dr. Mahomed Ali, himself a translator, and the late Mr. Pickthall, also a translator of the book. I was presented by the late Hakimsaheb Ajmal Khan with Maulana Shibli's translation. Have I changed or have the times so changed that it has become a crime for a non-Muslim like me to read and even dare to put his own interpretation upon the Koran? Many pious Muslims have remarked that I am a better Muslim than most Muslims in that I act in the spirit of the Koran and know more of the life of the Prophet than most Muslims. Whose testimony am I to accept—these Muslim friends', or the research scholar's and of those who think like him—I wonder.

The research scholar is right in imputing to me the desire to read my meaning into the Koran. Surely, there is no harm in it so long as I remain absolutely faithful to the text and approach my task with a prayerful and open mind. My correspondent should know as a scholar that an interpretation of a life or a book is not necessarily correct because it has been handed down for generations. An error does not cease to be one after a given number of repetitions by a given number of men for a given number of years. The Biblical texts are still being corrected. And many good Christians believe that the Christianity of the West is a negation of Christ's central teaching. It is just possible that the research scholar's views about the qualifications required for reading and interpreting the Koran and his own interpretation are wrong, and that my being a non-Muslim is no bar to my reading the Koran or interpreting it. And it is not at all impossible that my interpretation may be found to be right. It will be an evil day if the reading and the interpreting of religious books are to be confined only to those who wear particular religious labels. I ask my correspondent and his companions, as their friend, to shed what, in my opinion, is their gross intolerance and give the same credit to others for seeing truth as they claim for themselves. No one has a monopoly of truth. All truth represented by imperfect humans that we are is relative. We can each act according to our lights. God alone knows the reality. That being so, it behoves research scholars at least to be humble and tolerant. Fanaticism and intolerance can neither conduce to research work nor advance the cause they represent.[129]

Every work labelled as scripture is not necessarily so. Moreover, a scripture to be scientific lends itself to emendations as the times may really require. They must progress with the times if they are to live in the lives of the people. The changeless and universal fundamentals are always very few. They do not require learned treatises to be described. The treatises are built upon these immovable rocks.[130]

6 TEMPLES AND MOSQUES

Idolatry in Hindu Temples

I am both an idolater and an iconoclast in what I conceive to be the true sense of the terms. I value the spirit behind idol-worship. It plays a most important part in the uplift of the human race. And I would like to possess the ability to defend with my life the thousands of holy temples which sanctify this land of ours. My alliance with the Musalmans presupposes their perfect tolerance for my idols and my temples. I am an iconoclast in the sense that I break down the subtle form of idolatry in the shape of fanaticism that refuses to see any virtue in any other form of worshipping the deity, save one's own. This form of idolatry is more deadly for being more fine and evasive than the tangible and gross form of worship that identifies the deity with a little bit of a stone or a golden image.[131]

And what is it that we should be fighting for? We Hindus may be idol-worshippers. We may be mistaken. But when God gave every man the right to make mistakes, when God suffers us to live although we are idol-worshippers, why should not the Musalmans suffer us too? [132]

Idolatry is bad, not so idol-worship. An idolater makes a fetish of his idol. An idol-worshipper sees God even in a stone and, therefore, takes the help of an idol to establish his union with God. Every Hindu child knows that the stone in the famous temple in Banaras is not Kashi Vlshwanath. But he believes that the Lord of the Universe does reside specially in that stone. This play of the imagination is permissible and healthy. Every edition of the Gita on a bookstall has not that sanctity which I ascribe to my own copy. Logic tells me there is no more sanctity in my copy than in any other. The sanctity is in my imagination. But that imagination brings about marvellous, concrete results. It changes men's lives. I am of opinion that whether we admit it or not, we are all idol-worshippers or idolaters, if the distinction I have drawn is not allowed. A book, a building, a picture, a carving, are surely all images in which God does reside, but they are not God. He who says they are errs.[133]

I ask you to accept the slavery of the one Omnipotent God, no matter by what name you address Him. Then you will bend the knee to no man or men. It is ignorance to say that I coupled Rama, a mere man, with God. I have repeatedly made it clear that my Rama is the same as God. My Rama was before, is present now and will be for all time. He is Unborn and Uncreated. Therefore, you should tolerate and respect the different

faiths. I am myself an iconoclast, but I have equal regard for the so-called idolaters. Those who worship idols also worship the same God who is everywhere, even in a clod of earth, even in a nail that is pared off. I have Muslim friends whose names are Rahim, Rahman, Karim. Will I, therefore, join on to them the name of God when I address them as Rahim, Karim, or Rahman? [134]

Some dub Hindus as image worshippers but it is not the stone image which they worship but the God within, without whom not a particle of matter exists. If a devotee sees God in an image, it is not a thing for anyone to cavil at. Granting that his belief is a delusion, it deludes nobody but himself. It requires magnanimity and breadth of outlook to understand and appreciate the religious convictions and practices of others. It is the same thing if they considered the Koran or the Granth Saheb as God.[135]

Desecration of places of worship

I hinted last week that there was evidently an organization at the back of the mania for desecrating Hindu temples. Gulbarga is the latest instance in point. Whatever the Hindu provocation, if there was any, the Musalman outburst has an ominous look about it. The desecration of temples cannot be justified in any circumstance, whatsoever... I feel, perhaps more keenly than most of them, every fanatic outburst on the part of Musalmans. I am fully aware of my responsibility in the matter. I know that many Hindus feel that I am responsible for many of these outbursts. For, they argue, I contributed the largest share to the awakening of the Musalman masses. I appreciate the charge. Though I do not repent of my contribution, I feel the force of the objection. Therefore, if for no other reason, for this at least of greater responsibility, I must feel more keenly than most Hindus can, these desecrations.

...The law of retaliation we have been trying since the day of Adam and we know from experience that it has hopelessly failed. We are groaning under its poisonous effect. Above all, the Hindus may not break mosques against temples. That way lies slavery and worse. Even though a thousand temples may be reduced to bits, I would not touch a single mosque and expect thus to prove the superiority of my faith to the so-called faith of fanatics. I would love to hear of priests dying at their posts in defence of their temples and their idols. Let them learn to suffer and to die in the defence of their temples, even as God allows Himself to be insulted and broken up in the insult and damage done to the idols in which, being omnipresent, He undoubtedly resides. Hindus

will not defend their religion or their temples by seeking to destroy mosques, and thus proving themselves as fanatical as the fanatics who have been desecrating temples.

To the unknown Musalmans who are undoubtedly behind these desecrations, I submit: "Remember that Islam is being judged by your conduct. I have not found a single Musalman defending these outbursts, not even under provocation. There seems to me to have been little, if any, provocation offered by the Hindus. But let us assume that it was otherwise, that the Hindus played music near mosques to exasperate the Musalmans, that [they] even removed a stone from a minaret. Yet I venture to say that the Musalmans ought not to have desecrated the Hindu temples. Even retaliation has its limits. The Hindus prize their temples above their lives. It is possible to contemplate with some degree of equanimity injury to life but not to temples.

...I have been trying to find proof for the allegations about Hindu desecration in the places referred to in my article on the Hindu-Muslim tension. I have failed to receive any proof in support of them. You will not enhance the reputation of Islam by the acts reported about Amethi, Shambhar, and Gulbarga. If you will permit me to say so, I feel about the honour of Islam as much as I feel about my own religion. This I do because I desire to live in perfect, open and hearty friendship with the Musalmans. I cannot help saying that these desecrations are cutting a deep wound in my heart.[136]

If it could be proved, whilst I would still hold, under every conceivable circumstance, desecration of temples and I equally of mosques to be unjustified from my point of view, I admitted that my condemnation would lose much of its force. I should be deeply hurt and ashamed, if the alleged Hindu desecration in Gulbarga was found to be true.[137]

A simple *pujari* not knowing the meaning of non-violence told me with some glee that when a mob entered his temple to break his idols, he carefully hid himself away. Such a man I hold to be unfit to be a *pujari*. He should have died at his post. He would then have sanctified the idol with his blood. He would have been justified in killing the intruders, if he had not the courage to die at his post with a prayer on his lips that God might have pity on the assailants. But it was unmanly for him to have hidden himself to save his perishable skin. The truth is that cowardice itself is violence of a subtle and, therefore, dangerous type, and far more difficult to eradicate than the habit of physical violence. A coward never risks his life. A man who would kill often risks it. A non-violent person's life is always at the disposal of him who would take it.

For he knows that the soul within never dies. The encasing body is ever perishing. The more a man gives his life, the more he saves it. Thus, non-violence requires more than the courage of the soldier of war. The Gita definition of a soldier is one who does not know what it is to run away from danger.[138]

If some misdirected individual took it into his head to desecrate a temple or break idols, should a Hindu in return desecrate a mosque on that account? Does it anyway help to protect the temple or to save the cause of Hinduism? Personally, I am as much an idol-worshipper as an idol-breaker, and I suggest that the whole of the audience, whether Hindu, Muslim or any other, are also so, whether they admit it or not. I know that mankind thirsted for symbolism.

Are not *masjids* or churches in reality the same as *mandirs?* God resides everywhere, no less in stock or stone than in a single hair on the body of man. But men associate sacredness with particular places and things more than with others. Such sentiment is worthy of respect when it does not mean restrictions on similar freedom for others. To every Hindu and Musalman my advice is that, if there is compulsion anywhere, they should gently but firmly refuse to submit to it. Personally, I myself would hug an idol and lay down my life to protect it rather than brook any restriction upon my freedom of worship. That requires courage of a higher order than is needed in violent resistance.[139]

I had visited a mosque in the village Bola which was damaged during the disturbances. I was told that on the *Holi* day the mosque was again desecrated by some villagers who played *Holi* inside the mosque premises. If it is true it is undoubtedly a notice given by them to the Muslims not to enter their homes even when they are rebuilt nor dare to visit the mosque. If this reported desecration on the *Holi* day is a fact, it is a bad omen for the Hindus, for Bihar and for the whole country.[140]

If...any attempt at desecration of the *Gurudwaras* is made by the Muslims, it will be contrary to the tradition of Islam as I know it. And those Muslims who take part in such desecration would be partakers in the destruction of Islam. Every faith is on its trial in India. God is the infallible judge and the world which is His creation will judge the Muslim leaders not according to their pledges and promises but according to the deeds of these leaders and their followers. What I have said of the Muslim leaders is also true of the leaders and followers of other faiths.[141]

Do not look to any other power outside yourselves for the protection of these shrines. I would like every Sikh to be a defender of his faith and, therefore, of all the *Gurudwaras* and not merely of Panja Saheb, which is one of the greatest.[142]

An idol has no value unless it is duly installed in a consecrated place by duly qualified devotees. Forcible possession of a mosque disgraces Hinduism and Sikhism. It is the duty of the Hindus to remove the idols from the mosques and repair the damage. I have not heard of any mosque being turned into a *Gurudwara*. The Sikhs worship the Guru Granth Saheb. It will be an insult to the Granth Saheb if it is placed in a mosque.[143]

Reparations

Not perhaps eight miles from here is the mausoleum of Kutubuddin Bakhtiyarkaki Chishtisaheb which is reputed to be second in sanctity to the one in Ajmer. Both are visited not only by Muslims but by thousands of Hindus and other non-Muslims in equal veneration. Hindu wrath visited the sacred place in early September last. The Muslims in the surroundings felt compelled to vacate their favourite home which had been such for close on four centuries. It would be unnecessary to mention this tragic occurrence but for the fact that the place is still deserted by the Muslims, however much they may be devoted to the mausoleum. It behoves the Hindus, the Sikhs, the officials immediately in charge and the Ministers to wipe out the disgrace and reinstate the place in all its original glory. What I have said here is equally applicable to all the Muslim places of worship in and around Delhi and elsewhere in the Union. It is high time that both the Governments by their firm action made it clear to their respective majorities that they could no longer tolerate desecration of the places of worship, big or insignificant. All damage done to them should be repaired without delay.[144]

I am also distressed to see the costly marble trellis damaged. It is no answer to say that similar or worse things have happened in Pakistan. Have we fallen so low as to stoop to such acts of vandalism? Granting that such incidents have occurred on a larger scale in Pakistan, it will be improper to institute comparisons in evil doing. Even if the whole world did wrong, should we do likewise? If today I take to evil courses, will it not distress you? For me it will be worse than death. Similarly, we have reason to feel ashamed at the damage done to the *Dargah*. It behoves them all to show to such a holy place the veneration due to it.[145]

7 'MUSIC BEFORE MOSQUES'

The thing became clear in Nellore when the problem confronted me in a concrete shape. The relations between the two were none too happy. They fought only about two years ago over what appeared to me to be a small matter. It was the eternal question of playing music whilst passing mosques.[146]

The question of music before mosques, and now, even *arati* in Hindu temples, has occupied my prayerful attention. This is a sore point with the Musalmans as cow-slaughter is with the Hindus.[147]

The trouble about music...is fast growing every day. A letter I had in Surat says that, as it is not obligatory on a Hindu to play music, he should stop it before mosques to spare the feelings of the Musalmans. I wish the question is as simple as the correspondent thinks. But it is the opposite of simple. Not a single Hindu religious ceremony can be performed without the accompaniment of music. Some ceremonies require the accompaniment of continuous music. No doubt, even here due regard ought to be had for the feelings of the Musalmans. The music may in such cases be less noisy. But all this can be and ought to be done on the basis of 'give and take'. Having talked with a number of Musalmans in the matter, I know that Islam does not make it obligatory for Musalman to prevent a non-Musalman from playing music near mosques. Nor is such a thing on the part of a non-Musalman calculated to injure Islam. Music should never, therefore, be a bone of contention.[148]

I have heard of a peremptory demand for total cessation of music, soft or loud, at any time whatsoever in front of mosques. There is, too, a demand for the stopping of *arati* during prayer hours in temples in the neighbourhood of mosques. I heard in Calcutta that even boys passing by a mosque early in the morning and reciting Ramanama were stopped.[149]

Religious necessity

I hold that we may not dignify every trifle into a matter of deep religious importance. Therefore, a Hindu may not insist on playing music whilst passing a mosque. He may not even quote precedents in his own or any other place for the sake of playing music. It is not a matter of vital importance for him to play music whilst passing a mosque.

One can easily appreciate the Musalman sentiment of having solemn silence near a mosque the whole of the twenty-four hours.[150]

Either continuous music, *arati* or the repeating of Ramanama is a religious necessity or it is not. If it is a religious necessity, no prohibition order by a court of law can be held obligatory. Music must be played, *arati* must be made and Ramanama repeated, cost what it may. If my formula were accepted, a procession of the meekest men and women, unarmed even with *lathis,* would march with Ramanama on their lips, supposing that that was the bone of contention, and draw down on their heads the whole of the Musalman wrath. But, if they would not accept that formula, they would still proceed with the sacred name on their lips and fight every inch of the ground. But to stop music for fear of a row or because of an order of court is to deny one's religion.[151]

But then there is the other side to the question is continuous playing of music, even while passing mosques at prayer time, always a religious necessity? Is repeating of Ramanama a similar necessity? What about the charge that the fashion nowadays is to organize processions purely for the sake of irritating Musalmans, and to make *arati* just at the time of the prayer, and to utter Ramanama not because it is held religiously necessary, but in order to create an occasion for a fight? If such be the case, it will defeat its own end and, naturally the zest being wanting, a court's order, a military display or a shower of brick-bats would end the irreligious show.

A religious necessity must, therefore, be clearly established. Every semblance of irritation must be avoided. A mutual understanding should be sincerely sought. And where it is not possible, an irreducible minimum should be fixed making due allowance for the opposite sentiment, and then, without seeking the intervention of courts or in spite of a prohibition order, a fight must be put up for that minimum. Let no one charge me with ever having advised or encouraged weakness or surrender on matters of principle. But I have said, as I say again, that every trifle must not be dignified into a principle. [152]

Use of compulsion

Hindus and Musalmans prate about no compulsion in religion. What is it but compulsion if Hindus will kill a Musalman for saving a cow? It is like wanting to convert a Musalman to Hinduism by force. And, similarly, what is it but compulsion if Musalmans seek to

prevent by force Hindus from playing music before mosques? Virtue lies in being absorbed in one's prayers in the presence of din and noise. We shall both be voted irreligious savages by posterity if we continue to make a futile attempt to compel one another to respect our religious wishes.[153]

And just as the Hindus cannot compel the Musalmans to refrain from killing cows, so can the Musalmans not compel the Hindus to stop music or *arati* at the point of the sword. They must trust to the good sense of the Hindus...

But the Musalmans should never expect to stop Hindu music by force. To yield to the threat or actual use of violence is a surrender of one's self-respect and religious conviction. But a person, who never will yield to threat, would always minimize and, if possible, even avoid occasions for causing irritation.[154]

For the Hindus, cow-protection and the playing of music even near the mosque is the substance of Hinduism, and for the Musalmans cow-killing and prohibition of music is the substance of Islam. It is, therefore, necessary that the Hindus abandon the idea of compelling Musalmans to stop cow-killing, and the Musalmans the idea of compelling the Hindus to stop music.[155]

The middle-class people must be prepared for a beating, if they wish to play music in the teeth of opposition, or they must befriend Musalmans in a self-respecting manner.[156]

In many places, however, the Musalmans have forcibly sought to stop Hindus from playing music. This is clearly intolerable. What is readily yielded to courtesy is never yielded to force. Submission to a courteous request is religion, submission to force is irreligion. If the Hindus stop music for fear of a beating from the Musalmans, they cease to be Hindus.[157]

Accommodation

As a Hindu, I would certainly advise Hindus, without any bargaining spirit, to consult the sentiment of their Musalman neighbour, and wherever they can, accommodate him. I have heard that in some places, the Hindus, purposely and with the deliberate intention of irritating the Musalmans, perform *arati* just when the Musalman prayers commence. This is an insensate and unfriendly act. Friendship presupposes the utmost attention to the feelings of a friend. It never requires consideration.[158]

...It is clear that we have not arrived at the stage when a pact is even a possibility. There can be, it is clear to me, no question of bargain about cow-slaughter and music. On either side, it must be a voluntary effort and therefore, can never be the basis of a pact. [159]

General principles

The general rule in this respect may be said to be this, that where the Hindus have long been deliberately observing the custom to stop music before mosques, they must not break it. But where they have been playing music without interference, the practice should continue. Where trouble is apprehended and facts are disputed, both communities ought to refer the matter to arbitration.

Where a court of law has prohibited music, the Hindus should not take the law in their own hands. And the Musalmans should not insist on stopping music by force.

Where the Musalmans refuse to yield, or where the Hindus apprehend violence, and where there is no prohibition by a court of law, the Hindus must take out their processions with music accompanying, and put up with all the beating inflicted on them. All those who join such processions or who form the musical band must thus sacrifice themselves. They will thereby defend their faith and their self-respect.[160]

The regulation of cow-slaughter and playing of music must be left to the goodwill of the respective communities. Each practice would assume a becoming proportion with the growth of the tolerant spirit.[161]

For me, music before mosques is not on a par with cow-slaughter. But it has assumed an importance which it would be folly to ignore. It is for the Musalmans to say what would spare Musalman feelings. And if complete stoppage of music before mosques will be the only thing that will spare the Musalman feelings, it is the duty of the Hindus to do so without a moment's thought. If we are to reach unity of hearts, we must each be prepared to perform an adequate measure of sacrifice.[162]

They [music before mosques, cow-slaughter etc.] are questions of law. I want to capture your hearts and see you welded into one. If this is attained, everything else will right itself. If your hearts are not united, nothing can be right. Your unfortunate lot will then be slavery.[163]

I had to listen not without shame and sorrow to the statement that a Muslim friend made to me. He said with a sigh that there is nothing left but a kind of subjection to the Hindu majority, and they might have to suffer in silence the playing of music before mosques whilst they were offering prayers. I shall have no such despair on the part of Muslims. The friend, who made the remark, did not realize that he unconsciously implied that the Muslim majority would inflict revenge in Pakistan. I hope it will never be so either in Hindustan or Pakistan. The proper thing is for each majority to do their duty in all humility, irrespective of what the other majority does in the other State. I suggest, therefore, that until the Prime Ministers of Pakistan and the Union agree upon another course in both the States, the practice that was followed during the British regime, often under compulsion, should be fully and voluntarily followed in both the States. Those who think that they can haughtily impose their will on the minority are foolish and are vastly mistaken. If, therefore, you want to consolidate the prevailing goodwill, you will see to it that you act on the square under all circumstances.[164]

8 CONGREGATIONAL PRAYER

No act of mine is done without prayer. Man is a fallible being. He can never be sure of his steps. What he may regard as answer to prayer may be an echo of his pride. For infallible guidance man has to have a perfectly innocent heart incapable of evil. I can lay no such claim. Mine is a struggling, striving, erring, imperfect soul. But I can rise only by experimenting upon myself and others.[165]

When I came to India in 1915, Gurudev invited me through the late Deenabandhu Andrews to stay at Santiniketan along with the inmates of the Phoenix Settlement Kakasaheb and Harihar Sharma were there and so were the late Deenabandhu Andrews and Pearson. These friends had created a sort of South African group at the place. The prayer which was observed at that early time by the small group practically continues to this day so far as the Sanskrit part is concerned.

While on my Harijan tour in Travancore, I added the first verse of the Ishopanishad to it, as, in my opinion, it contains the cream of Hindu spiritual thought. Later on, Raihana Tyebji, who is noted for her musical talents, proposed the incorporation of a passage from the Koran Shareef, and this was done. Lastly, on Kasturba's death at the Aga Khan Palace, Dr. Gilder had recited a passage from the Zoroastrian scripture. Since then that prayer has been a part of the Ashram prayer. In addition there was a *bhajan* in an Indian language or an English hymn and Ramadhun.[166]

When I broke my last fast in jail, Dr. Gilder recited a verse from the Zend Avesta and ever since the Parsi verse has also been included in my prayers...By using these prayers and singing the Ramadhun as I do, I do not take away from, but add to, the glory of the name of Rama.[167]

The prayer which has thus taken shape can, on no account, be considered as belonging to any single community or religion. It is of universal appeal; and no one, whatever his denomination may be, should have hesitation in sharing it.[168]

Verse from Koran

How can it be a sin to chant God's name in Arabic? [169]

The verse from the Koran that is being recited, is a mighty prayer in praise of God. How does it harm the Hindu religion if the prayer is recited in the Arabic language? He

who says so knows neither his religion nor his duty. That prayer can also be recited in a temple.

I have been told by a friend that a prayer with the same meaning is also found in the Yajurveda. Those who have studied the Hindu scriptures know that among the 108 Upanishads there is one called the Allopanishad. Did not the man who wrote it know his religion? It is said that Guru Nanak himself went to Arabia in search of truth during his religious wanderings.[170]

If every word of it were enshrined in your hearts you will be uplifted and be the better for it. No one objects to the translation* because it is in Hindi, but the moment I read it in Arabic, there are objections. I plead with you to see the folly of your ways. I hope you would pray to God to lighten your darkness.[171]

In regard to the verse from the Koran, one friend says that there is no difference except the difference between the Arabic and Sanskrit languages in the spirit of what the Koran verse says and what is contained in the Upanishad *shlokas*. I maintain that I have the right to praise God in whatever language I choose.[172]

I am of opinion that the addition enriched the prayer. It reached the hearts of a larger audience than before. It certainly showed Hinduism in its broad and tolerant aspect. The questioner ought also to have asked why the prayer commenced with the Buddhist prayer in Japanese. The selections of the stanzas of the prayer has a history behind it befitting the sacred character. The Buddhist prayer was the prayer with which the whole of Sevagram resounded in the early morning, when a good Japanese monk was staying at the Sevagram Ashram and by his silent and dignified conduct had endeared himself to the inmates of the Ashram.[173]

Mutual respect

Culture and good breeding require that we should observe silence when others say their prayers. There should be mutual respect. All worship the same God, whatever their religion.[174]

Objections

The objection [that it was wrong for him, a non-Muslim, to recite anything from the Koran or to couple Rama and Krishna with Rahim and Karim,] gives me a painful surprise. I think that the objection betrays narrowness of mind.[175]

I am not one to refrain from doing what I hold to be my duty, but my non-violence dictates that even if a boy rejects to my holding the prayer meeting, I should refrain from doing so. But this should in no way be interpreted as cowardice. I do not hold the prayers in order to prevent argument and violence. Violence is the work of the devil and all my life I have fought against it.[176]

An objection [to holding prayers in a Hindu temple] only the Harijans of that place can raise. The Harijans of the place are sad at the happenings of the last three days. They are my younger brothers. I am a Bhangi, and it is the duty of a true Bhangi and, therefore, a true Hindu to cleanse not only the dirt of the body but also all the pollution of the mind and the spirit. The true Hindu sees Truth in every religion. The essence of the Koran verse is found in every religion.

The Vedas are from time immemorial. So are the Upanishads. But they are imperfectly known. Any Impurities that have crept in any of the scriptures are due to the fact that they were written many years later. The Hindu religion is a great religion and has infinite toleration and powers of absorption in it. God is everywhere as the Harijan woman-saint told her young questioner. He is the ruler of men's hearts. He only wants single-minded worship in whatsoever form and whatsoever language it be. It is, therefore, wholly un-Hindu and irreligious to object to the great verse from the Koran Sharif being recited.

Ready far martyrdom

I shall ask those who are against my holding the prayer meeting not to come, or if they did, they should come by themselves and kill me if they wanted to. Even if I am killed, I shall not give up repeating the names of Rama and Rahim, which means to me the same God. With these names on my lips I shall die cheerfully.

If I refrain from repeating the names of Rama and Rahim, how am I to face the Hindus of Noakhali and the Muslims of Bihar?

Those who want the prayer to be held should not entertain anger or malice towards the obstructionists but to pity them. Anger and desire for revenge are no service to Hinduism.

It has hurt me much to think that on three days we have not been able to hold the prayer and hundreds have been disappointed because of the unenlightened objection

of a few. But, if prayer has been in our hearts we really have not missed the worship. I myself am grateful to the objectors because they have given me ample opportunity for heart searching. I have asked myself whether, because I have not been able to calm them, there is anything against them in my heart. If we have understood the inner meaning of the *bhajan* sung today, we should have understood that it is right for us to take everything that came from God as a gift. I feel glad that I have gone through the test. Even if three or four have said that they would kill me for saying Rama and Rahim in the same breath, I hope I shall die smiling with those very names on my lips.

Prayers in Noakhali

In Noakhali, it was difficult to have the Ramadhun but there, too, was able to continue my customary worship. All will be well if there is no anger or malice in our hearts. I implore you not to degrade Hinduism by not understanding your immortal scriptures. Everyone should be at liberty to pray as he likes.[177]

The argument that I cannot recite Gita in a mosque and that no Muslims will read a verse from any scripture other than their own is a fallacious one. I have held prayers in Muslim houses and in Noakhali I have held them in the compound of a mosque. The person in charge has raised no objection and has said that it is perfectly legitimate to call God by the names of Rama and Rahim...[178]

If both Rahim and Rama are names of God, why use the two? Would not only Rama suffice? God is supposed to have a thousand names in the Hindu scriptures. What if He has 40 crores of names? It is open to everyone to call Him by as many names as he wants to for his spiritual satisfaction.

No vindictiveness

I am accused of trying to please the Muslims. If he did, what harm is there? Some Muslims may want to hurt me, but that does not mean that I am to hurt them in return.[179]

Mere shouting of slogans will not carry Hinduism anywhere. I am at a loss to understand why some Hindus object to my reading the Koran verses in my prayer. If at places the Muslims have not behaved as they should, then it does not mean that the Hindus should retaliate by opposing the reading of the Koran.[180]

I refute the argument that because some Muslim fanatics have done evil deeds in Bengal and in the Punjab, the Koran Sharif is bad. The Hindus have gone mad in Bihar, but this does not take away from the greatness of the Gita. I may understand your not wishing to admit Muslim wrong-doers into your homes, though even that is wholly contrary to the spirit of religion, all of which teaches man to love his enemies. But not to wish to read a verse from any scripture, simply because hate for the followers of that religion fills your hearts, is the negation of true religion and far from protecting Hinduism, is the very way to destroy it.[181]

There is no sense in objecting to any part of the prayer because it is selected from the Koran or from any other scripture. Whatever may be the shortcomings of certain Muslims (no matter what at their number is), the objection cannot apply to a whole community much less to the Prophet or any other or his message. I have gone through the whole of the Koran. I have gained by it, not lost by it. I feel that I am a better Hindu for the reading of the world's scriptural books. I know that there are hostile critics of the Koran. A friend from Bombay who has many Muslim friends has put before me a conundrum. What is the teaching of the Prophet about the Kafirs? Are not the Hindus Kafirs according to the Koran? I have long come to the conclusion that they are not. But I spoke to my Muslim friends about the matter. They speak from knowledge. They assure me that Kafir in the Koran means a non-believer. They say that the Hindus are not because they believe in one God. If we go by what the hostile critics say, we would condemn the Koran and the Prophet as we would condemn Krishna who is depicted as a dissolute being having sixteen hundred Gopis. My Krishna is immaculate. I will never bow my head before a rake.[182]

Love, tolerance

I am hurt that such objections can come from a woman. I expect love and toleration in a higher degree from women than from men. I wonder where we are drifting, and what women will or can teach their children if their hearts are permeated with hate.[183] The thoughtless interference at prayer meetings is not a small symptom of the disease I am describing. Intolerance is a form of *goondaism*. It is no less disgraceful than the savagery which we see announced in the daily press.[184]

A prayer meeting is not a debating assembly. It is possible to conceive prayer meetings of many communities on the same plot of land. Decency requires that those who are

opposed to particular prayers would abstain from attending the meetings they object to. The reverse would make any meeting impossible without disturbance. Freedom of worship, even of public speech, would become a farce if interference became the order of the day. In decent society the exercise of this elementary right should not need the protection of the bayonet. It should command universal acceptance.[185]

You are entitled to resent the treatment of the Hindus and the Sikhs in Pakistan. But this should not make you resent recitation from Koran. The Gita, the Koran, the Bible, the Granth Saheb and the Zend Avesta contain gems of wisdom although the followers may belie their teachings.[186]

I have noticed with great joy at the annual sessions of the Congress on its exhibition grounds several meetings held by religious sects or political parties holding their gatherings, expressing divergent and often diametrically opposite views without molestation and without any assistance from the police. There have been departures from this fundamental rule and they have excited public condemnation. Where is that spirit of healthy toleration gone now? Is it because, having gained our political freedom, we are testing it by abusing it? Let us hope it is only a passing phase in the nation's life. [187]

I am glad that the people are open enough to register their objection. I do not like to think that they come not to share the worship of God but merely to see me or hear me because I am called a *mahatma* or because of my long service of the nation. The prayer is all inclusive. God is known by many names. In the last analysis the names are as many as human beings. It is rightly said that even animals, birds and stones adore God. You will find in the *Bhajanavali*** a hymn by a Muslim saint which says that the chirp of birds in the morning and evening signifies that they adore their Maker. The God you worship with me every evening is in everyone and is all powerful. Therefore, you can have no enemy and you can fear none because God is in you and by you every moment. Such being the nature of the congregational worship, I shall prefer to have no such worship if you cannot, with your whole heart and without reservation, join the prayer. If you can, you will find that you daily gather strength to enable you to dispel the darkness that surrounds you.[188]

---

* In order to escape from the evil one I seek refuge in God.

Oh God, I begin every task with the remembrance of Thy name.

Thou art the compassionate and the merciful.

Thou art the Creator of the universe.

Thou art Lord and Master.

I praise Thee alone and desire only Thy help.

Thou will mete out justice on the Day of judgement.

Show me the right path, the path which Thy saints have trod, not the wrong path of those who have offended Thee.

God is one.

He is eternal, all-powerful, un-create.

There is none other like Him. He has created all things.

None has created Him.

** Published by the Navajivan Press, Ahmedabad, Price 0.50, Postage etc. 0.25

9 COW-SLAUGHTER AND COW-PROTECTION

Cause of friction

Save for the cow, the Hindus have no ground for quarrel with Musalmans.[189]

The first [constant cause of friction] is cow-slaughter. Though, I regard cow-protection as the central fact of Hinduism, central because it is common to the classes as well as the masses, I have never been able to understand the antipathy towards the Musalmans on that score. We say nothing about the slaughter that daily takes place on behalf of Englishmen. Our anger becomes red-hot when a Musalman slaughters a cow. All the riots that have taken place in the name of cow have been an insane waste of effort. They have not saved a single cow, but they have, on the contrary, stiffened the backs of the Musalmans and resulted in more slaughter.[190]

No obligation

The latter [Musalmans] are under no religious obligation to slaughter a cow.[191]

The Koran, so far as I have been able to understand it, declares it to be a sin to take the life of any living being without cause. I want to develop the capacity to convince the Musalmans that to kill the cow is practically to kill their fellow countrymen and friends—the Hindus. The Koran says that there can be no heaven for one who sheds the blood of an innocent neighbour.[192]

Beef-eating

The standing complaint of Hindus against Musalmans is that the latter are beef-eaters and that they purposely sacrifice cows on the *Bakr-Id* day.[193]

It is generally known that I am a staunch vegetarian and food reformer. But it is not equally generally known that Ahimsa extends as much to human beings as to lower animals and that I freely associate with meat-eaters.

Hindus may not compel Musalmans to abstain from meat or even beef-eating. Vegetarian Hindu may not compel other Hindus to abstain from fish, flesh or fowl. I would not make India sober at the point of the sword. Nothing has lowered the morale of the nation so much as violence...

No reform by compulsion

As a Musalman friend writes, beef-eating which is merely permissible in Islam will become a duty, if compulsion is resorted to by Hindus.[194]

Once, while in Champaran, I was asked to expound my views regarding cow-protection. I told my Champaran friends then that, if anybody was really anxious to save the cow, he ought once for all to disabuse his mind of the notion that he had to make the Christians and Musalmans to desist from cow-killing. Unfortunately, today we seem to believe that the problem of cow-protection consists merely in preventing non-Hindus, especially Musalmans, from beef-eating and cow-killing. That seems to be absurd. Let no one, however, conclude from this that I am indifferent when a non-Hindu kills a cow or that I can bear the practice of cow-killing. On the contrary, no one probably experiences a greater agony of the soul when a cow is killed. But what am I to do? Am I to fulfil my *dharma* myself or am I to get fulfilled by proxy? Of what avail would be my preaching *brahmacharya* to others if I am at the same time steeped in vice myself? How can I ask Musalmans to desist from eating beef when I eat myself? But supposing even that I myself do not kill the cow, is it any part of my duty to make the Musalman, against his will, to do likewise?[195]

The very Hindus who quarrel with the Muslims because they slaughter the cow for the beef she gives are not ashamed to accept the mastery of the English who are known to be beef-eaters in a sense in which the Muslims never are. I have no quarrel with the Englishmen because they eat beef and as such I have none with the Muslims either. I am concerned with showing the great inconsistency of the Hindus who for the sake of money gladly serve their English masters and quarrel with the Muslims. Then we forget that there are Hindus who gladly partake of beef. I have known orthodox Vaishnavas who eat beef-extract when it was prescribed by their doctors.[196]

Freedom of food.

I do not know how this question [Will the Muslims be allowed to eat their national food—beef—under a Hindu majority Government?] arises. For, whilst Congressmen were in office, they are not known to have interfered with the practice of beef-eating by Muslims. The question is also badly conceived. There is no such thing as a Hindu-majority Government...

It is, moreover, not true to say that beef is the *national* food of Muslims. In the first place, the Muslims of India are not as yet a separate nation. In the second, beef is not their ordinary food. Their ordinary food is the same as that of the millions. What is true is that there are very few Muslims who are vegetarians from a religious motive. Therefore, they will take meat, including beef, when they can get it. But during the greater part of the year millions of Muslims, owing to poverty, go without meat of any kind. These are facts. But the theoretical question demands a clear answer. As a Hindu, a confirmed vegetarian, and a worshipper of the cow whom I regard with the same veneration as I regard my mother (alas, no more on this earth!), I maintain that Muslims should have full freedom to slaughter cows, if they wish, subject of course to hygienic restrictions and in a manner not to wound the susceptibilities of their Hindu neighbours. Fullest recognition of freedom to the Muslims to slaughter cows is indispensable for communal harmony, and is the only way of saving the cow.[197]

Essence of Hinduism

Hinduism does not consist in eating and not eating. Its essence consists in right conduct, in correct observance of truth and non-violence. Many a man eating meat, but observing the cardinal virtues of compassion and truth and living in the fear of God, is a better Hindu than a hypocrite who abstains from meat.

He whose eyes are opened to the truth of the violence in beef-eating or meat-eating and who has therefore rejected them, who loves 'both man and bird and beast' is worthy of our adoration. He has seen and known God; he is His best devotee. He is the teacher of mankind.[198]

Cow-protection and Khilafat

The only chance Hindus have of saving the cow in India from the butcher's knife is by trying to save Islam from the impending peril, and trusting their Musalman countrymen to return nobility, i.e., voluntarily to protect the cow out of regard for their Hindu countrymen...

The best and the only way to save the cow is to save the Khilafat. I hope, therefore, that every non-co-operator will strain himself to the utmost to prevent the slightest tendency to violence in any shape or form whether to protect the cow or any other animal, or to effect any other purpose.[199]

The Hindus' participation in the Khilafat is the greatest and the best movement for cow-protection. I have, therefore, called Khilafat our *Kamadhuk*.

The Musalmans are striving their utmost to respect Hindu susceptibilities in this matter of life and death to the Hindu. The Muslim League under Hakimji Ajmalkhan's presidentship carried a cow-protection resolution at Amritsar, two years ago. Maulana Abdul Bari has written upon it. The Ali Brothers, for the sake of their Hindu countrymen, have given up the use of beef in their house. Mian Chhotani saved hundreds of cows in Bombay alone during the last *Bakr-Id*. We could not accuse our Musalman countrymen of apathy in the matter.

The surest way of defeating our object is to rush Musalmans. I do not know that Musalman honour has ever been found wanting. With them, as with every one, prejudices die hard. We have got enlightened Musalman opinion with us. It must take time for it to react upon the Musalman masses. The Hindus must therefore be patient.[200]

The way to save the cow is not to kill or quarrel with the Musalman. The way to save the cow is to die in the act of saving the Khilafat without mentioning the cow.[201]

Muslim response

It is not correct to say that the appeal of the Khilafat associations against cow-killing leaves the Musalmans cold and unresponsive. In the first place, is it not a cheering phenomenon that Khilafat workers, themselves Musalmans, are working to prevent cow-killing? In the second place, I venture assure... that the appeal has had wonderful success in almost all parts of India. Is it a small matter that the burden of cow-protection has been taken over almost entirely by Musalman workers? Was it not a soul stirring thing for Hindus to witness Messrs. Chhotani and Khatri of Bombay rescuing hundreds of cows from their religionists and presenting them to the grateful Hindus?[202]

I have been telling Maulana Shaukat Ali all along that I was helping him to save his cow, i.e., the Khilafat, because I hoped to save my cow thereby. I am prepared to place my life in the hands of the Musalmans, to live merely on their sufferance. Why? Simply that I might be able to protect the cow. I hope to achieve the end not by entering into a bargain with the Musalmans but by bringing about a change of heart in them. So long as this is not done, I hold my soul in patience. For I have not a shadow

of doubt in my mind that such a change of heart can be brought about only by our own correct conduct towards them and by our personal example...

I offered to share with the Musalmans their suffering to the best of my capacity not merely because I wanted their co-operation for winning Swaraj but also because I had in mind the object of saving the cow.[203]

If the Khilafat question had a just and legitimate basis, as I believe it had, and if the Government had really committed a gross injustice, the Hindus were bound to stand by the Musalmans in their demand for the redress of the khilafat wrong. It would ill-become them to bring in the cow question in this connection, or to use the occasion to make terms with the Musalmans, just as it would ill become the Musalmans to offer to stop cow-slaughter as a price for the Hindus' support on the Khilafat question. But it would be another matter and quite graceful, and reflect great credit on them if the Musalmans of their own free will stop cow slaughter out of regard for the religious sentiments of the Hindus, and from a sense of duty towards them as neighbours and children of the same soil. To take up such an independent attitude was, I contended, their duty, and would enhance the dignity of their conduct. But, if the Musalmans considered it as their neighbourly duty to stop cow slaughter, they should do so regardless of whether the Hindu helped them in the Khilafat or not.[204]

I am satisfied that during 1921 more cows were saved through the voluntary and generous efforts of the Musalmans than through Hindu effort during all the previous twenty years (say).[205]

In 1921, thousands of cows were saved by the sole and willing effort of Muslims themselves. In spite of the black clouds hanging over our heads, I refuse to give up the hope that they will disperse and that we shall have communal peace in this unhappy land. If I am asked for proof, I must answer that my hope is based on faith and faith demands no proof. [206]

The late Maulana Abdul Bari used to say that, if the Hindus helped the Muslims to save the Khilafat, the Muslims were bound to save the cow for the sake of the Hindus.[207]

I claim that, without the assistance of law, but because of my being able to cultivate friendship with the Muslims of India during the Khilafat days, I have been instrumental in saving more cows from the butcher’s knife than any other individual.[208]

Cow-protection and Hinduism

Cow-protection is the dearest possession of the Hindu heart. It is the one concrete belief common to all Hindus. No one who does not believe in cow-protection can possibly be a Hindu. It is a noble belief... Cow-worship means to me worship of innocence. For me, the cow is the personification of innocence. Cow-protection means the protection of the weak and the helpless... Cow-protection means brotherhood between man and beast. It is a noble sentiment that must grow by patient toil and *tapasya.* It cannot be imposed upon any one. To carry cow-protection at the point of the sword is a contradiction in terms. *Rishis* of old are said to have performed penance for the sake of the cow. Let us follow in the footsteps of the *Rishis;* and ourselves do penance, so that we may be pure enough to protect the cow and all that the doctrine means and implies.[209]

Central fact

The central fact of Hinduism is cow-protection. Cow-protection to me is one of the most wonderful phenomena in human evolution. It takes the human being beyond his species. The cow to me means the entire sub-human world. Man, through the cow, is enjoined to realize his identity with all that lives.

Why the cow was selected for apotheosis is obvious to me. The cow was, in India, the best companion. She was the giver of plenty. Not only did she give milk, but she also made agriculture possible. The cow is a poem of pity. One reads pity in the gende animal. She is the mother to millions of Indian mankind.

Protection of the cow means protection of the whole dumb creation of God... The appeal of the lower order is all the more forcible because it is speechless. Cow-protection is the gift of Hinduism to the world. And Hinduism will live so long as there are Hindus to protect the cow. Hindus are enjoined to protect the cow by their *tapasya,* by Self-purification, by self-sacrifice...

By every act of cruelty to our cattle, we disown God and Hinduism...

Hindus will be judged not by their *tilaks,* not by the correct chanting of *mantras,* not by their pilgrimages, not by their most punctilious observance of caste rules, but by their ability to protect the cow.[210]

When I pledge myself to save the cow, I do not mean merely the Indian cow, but the cow all the world over. My religion teaches me that I should by my personal conduct instil into the minds of those who might hold different views, the conviction that cow-killing is a sin and that, therefore, it ought to be abandoned. My ambition is no less than to see the principle of cow-protection established throughout the world. But that requires that I should set my own house thoroughly in order first.[211]

Cow-protection to me is infinitely more than mere protection of the cow. The cow is merely a type for all that lives. Cow-protection means protection of the weak, the helpless, the dumb and the deaf. Man becomes then not the Lord and master of all creation but he is its servant. The cow to me is a sermon on pity. So far we are merely playing at cow-protection. But we shall soon have to grapple with reality.[212]

There is serious ignorance about the place of the cow in Hinduism and in the economy of Indian life.[213]

The purport [of a letter from a Muslim who describes himself as a *sufi,]* is that, in his opinion, there is nothing common between Hinduism and Islam and that the two cannot be as if they are one. For, he argues that the Hindus do not believe in one and only God but hold cows and goats as superior to man and believe in high and low, whereas Islam is a brotherhood in which there is no hierarchy and which believes in one God as Allah. In this there is a caricature of Hinduism. There is no Hindu who puts animals, the cow and the goat, before man. But I submit that if anyone like me believes himself to be the lowest in God's creation, there is nothing wrong. It is a sign of true humility.[214]

Not by violence

I believe myself to be an orthodox Hindu and it is my conviction that no one who scrupulously practises the Hindu religion may kill a cow-killer to protect the cow.[215]

I would not kill a human being for protecting a cow, as I will not kill a cow for saving a human life, be it ever so precious...

The cow question is a big question, the greatest for a Hindu. I yield to no one in my regard for the cow. Hindus do not fulfil their trust so long as they do not possess the ability to protect the cow. That ability can be derived either from body-force or soul-

force. To attempt cow-protection by violence is to reduce Hinduism to Satanism and to prostitute to a base end the grand significance of cow protection...

The Hindus must scrupulously refrain from using any violence against Musalmans. Suffering and trust are attributes of soul-force. I have heard that, at big fairs, if a Musalman is found in possession of cows or even goats, he is at times forcibly dispossessed. Those who, claiming to be Hindus, thus resort to violence, are enemies of the cow and of Hinduism.[216]

I make bold to assert without fear of contradiction, that it is not Hinduism to kill a fellowman even to save the cow.[217]

To nurse enmity against the Musalman, for the sake of saving the cow, is a sure way to kill the cow and is doubly sinful. Hinduism will not be destroyed by a non-Hindu killing a cow. The Hindu's religion consists in saving the cow, but it can never be his religion to save the cow by a resort to force towards a non-Hindu.[218]

What profit would it be if I succeed in saving a few cows from death by using force against persons who do not regard cow-killing as sinful?[219]

And if a Musalman thinks that he must slaughter the cow, why should a Hindu stay his hands by force? Why should he not fall on bended knees before him and plead with him? But we will do no such thing. Well then, God will one day make the Musalman and the Hindu do what we will not do today. If you are believers, I beseech you to retire into yourselves and pray to the Indweller to stay your hands from wrong and to make them do the right thing. Let that be our prayer every morning and evening. There is no other way. [220]

Not by Law

There is nothing strange about all the Shikarpur Hindus having voted unanimously in favour of the prohibition of cow-slaughter. Is there a Hindu who will not vote for it? The use of that unanimous opinion for bearing down Musalman opposition is the way to stiffen it. The Hindu members must have known, must have ascertained, Musalman feeling. And they should have refrained from going to a division, so long as Musalman opinion was against them.[221]

The Musalmans claim that Islam permits them to kill the cow. To make a Musalman, therefore, to abstain from cow-killing under compulsion, would amount in my opinion

to converting him to Hinduism by force. Even in India under Swaraj, in my opinion, it would be unwise and improper for a Hindu majority to coerce by legislation a Musalman minority into submission to statutory prohibition of cow-slaughter. [222]

Nevertheless, a large number of vocal Hindus have begun to believe the superstition that the Union belongs to the Hindus and that, therefore, they should enforce their belief by law even among non-Hindus. Hence an emotional wave is sweeping the country, in order to secure legislation prohibiting the slaughter of cows within the Union.

In this state, which I hold, is based on ignorance, claiming to be a knowing lover and devotee; second to none in India, of the cow, I must try in the best manner I can to dispel the ignorance.[223]

Rajendra Babu has told me that he has received about 50,000 post cards, 30,000 letters and thousands of telegrams asking for prohibition of cow-slaughter in the Union of India. A telegram was received today saying that a Pandit has undertaken a fast in Kanpur on that issue. Hindu religion prohibits cow-slaughter for the Hindus, not for the world. Religious prohibition comes from within. Any imposition from without means compulsion. Such compulsion is repugnant to religion. India is the land not only of the Hindus but also of the Muslims, the Sikhs, the Parsis, the Christians, the Jews and all who claim to be of India and are loyal to the Union. If they can prohibit cow-slaughter in India on religious grounds, why cannot the Pakistan Government prohibit, say, idol worship in Pakistan on similar grounds? I am not a temple-goer, but if I am prohibited from going to a temple in Pakistan, I shall make it a point to go there even at the risk of losing my head. Just as *Shariat* cannot be imposed on the non-Muslims, Hindu law cannot be imposed on the non-Hindus.[224]

It is obviously wrong legally to enforce one's religious practice on those who do not share that religion.[225]

The complaint of one writer is why, when slaughter of pigs is prohibited in Pakistan, cow-slaughter cannot be prohibited in the Union? I have no knowledge of legal prohibition of the slaughter of pigs in Pakistan. If the information given by the complainant is true, I am sorry. I know that use of pork for food is prohibited in Islamic law. But even so, I cannot justify the prohibition of the use of pork by those other than Muslims. [226]

By conversion

The conversion of only one party is enough because the solution requires no bargains. For instance, the Hindus should cease to worry the Musalmans about the cow without expecting any consideration from the latter. They should yield to the Musalman demand whatever it may be regarding representation, again without requiring any return. And if the Musalmans insist on stopping the Hindu music or *arati* by force, the Hindus will continue playing it although every single Hindu should die at his post but without retaliation. The Musalmans will then be shamed into doing the right thing in an incredibly short space of time. The Musalmans can do likewise, if they choose, and shame the Hindus into doing the right thing. One has to dare to believe.[227]

I have up to now confined myself to giving general advice. Maulana Hasrat Mohani told me that the Musalmans ought to protect the cow for the sake of the Hindus, and the Hindus should cease to regard the Musalmans as untouchables, as he said they are regarded in North India. I told him: I will not bargain with you in this matter. If the Musalmans think it their duty to protect the cow for the sake of the Hindus, they may do so irrespective of how the Hindus behave towards them. I think it a sin for a Hindu to look upon a Musalman as an untouchable, and the Hindu ought not to do so, irrespective of a Musalman killing or sparing the cow. The Musalman ought to be no more untouchable to a Hindu than a Hindu of any of the four castes is to one of the other. I regard these things as axiomatic. If Hinduism teaches hatred of Islam or of non-Hindus, it is doomed to destruction. Each community should then put its house in order without bargaining with the other.[228]

...I am anxious to establish the best neighbourly relations with the Musalmans. I scrupulously avoid doing anything that might hurt their feelings. I even try to respect their prejudices. But I do this not in a spirit of bargain, I ask them for no reward. For that I look to God only. My Gita tells me that evil can never result from a good action. Therefore, I must help the Musalmans from a pure sense of duty—without making any terms with them. For more cows are killed today for the sake of Englishmen in India than for the Musalmans. I want to convert the former also. I would like to convince them that, whilst they are in our midst, their duty lies in getting rid of their Western culture to the extent that it comes in conflict with ours.[229]

Voluntary self-denial by Muslims

Professor Vaswani has unfurled the banner of the cow's freedom. The danger has come sooner than I had expected. I had hoped that it would come when India could regard it with equanimity. In my humble opinion, Professor Vaswani might have started the movement under better auspices. Any movement started by Hindus for protecting the cow, without whole-hearted Musalman co-operation, is doomed to failure...

It must be an article of faith for every Hindu that the cow can only be saved by Musalman friendship. Let us recognize frankly that complete protection of the cow depends purely upon Musalman goodwill. It is as impossible to bend the Musalmans to our will, as it would he for them to bend us to theirs. We are evolving the doctrine of equal and free partnership. We are fighting Dyerism—the doctrine of frightfulness.[230]

The only effective and honourable way is to befriend the Musalmans and leave it to their honour to save the cow.[231]

It would redound to the credit of Hinduism, if stopping of cow-slaughter was brought about not by force, but as a deliberate voluntary act of self-denial on the part of the Musalmans and others. I would, therefore, deem it unpatriotic even to nurse a dream of Hindu Raj.[232]

I know what would spare the Hindus' feeling in the matter of the cow. It is nothing short of complete voluntary stoppage of cow-slaughter by Musalmans whether for sacrifice or for food. The Hindu *dharma* will not be satisfied if some tyrant secured by force of arms immunity of the cow from the slaughter. Islam in India cannot make a better gift to the Hindus than this voluntary self-denial. And I know enough of Islam to be able to assert that Islam does not compel cow-slaughter and it does compel its followers to spare and respect to the full the feelings of their neighbours whenever it is humanly possible.[233]

The way of Satyagraha

Now it is impossible to unite Hindus and Mohammedans so long as Hindus do not hesitate to kill their Mohammedan brethren in order to protect the cow. For, I think it is futile to expect that our violence will ever compel Mohammedans to refrain from cow-slaughter...

There is one, and only one, means open to a Hindu to protect the cow, and that is that he should offer himself as a sacrifice if he cannot stand its slaughter. Even if a very few enlightened Hindus thus sacrificed themselves, I have no doubt that our Musalman brethren would abandon cow-slaughter. But this is Satyagraha, this is equity; even as, if I want my brother to redress a grievance, I must do so by taking upon my head a certain amount of sacrifice and not by inflicting injury on him. I may not demand it as of right. My only right against my brother is that I can offer myself as a sacrifice. It is only when Hindus are inspired with a feeling of pure love of this type that Hindu-Muslim unity can be expected.[234]

The latter [Hindus] can protect the cow only by developing the faculty for dying, for suffering. [235]

Cow-protection is a process of purification. It is *tapasya,* i.e., self-suffering. When we suffer voluntarily and, therefore, without expectation of reward, the cry of suffering (one might say) literally ascends to heaven, and God above hears it and responds. That is the path of religion, and it has answered even if one man has adopted it *in its entirety*...Hinduism requires its votaries to immolate themselves for the sake of their religion, i.e., for the sake of saving the cow.

The question is how many Hindus are ready, without bargaining with the Musalmans, to die for them and for their religion? If the Hindus can answer it in the religious spirit, they will not only have secured Musalman friendship for eternity, but they will have saved the cow for all time from the Musalmans. Let us not swear even by the greatest among them. They can but help. They cannot undertake to change the hearts of millions of men who have hitherto given no thought to the feeling of their Hindu neighbours when they slaughter the cow. But God Almighty can in a moment change them and move them to pity. Prayer accompanied by adequate suffering is a prayer of the heart. That alone counts with God.[236]

Cow-slaughter and man-slaughter are in my opinion the two sides of the same coin. And the remedy for both is identical, i.e., that we develop the Ahimsa principle and endeavour to win over our opponents by love. The test of love is *tapasya,* which means suffering...

You will...see that even our self-interest requires us to observe Ahimsa. By Ahimsa we shall be able to save the cow and also to win the friendship of the English. I want to

purchase the friendship of all by sacrifice. But if I do not approach the English on bent knees, as I do the Musalmans, it is because the former are intoxicated with power. The Musalman is a fellow sufferer in slavery. We can therefore speak to him as a friend and a comrade...

Cow-protection then can only be secured by cultivating universal friendliness, i.e., Ahimsa. Now you will understand why I regard the question of cow-protection as greater even than that of Swaraj. The fact is that the capacity to achieve the former will suffice for the latter purpose as well.[237]

Cow-protection is not an easy thing. Much money is wasted in its name. Nevertheless, in the absence of Ahimsa the Hindus have become destroyers, instead of saviours, of the cow. It is even more difficult than the removal of foreign rule from India.[238]

Real cow-protection

Let them consider it a shame to have a single cow or her progeny in distress, or undergoing ill-treatment at the hands of Hindus themselves. Let them develop their *goshala* so as to make it a model dairy-farm as well as a home for the aged and infirm cattle. Let them breed the finest cattle in their *goshala*. They will do real service to *gomata.*[239]

Cow-protection should commence with ourselves. In no part of the world, perhaps, are cattle worse treated than in India. I have wept to see Hindu drivers goading their jaded oxen with the iron points of their cruel sticks. The half-starved condition of the majority of our cattle is a disgrace to us. The cows find their necks under the butcher's knife because Hindus sell them.[240]

If ... I am asked how to save the cow, my first advice will be: "Dismiss from your minds the Musalmans and Christians altogether and mind your own duty first."[241]

In no country on the earth are the cow and her progeny so ill-treated as in India which, strangely enough, is the only country where the cow is venerated. Their veneration, however, consists of mere words and deadly quarrel with the Muslims over cow-killing...

From every point of view, therefore, I hold that it is insensate on the part of the Hindus to be angry with their Muslim brethren because they eat beef and slaughter

cows. I, therefore, ask the Hindus to put their own house in order before it totters to its ruin.[242]

...Many Hindus are guilty of cow-slaughter by slow torture. It is the Hindus who export cows outside India, well knowing that they are to be slaughtered for beef extract which comes to India and which the children of orthodox Hindus eat without compunction, under medical advice. Are they not co-partners in cow-slaughter? [243]

Let us ...realize that Cow-worship in the religious sense is largely confined to Gujarat, Marwad, the United Provinces and Bihar. Marwadis and Gujaratis, being enterprizing merchants, have succeeded in making the greatest noise without at the same time devoting their business talent to the solution of the very difficult question of conserving the cattle-wealth of India.[244]

I yield to none in my devoted worship of the cow but this devotion cannot be imposed by law. It will only come by cultivation of friendship with all non-Hindus including the Muslims and by correct conduct. The Gujaratis and the Marwadis are supposed to be the foremost in their wish for the protection of the cow, but they have so far forgotten the dictates of Hinduism that they will gladly impose restrictions on others whilst they themselves are grossly ill-treating the cow and her progeny. Why are the cattle of India the most neglected? Why have they, as is contended, become a burden on the land by reason of the poorest yield of milk in the world? As beasts of burden why are they grossly ill-treated? [245]

Cow-protection Societies

I do not believe the efforts of our cow-protection societies have availed in the least to lessen the number of cows killed every day. I have had no reason to believe so. [246]

Cow-protection societies must turn their attention to the feeding of cattle, prevention of cruelty, preservation of the fast-disappearing pasture land, improving the breed of cattle, buying from poor shepherds and turning *pinjrapoles* into model, self-supporting dairies. Hindus do sin against God and man when they omit to do any of the things I have described above. They commit no sin, if they cannot prevent cow-slaughter at the hands of Musalmans; they do sin grievously when, in order to save the cow, they quarrel with the Musalmans. [247]

I am reported as having said that I advised Hindus to kill Musalmans on certain occasions, e.g., when they were in the act of killing cows. I have not seen the report in question. But as the matter is of the utmost importance, I cannot be too precise or definite. I hold that it is no part of Hinduism to defend the cow against the whole world or against the Musalmans. If the Hindu attempted any such thing, he would be guilty of forcible conversion. His duty ends with his tender care of the cow. This duty, let me incidentally observe, he signally fails to discharge. The only way the Hindus can convert the whole world to cow-protection is by giving an object-lesson in cow-protection and all it means.[248]

Nearly forty years ago I wrote about it [cow-protection] in *Hind Swaraj,* in South Africa. I am from my childhood a devotee of the cow. I believe her to be the natural mother of prosperity. But I have expressed the opinion in *Hind Swaraj* that cow-protection societies are destroyers of the cow and not her protectors. To this view I adhere even today. True devotion to the cow requires broad-mindedness and an accurate knowledge of the art and science concerning the protection of the cow.[249]

In so far as the pure economic necessity of cow-protection is concerned, it can be easily secured if the question was considered on that ground alone. In that event all the dry cattle, the cows who give less milk than their keep, and the aged and unfit cattle, would be slaughtered without a second thought. This soulless economy has no place in India, although the inhabitants of this land of paradoxes may be, indeed are, guilty of many soulless acts.

Then, how can the cow be saved without having to kill her off when she ceases to give the economic quantity of milk or when she becomes otherwise an uneconomic burden? The answer to the question can be summed up as follows:

1. By the Hindus performing their duty towards the cow and her progeny. If they did so, our cattle would be the pride of India and the world. The contrary is the case today.
2. By learning the science of cattle-breeding. Today there is perfect anarchy in this work.
3. By replacing the present cruel method of castration by the humane method practised in the West.

4. By thorough reform of the *pinjarapoles* (institutions for aged cows) of India which are today, as a rule, managed ignorandy and without any plan by men who do not know their work.
5. When these primary things are done, it will be found that the Muslims will, of their own accord, recognize the necessity, if only for the sake of their Hindu brethren, of not slaughtering cattle for beef or otherwise.

The reader will observe that behind the foregoing requirements lies one thing and that is Ahimsa, otherwise known as universal compassion. If that supreme thing is realized, everything else becomes easy. Where there is Ahimsa, there is infinite patience, inner calm, discrimination, self-sacrifice and true knowledge.[250]

10 UNTOUCHABILITY AND CASTE

The Hindus have to do penance for the past and for still continuing disabilities imposed by them upon the suppressed brothers. There can be no question, therefore, of expecting any return from them for a debt we owe them. If we use them to cover our cowardice, we shall raise in them false hopes we shall never be able to fulfil, and if the retribution comes, it will be a just punishment for our inhuman treatment of them.[251]

The Hindus, living as they do in glass houses, have no right to throw stones at their Musalman neighbours. See what we have done, are still doing, to the suppressed classes! If Kafir is a term of opprobrium, how much more so is *chandala?* In the history of the world religions, there is perhaps nothing like our treatment of the suppressed classes. The pity of it is that the treatment still continues. What a fight in Vaikom for a most elementary human right! God does not punish directly. His ways are inscrutable. Who knows that all our woes are not due to that one black sin? [252]

Removal of untouchability

It is simple fanatical obstinacy to persist in persecuting man in the sacred name of religion. It is the persecutors who are unknowingly defiling their own religion by keeping out of public temples men who are atleast as honourable as they claim to be themselves.[253]

For me the appeal only for funds for the removal of untouchability has a value. It comes with a force all its own. For reform of Hinduism and for its real protection removal of untouchability is the greatest thing. It is all-inclusive, and therefore, if this, the blackest spot on Hinduism, is removed, you have automatically all that *Shuddhi* and *Sangathan* can be expected to yield. And I say this, not because of the vast number of "untouchables" whom every Hindu should seek to embrace as one of his own, but because consciousness of having broken down a barbarous and ancient custom, and the consequent purity it necessarily implies give a strength which is irresistible. Removal of untouchability, therefore, is a spiritual process. [254]

...The most important thing to do is purification from within. So long as the poison of untouchability remains in the Hindu body, it will be liable to attacks from outside. It

will be proof against such attacks only when a solid and impregnable wall of purification is erected in the shape of complete removal of untouchability.[255].

Removal of untouchability, again, has deep significance. The very idea of high and low among Hindus should be rooted out. Caste solidarity should give place to national solidarity. In Congress ranks these distinctions should be relics of the past.[256]

I know this touch-me-not-ism is deep-rooted in Hinduism as it is practised today. But there is no reason why it should be tolerated by Congressmen. If they will be correct in their behaviour, they will pave the way for a radical transformation of Hindu society. The message of anti-untouchability does not end in merely touching the so-called untouchables. It has a much deeper meaning.[257]

Every religion today has become tainted by unwanted accretions. In Hinduism we treat a large part of our brethren as untouchables. I have no doubt that we are paying sorrowfully for that sin.[258]

Eschew untouchability. If we still went on disowning the untouchables, more sorrow is in store for us. You should invite a Harijan every day to dine with you. If you cannot do so, you will call a Harijan before taking a meal and ask him to touch the drinking water or the food. This will go a long way to cement the gulf created between different classes of people by artificial caste barriers. Unless we do penance for our sins in this way, more calamities and more severe ones will overtake us all.[259]

This means a revolutionary reform in the religion of the major partner. Let us not shut our eyes to the plain fact. The "untouchables", the scheduled classes are the target because they are the weakest point of Hinduism.[260]

After all, the British could not remove untouchability. It was the Hindus themselves who had opened all the ancient temples in South India—a fact that gladdened my heart, for it is by removing the stain of untouchability that Hinduism can live.[261]

Caste must go

I maintain that caste, as it is understood, must go if Hinduism is to survive. I do not believe that Christianity and Islam are progressive and Hinduism static i.e., retrogressive. As a matter of fact, I notice no definite progress in any religion. The world will not be the shambles it has become if the religions of the world are progressive. There is room for *varna,* as a duty.

This is true of all religions whether the name used is other than *varna*. What is a Muslim Maulvi or a Christian priest but a Brahmana if he teaches his flock its true duty, not for money but because he possesses the gift of interpretation? And this is true of the other divisions.[262]

When the poison of untouchability entered Hinduism, the decline began. One thing was certain, and I have been proclaiming it from the house tops, that if untouchability lives, Hinduism must die.[263]

I am not interested in political reforms in the State if there is to be any distinction of caste, creed or community. Both the Maharaja and the people will deserve my congratulations and blessings only if they do away with all such distinction, and if there is not the least dislike towards the Muslims, and the Bhangi and the Brahmana, and the rich and the poor had equality of treatment in law and in fact. If the Maharajasaheb will be the first servant of the people I shall welcome him and his successors to continue to occupy the *gadi* and keep on serving the people. The rulers and the ruled have all to undergo Self-purification. That is the only way for India to stand erect before the world and be the custodian of its moral height.[264]

11 COMMUNAL SLOGANS

Cries of *Vande Mataram*, *Jai Bharat* or *Jai Hind* frighten the Musalmans today. Are the shouts of *Bharatki Jai* (victory for India) going to mean *Musalmanki Kshay* (destruction for Musalmans)? It is a matter of shame that things have been brought to such a pass.[265]

I am glad too that Shaheed Saheb has suggested the revival of the slogan 'Hindu-Muslimki *Jai',* for it was started during the palmy Khilafat days. I recall the memory of the old days when a Muslim fellow prisoner used to sing Iqbal's *sare jahanse achchha* (Better than all the world). I used to have it sung equally sweetly by the late Saraladevi Chowdharani. The third time was this evening when I heard it sung with equal sweetness and force. The words of the poem are as sweet as the tune. And among us what can be sweeter than that religion never teaches mutual hatred? [266]

Allah-o-Akbar

I hold that it [the cry of *Allah-o-Akbar*] is probably a cry than which a greater one has not been produced by the world. It is a soul-stirring religious cry which means, God only is great. There is nobility in the meaning. Does it become objectionable because it is Arabic? I admit that it has, in India, a questionable association. It often terrifies the Hindus because, sometimes, the Muslims in anger come out of the mosques with this cry on their lips to belabour the Hindus. I confess that the original has no such association. So far as I know, the cry has no such association in other parts of the world. If, therefore, there is to be a lasting friendship between the two, the Hindus should have no hesitation in uttering the cry together with their Muslim friends. God is known by many names and has many attributes. Rama, Rahim, Krishna, Karim are all names of the one God. *Sat Shri Akal* (God is True) is an equally potent cry. Should a single Muslim or Hindu hesitate to utter it? It means that God is and nothing else is. The *Ramadhun* has the same virtue.

Vande Mataram

I now come to *Vande Mataram.* That is no religious cry. It is a purely political cry. The Congress had to examine it. A reference was made to Gurudev about it. And both the Hindu and the Muslim members of the Congress Working Committee had to come to the conclusion that its opening lines are free from any possible objection. I plead that it should be sung together by all on due occasion. It should never be a chant to insult

or offend the Muslims. It is to be remembered that it is the cry that had fired political Bengal. Many Bengalis have given up their lives for political freedom with that cry on their lips. Though, therefore, I feel strongly about *Vande Mataram* as an ode to Mother India, I advise my League friends to refer the matter to the League High Command. I will be surprised if in view of the growing friendliness between the Hindus and the Muslims, the League High Command objects to the prescribed lines of the *Vande Mataram,* the national song, and the national cry of Bengal which sustained her when the rest of India was almost asleep and which is, so far as I am aware, acclaimed by both the Hindus and the Muslims of Bengal. No doubt, every act...must be purely voluntary on the part of either partner. Nothing can be imposed in true friendship.[267]

IV. Problem of Minorities

1 MUSLIMS A MINORITY?

" 'The Muslims are a minority in India.' How often such a statement is made, and how many times more is it tacitly assumed in political argument? But are they really a minority? Even taking one sect of them, viz., the Sunni Hanafi, for comparison, do we not find that it is numerically stronger by far than any single community amongst the Hindus, or even than each of the other religious groups in India, as the Christians, Parsis, Sikhs, Jains, Jews and Buddhists? And is it not the case that the Hindus are divided into communities land sects which are in most cases farther apart from one another socially than the Muslims are from the Non-Muslims? Then, what about the Hindu Untouchables? Is not their number equal to, if not greater than, that of the Muslim 'minority'? If Muslims as a 'minority' in India may claim separate and special treatment, protection and guarantees, how much stronger must the claim of this untouchable section of Hindus be allowed to be, since they not only are by their numbers as important a 'minority'—and a claimant one too, since the date of the Lucknow Pact—but have been suffering for ages from *actual present disabilities* with which no Muslim or any other touchable minority's *apprehensions for the future* may possibly bear comparison? As witness the Vaikom Satyagraha, the Palghat dispute, the Bombay 'lynchers'. I leave alone the innumerable backward castes and the aborigines so far reckoned within the Hindu fold. Are the Muslims then *the* minority?"

...To me, an observer untouched, I hope, by any bias one way or the other, the reasoning appears to be specious when it is used to demonstrate that the Musalmans are not a minority in India. The writer forgets that the claim is that of all Musalmans against all Hindus. The latter cannot both have the cake and eat it too. Though divided among themselves, the Hindus do present a more or less united front not only to the Musalmans but to all non-Hindus, even as the Musalmans though divided among themselves present naturally a united front to all non-Muslims. We shall never solve the question by ignoring facts or re-arranging them to suit our plans. The facts are that the Musalmans are seven crores against twenty-two crores of the Hindus. The latter have never denied it.[1]

Who are the minorities? They are religious, political and social: thus, Musalmans (religious); Depressed Classes (social); Liberals (political); Princes (social); Brahmans

(social); Non-Brahmins (social); Lingayats (social); Sikhs (social?); Christians—Protestants and Catholics (religious); Jains (social?); Zamindars (political?). I have a letter from the Secretary of the All-India Shiah Conference registering their claim for separate existence. Who are the majority in this medley? Unfortunately for unhappy India, even Muslims are somewhat divided and so are the Christians. It is the policy of the British Government to recognize every group that becomes sufficiendy vocal and troublesome. I have drawn no fanciful picture of the minorities. It is true to life. The Congress itself has been obliged to deal with every one of the groups I have mentioned. My list is not exhaustive. It is illustrative. It can be increased *ad libitum*.[2]

Minority-majority complex

A minority does not always fear a majority because it is a majority. The Musalmans fear the Hindu majority because the Hindus, they say, have not always treated them with justice, have not respected their religious prejudices, and because, they say, the Hindus are superior to them in education and wealth. Whether these are facts or not is irrelevant for our purpose. It is enough that Musalmans believe them and, therefore, are afraid of the Hindu majority. The Musalmans expect to meet this fear only partially by means of separate electorates and special representation, even in excess of their numbers in some cases. The Musalmans charge the Hindus of injustice. This must be verified. I have not known Hindus to deny the statement that they are superior to Musalmans in education and wealth.

The Hindus on their part fear the Musalmans because they (the Hindus) say that the Musalmans, wherever they have held power, have treated them with great harshness, and contend that, though they were in a majority, they are *non-plussed* by a handful of Musalman invaders, that the danger of repetition of the experience is ever present before the Hindus, and that, in spite of the sincerity of the leading Musalmans, the Musalman masses are bound to make common cause with any Musalman adventurer. The Hindus, therefore, reject the plea of weakness on the part of the Musalmans and refuse to entertain the idea of extending the doctrine of the Lucknow Pact. It is again beside the question whether the Hindu fear is justified. The fear is a fact to be reckoned with. It would be wrong to impute motives to any community or leaders...Wisdom lies, therefore, in brushing aside all side issues and facing the situation as it is, not as we would like it to be.

In my opinion, therefore, the writer has tried, be it ever so unconsciously, to overprove his case. He is right in saying that the Hindus are divided into many antagonistic sects or parties each setting up a claim for separate treatment. The "untouchables" have even a stronger case than the Musalmans for separate representation and separate electorates. He has shown that any extension of the doctrine of the Lucknow Pact must inevitably lead to communal representation for innumerable sub-castes and other denominations, thus indefinitely postponing the early advent of Swaraj.[3]

To extend the Lucknow Pact doctrine or even to retain it is fraught with danger.

To ignore the Musalman grievance as if it was not felt is also to postpone Swaraj. Lovers of Swaraj cannot, therefore, rest till a solution is found which would allay Musalman apprehension and yet not endanger Swaraj. Such a solution is not impossible.

Here is one.

In my opinion the Musalman claim for majority in Bengal and the Punjab in accordance with their numbers is irresistible. That claim cannot be resisted for the fear from the North or the North-West. The Hindus, if they want Swaraj, must take the chance. So long as we fear the outside world, we must cease to think of Swaraj. But Swaraj we must have. I would, therefore, rule out the Hindu fear in considering the just claim of the Musalmans. We must dare to do justice even at the cost of future safety.[4]

Muslim aloofness

The Musalmans take less interest [in the internal political life and advancement of the country]... because they do not yet regard India as their home of which they must feel proud. Many regard themselves, quite wrongly, I think, as belonging to a race of conquerors. We Hindus are in a measure to blame for this aloofness on the part of the Musalmans. We have not come to regard them as an integral part of the nation. We have not set out to win their hearts. The causes for this unfortunate state of things are historical and were, in their origin, inevitable. The blame of the Hindus, therefore, can be felt only *now*. The consciousness, being of recent growth, is naturally not universal and the physical fear of the Musalmans in a vast number of

cases makes it constitutionally difficult for the Hindus to adopt the blame and proceed to win the Musalman heart.[5]

I must woo the orthodox Ulema as well as the Ahmediah community. It is impossible, even if it were desirable, to disregard the 'Orthodox Ulema'. What one must, however, do is not to truckle to any person or party. Having fixed one's minimum from which one may not recede, one may stoop to conquer the whole world.[6]

When the power has been generated and time has come for the establishment of Independence, the Musalmans and all other minorities will have to be placated. If they are not, there must inevitably be civil war. But I live in the hope that, if we succeed in generating the power, our differences and distrust will vanish. These are due to our weakness. When we have the power from within, we shall shed our weakness.

The only non-violent solution I know is for the Hindus to let the minority communities take what they like. I would not hesitate to let the minorities govern the country. This is no academic belief. The solution is attended with no risk. For, under a free government the real power will be held by the people.[7]

I regard a Muslim or any non-Hindu as my blood-brother, not in order to please him but because he is born of the same mother Hind as I am. He does not cease to be my brother because he may hate or disown me. I must woo him, even, it may be, in spite of himself.[8]

Voluntary surrender to minorities

So far as political matters are concerned, as a non-co-operator I am quite uninterested in them; but, for the future understanding, I hold that it is up to the Hindus as the major party not to bargain but leave the pen in the hands of, say, Hakim Saheb Ajmal Khan and abide by his decision. I would similarly deal with the Sikhs, Christians and Parsis and be satisfied with the residue. It is, in my opinion, the only just, equitable, honourable and dignified solution. The Hindus, if they want unity among different races, must have the courage to trust the minorities. Any other adjustment must leave a nasty taste in the mouth.

Surely, the millions do not want to become legislators and municipal councillors. And, if we have understood the proper use of Satyagraha, we should know that it can be

and should be used against an unjust administrator whether he be a Hindu, Musalman or of any other race or denomination, whereas a just administrator or representative is always and equally good whether he be a Hindu or Musalman. We want to do away with the communal spirit. The majority must, therefore, make the beginning and thus inspire the minorities with confidence in their bona fides. Adjustment is possible only when the more powerful take the initiative without waiting for response from the weaker.[9]

We Hindus are described, to a certain extent rightly, as the majority community. Well, to them I would say the same thing as I used to do in 1921, viz., that voluntary surrender on the part of either community—preferably by the majority community—of all rights and privileges would immediately effect this unity. It would be a great thing, a brave thing, for the Hindus to achieve this act of self-denial. Let them say to the Musalmans: 'Have as big a share of the spoils as you want: we will be content to save you.' What, after all, are the things you are quarrelling for? Not, indeed, for air and water. It is for seats on legislatures and local bodies. What has the vast majority of you got to do with them? How many of you can go there? And what can you do there? Outside the legislatures you did wonderful things; you defied the ordinances, you defied lathi charges and 'firing' orders, because you were conscious of your strength. If you retain the same consciousness, what would it matter to you if your Parliament had all Musalmans in it and no Hindu? I am sick of these squabbles for seats, this scramble for the shadow of power. How I wish I could bring home to all Congressmen that they should have nothing to do with these legislatures! The very act of voluntary surrender will clothe you with a power undreamt of before.[10]

There is nothing like a Hindu case, at least so far as I am concerned, for, in the matter of my country's freedom, I am no more a Hindu than you are. There is a Hindu case put up by the Hindu Mahasabha representatives who claim to represent the Hindu mind, but who, in my opinion, do not do so. They will have a national solution of the question, not because they are nationalists but because it suits them. I call that destructive tactics, and am pleading with them that, representing as they do the great majority, they must step out and give to the smaller communities what they want, and the atmosphere would be clear as if by magic. What the vast mass of the Hindus feel and want nobody knows, but, claiming as I do to have moved amongst them all these years, I think they do not care for these petty-fogging things; they are not

troubled by the question of loaves and fishes in the shape of electoral seats and administrative posts.[11]

I know that the fashion is to talk of the Hindus as forming the majority community. But Hinduism is an elastic, indefinable term, and the Hindus are not a homogeneous whole like the Muslims and Christians. And, when one analyses the majority in any provincial legislature, it will be found to consist of a combination of the so-called minorities. In other words and in reality so far as India is concerned, there can only be political parties and no majority or minority communities. The cry of the tyranny of the majority is a fictitious cry.[12]

2 THE CONGRESS AND THE MINORITY PROBLEM

Representative character of Congress

The Congress has now to cultivate a spirit of common nationality and refuse to resort to camouflage or expediency in a matter so vital as the communal question. In the Congress, we must cease to be exclusive Hindus or Musalmans or Sikhs, Parsis, Christians or Jews. Whilst we may staunchly adhere to our respective faiths, we must be in the Congress, Indians first and Indians last. A good Hindu or a good Musalman should be a better Hindu or a better Musalman for being a lover of his country.

If the Congress is ever forced to consider a solution based on communalism, the resolution binds it to reject any that does not satisfy the parties concerned. In order, however, that the Congress may never be faced with a situation demanding a communal solution, it should now be joined in large numbers by Musalmans, Sikhs and others who will have India as one indivisible nation.

I for one would welcome the Congress passing into Musalman, Sikh, Parsi, Christian, or Jewish hands rather than that it should be in any sense a sectional organization. Any one who has the spirit of service in him can capture the Congress. It has the most democratic franchise. Its doors are ever open to those who would serve. Let all join it and make it a mighty instrument for gaining complete independence for the poorest, the weakest and the most down-trodden.[13]

I must clearly set forth its position. In spite of appearances to the contrary, especially in England, the Congress claims to represent the whole nation, and most decidedly the dumb millions, among whom are included the numberless untouchables, who are more suppressed than depressed, as also in a way the more unfortunate and neglected classes known as backward races.

...The Congress has, since its inception, set up pure nationalism as its ideal. It has endeavoured to break down communal barriers. The ...Lahore resolution was the culminating point in its advance towards nationalism.[14]

And what is this bugbear of the minorities' question? I cannot for the life of me understand it. You call Congress one of many organizations or the biggest organization. I say to you that the Congress is not only the biggest organization, but it is the most predominant organization, an organization which alone has fought for

freedom. It was at the call of the Congress that hundreds of villagers were nearly swept out of existence, crops worth thousands burnt or sold for a song, and lands worth lakhs confiscated and sold. Do you suppose we have gone through all this agony for a mess of pottage? The Congress, says the fable, is a Hindu organization. Do you suppose all that fought and went to prison and died last year were only Hindus? There were several thousands of Musalmans amongst them, and there were also Sikhs and Christians and Parsis.[15]

The Congress may be a very insignificant organization, but I have not hesitated to make the claim, and I am not ashamed to repeat the claim that the Congress claims to represent 85 per cent or 95 per cent of the population, not merely of British India but of the whole of India.[16]

I know that many have been angry with me for claiming an exclusive right for the Congress to speak for the people of India as a whole. It is not an arrogant pretension. It is explicit in the first article of the Congress. It wants and works for independence for the whole of India. It speaks neither for majority nor minority. It seeks to represent all Indians without any distinction.[17]

Hindu interests

I do not think that the Congress has failed to represent the Hindu interest in so far as it was consistent with the national interest, i.e., the interests of all communities considered as one nation. The existence, therefore, of the Hindu Mahasabha, too, must be justified on other grounds. It is obvious that the Congress cannot represent mutually antagonistic interests. Its existence presupposes mutuality of interest and effort.[18]

So far as the Congress is concerned, it does not represent all Hindus or all, of any single community except in 'the sense that the Congress represents all, because all are believed to desire independence for the country, and the Congress is without a rival in fighting for that goal. In fact, the Congress is the only national army the country possesses. It is not the less but all the more an army for its being non-violent. It has been the unbroken tradition of the Congress to refuse to represent any but the national interest. It has certainly never represented the Hindus as such. That function is claimed by the Hindu Mahasabha, just as that of solely representing Muslim interests is claimed by the Muslim League.

The only course left open to the Congress, therefore, is to state its own communal policy for the guidance of Congressmen, no matter to which community they belong.[19]

Evidently we have not heard the last of Lord Zetland's charge that the National Congress is an organization representing Hindus and, therefore, national only in name but, in reality, communal. There cannot be a grosser libel on the Congress than this. From its inception it has been national. Its originator was an Englishman. The late A.O. Hume was long its Secretary. It has always had one or two Muslim Secretaries. It has had Muslim, English, Christian and Parsi Presidents. Dadabhai was, till he became invalided, the soul of the Congress. His was the guiding hand and the directing brain in everything. Sir Pherozeshah Mehta was the uncrowned king of the Bombay Presidency. He was the maker of Presidents both of the Congress and of the Bombay Corporation. Badruddin Tyabji was for years a decisive factor in the deliberations of the Congress. Who does not know that, whilst Hakim Saheb Ajmal Khan was alive, nothing could be done by the Congress if it had not his *imprimatur?* Dr. Ansari was for years Joint General Secretary. The readers know the influence that the Ali Brothers exercised over the Congress during the Khilafat days. Today the Working Committee does not move without Maulana Abul Kalam Azad's co-operation and wise guidance. His is the decisive voice on Hindu-Muslim questions. Through its whole history, now running into the second half of a century, the Congress has ever striven to represent the whole of India in a manner no other organization has done. Every victory scored by the Congress has benefited all communities...

Obviously, the Congress felt that necessity of a communal adjustment for the political advancement of the country, and the Congress-League Pact of 1916 was born. Ever since that time the Congress has made communal unity a plank in the Congress programme. Though the function should logically belong to communal organizations, a mass organization like the Congress cannot look on if communities quarrel and when, in the national interest, a solution becomes necessary. Thus the Congress could not shirk what came to it as a clear call to duty. The Congress is and should be *the* organization to take a purely nationalistic and impartial view on communal questions.

National outlook

Whatever may be said to the contrary, I maintain that the Congress embodies the hope and aspirations of India. It can conclude no pact with any person if it does not

represent the whole of India in so far as her political aspirations are concerned. Its traditions unfit it to represent Hindus as against Muslims or vice versa. It is fit to represent the common interest of all the sons of Hindustan. I can see nothing wrong in the Congress trying to arrange pacts with men or their organizations for the furtherance of the common interest.[20]

The Congress endeavours to represent all communities. It is not by design, but by the accident of Hindus being practically more conscious than the others, that the Congress contains a majority of Hindus. As history proves, the Congress is a joint creation of Muslims, Christians, Parsis, Hindus, led by Englishmen, be it said to the credit of the latter. And the Congress, in spite of all that may be said to the contrary, retains that character. At the present moment, a Muslim divine is the unquestioned leader of the Congress and, for the second time, becomes its president. The constant endeavour of Congressmen has been to have as many members as possible drawn from the various communities, and, therefore, the Congress has entered into pacts for the purpose of securing national solidarity. It cannot, therefore, divest itself of that function, and therefore, although I have made the admission that the Hindu Mahasabha or a similar Hindu organization can properly make communal settlements, the Congress cannot and must not plead incapacity for entering into political pacts so long as it commands general confidence.[21]

Whatever talks I had with Quaid-i-Azam or any other have been on behalf of the Congress, which is not a Hindu organization. Can a Hindu organization have a Muslim divine as President, and can its Working Committee have 4 Muslim members out of 15? [22]

...There are no caste and casteless Hindus who are at all politically minded. Therefore, the word rings untrue and offensive. Who will represent them at your table? Not Congress which seeks to represent without distinction all Indians who desire and work for independence. Hence the existence of Hindu Mahasabha claiming to represent Hindus as such. I apprehend that even that body will disclaim representing caste Hindus.[23]

Minorities being a minority, their representation in the Congress organization will naturally be proportionately less. If they feel dissatisfied, they can keep out of the Congress without ceasing to be Congressmen, as I have done. It is my claim that I am

not less a Congressmen but more by reason of my ceasing to be even a four-anna member of the Congress...

The only worthy aim of a Congressman can be to belong wholly to the Congress, never to capture and dominate the Congress. If everybody took up the correct attitude there would be no minorities and majorities.[24]

...The Congress claims, in London at the Round Table Conference I had attended, that of all the organizations in India the Congress is only one organization which rightfully claims to represent the whole of India, whether it is called French India or Portuguese India or the India of the States, because the Congress claims by right of service to represent not only the nominal Congressmen or its sympathizers but also its enemies. Therefore, the Congress has to make itself responsible for the misdeeds of all communities and all classes. It should be its proud privilege to better and improve the moral, material and physical condition of the whole of India to entide it to the proud claim it has made ever since its inception.[25]

The Congress is national. Its doors are open to every Indian who chooses to enter its portals.[26]

It gladdens our heart that the A.I.C.C. is staunch to the Congress objective and refuses to envisage an India in which only the Hindus could live as masters. The Congress creed is broad-based enough to include all communities. There is no room in it for narrow communalism. It is the oldest of all political organizations. Its motto is service of the people. [27]

Communal settlement

Should all effort at agreement fail, when the Round Table Conference reaches the end of its labours, I would suggest the addition of a clause to the expected Constitution appointing a judicial tribunal that would examine all claims and give its final decision on all the points that may be left unsettled...

If, however, a national solution is impossible and the Congress scheme proves unacceptable, I am not precluded from endorsing any other reasonable scheme which may be acceptable to the parties concerned. The Congress position on this question, therefore, is one of the greatest possible accommodation. Where it cannot help it will

not obstruct. Needless to say that the Congress will whole-heartedly support any scheme of private arbitration.[28]

I will, in the event of difference, refer the question to the highest and most impartial tribunal that can be conceived by human ingenuity. Its voice shall be final as to what will amount to the fullest satisfaction of minority interests.[29]

...The question resolves itself into not who is numerically superior but who is stronger. Surely there is only one answer. Those who raise the cry of minority in danger have nothing to fear from the so-called majority which is merely a paper majority and which, in any event, is ineffective because it is weak in the military sense. Paradoxical as it may appear, it is literally true that the so-called minorities' fear has some bottom only so long as the weak majority has the backing of the British bayonets to enable it to play at democracy. But the British Power will, so long as it so chooses, successfully play one against the other, calling the parties by whatever names it pleases. And this process need not be dishonest. They may honestly believe that so long as there are rival claims put up, they must remain in India in response to a call from God to hold the balance evenly between them. Only that way lies not Democracy but Fascism, Nazism, Bolshevism and Imperialism, all facets of the doctrine of 'Might is Right'.[30] Communalism is bound to win, if the Congress cannot become effectively non-violent. It will itself become communal in action if it plays with non-violence. For the majority of Congressmen who are Hindus are bound to drift into violence, if they do not know the effective use of non-violence. I am quite clear in my mind that the Congress can remain non-communal only if it becomes truly non-violent in all matters. It cannot be non-violent only towards the rulers and violent towards others. That way lie disgrace and disaster.[31]

No coercion

The Congress cannot want independence and the use of British forces at the same time. But that is not all. The Congress will not coerce Muslims or any minority. That would not be a non-violent approach. The greatest coercion is British coercion. And the Congress is impatient to get out of that coercion.[32]

It is painful to find the British Press and Britishers advancing the minority claim to prevent the declaration suggested by the Congress, if I may say so, in the common interest. If the force of the Congress suggestion has not been overwhelmingly felt,

the declaration will not come. There need be no dejection among Congressmen if it does not. We shall get our independence when it is deserved. But it would be well for the British Government and the Allied cause, if the minority argument were not flung in the face of a credulous world...[33]

Whether the Muslims are regarded as a minority or otherwise, their as well as any other community's rights and privileges, religious, social, cultural and political, must be regarded as a sacred trust to be jealously guarded. And the independence of India will make no difference to the protection of those rights. In fact, they will be better protected in every way, if only because in the framing of the Charter of Independence by the nation's representatives the Muslims and other minorities, real or so-called, will have an effective voice.[34]

Protection of minorities

When the protection of minorities is pleaded against the declaration required by the Congress, the great pronouncement made by Sir Samuel Hoare sounds unreal. What the Congress has asked is not any sounding of Indian opinion but a declaration of Britain's intention. I have endeavoured to show that there is no such thing as real minorities in India whose rights can be endangered by India becoming independent. With the exception of the Depressed Classes, there is no minority which is not able to take care of itself. I observe that Sir Samuel Hoare has mentioned the Europeans also as a minority. The very mention of Europeans, in my opinion, condemns the cry of the interest of minorities. But the protection of minorities, whatever they are, is common cause between the British Government and the Congress. I would like the British Government to remember that there is every prospect of Congress India, to use Sir Samuel's phrase, being a hopeless minority. I like Sir Samuel’s division of India into Congress and non-congress.

And if non-congress India contains not merely the Princes but the people of Princes' India, all the Musalmans, all those who might be represented by the Hindu Mahasabha and others who refuse to be classified as part of Congress India, it is Congress India which will be in danger of a non-congress majority. And the Congress has got to make good its position even though it may represent a minority wholly unarmed, pardy by outside force but largely by its own will.[35]

Bogey of minorities

The minorities question has invariably been brought up: whenever the question of India's freedom has come to the fore. To represent the Congress and its demand as totalitarian is to misrepresent facts. This misrepresentation is not less serious because it is unconscious. The Congress has deliberately discarded the use of force. It has no military backing or tradition. It has from its inception believed in communal unity. It seeks to represent non-Hindus as well as Hindus. It has had Parsis, Muslims and Christians leading it. It has gone out of its way to placate all communities. It could not do otherwise as its only sanction was constitutional agitation till it forged non-co-operation and civil disobedience as an addition to constitutional agitation and as an effective substitute for violence. Communal differences have been used by the British Government to thwart India's aspiration. That the process is likely to have been unconscious does not make it less mischievous. That the Congress has no desire for loaves and fishes must be crystal clear from wholesale resignations of Congress ministries. The Congress will never be party to communal quarrels. It will rather stand aside and wander in the wilderness and wait for a better day. Even now the ugly spectacle of playing off the League against the Congress seems to be going on. I had expected that the stupendous European crisis would bring better perception to British statesmen.

The Times wants the Congress record of dealing with Muslims and Depressed Classes during the last two years. All that I can say is, 'Let governors of provinces speak.' That the Muslim League and some Depressed Class leaders complain is nothing strange. Some discontent is inevitable in democracy. The Congress has made a handsome and sporting offer. Let a Constituent Assembly of elected representatives frame a constitution for the future government of India, subject to safeguards for protection of the rights of minorities to their satisfaction. Will British statesmen play the game?[36]

Freedom and minority rights

Once a declaration to free India from bondage, not in stages but at once, is made, an interim solution will be found to be easy. Protection of rights of minorities will then become simple. The game of see-saw will cease. The minorities are entitled to protection, not in stages but to the fullest extent and in one single step. No charter of freedom will be worth looking at which does not ensure the same measure of

freedom for the minorities as for the majority. The minorities will be full-fledged partners in the framing of the constitution. How that can be attained will depend upon the wisdom of the representatives charged with the sacred duty of preparing the constitution. Britain has hitherto held power—this is inevitable in any system of imperialism—by playing the minorities against the so-called majority and has thus made an agreed solution among the component parts wellnigh impossible. The burden of finding a formula for the protection of minorities should be thrown on the parties themselves. So long as Britain considers it her mission to bear this burden, so long will she continue to feel the necessity of holding India as a dependency. And patriots impatient for deliverance will fight, non-violently if I can guide them, and violently if I fail and perish in the attempt.[37]

Absolute protection of the rights of minorities is a greater concern of the Congress than it ever can be of Great Britain. The Congress dare not seek and cannot get justice, if it is not prepared to do it itself. To be above suspicion is the only way open to non-violent organizations.[38]

The provision of safeguards for the rights of the minorities is not only common cause between the British Government and the Congress, but the Representative Assembly of Indians cannot evolve a stable constitution without fullest satisfaction being given to the *legitimate* minorities. I use the word 'legitimate' advisedly because I see that minorities crop up like mushrooms, till there will be no majority left. By 'fullest satisfaction' I mean 'satisfaction which will not militate against the progress of the nation as a whole'.[39]

I have dealt with general principles, not with particular minorities. Even as justice to be justice has to be generous, generosity in order to justify itself has got to be strictly just. Therefore, it should not be at the expense of any single interest. Hence there cannot be any question of sacrificing some minority or minorities, for the benefit of any minority. You are right again in contending that generosity has to be shown to the weak and the humble, and not to the bully. Nevertheless I would say, on behalf of the bully, that even he is entitled to justice, for immediately you brush aside the bully and be unjust to him you justify his bullying. Thus, the only safe—not to put it higher—rule of conduct is to do generous justice, irrespective of the character of the minority. I am quite sure that where there is strictest justice the question of majority and

minority would not arise. The bully is a portent and is an answer to some existing circumstance, as for instance cowardice. It is often forgotten that cowardice can be unjust. The fact is that cowards have no sense of justice. They yield only to threat, or actual use, of force. I do not know that there is any question of choice between a coward and a bully. The one is as bad as the other, with this difference that the bully always follows the coward in point of time.[40]

3 THE CONGRESS AND THE MUSLIMS

Invitation to Muslims

It is not right to say that the Congress is a Hindu organization. What is the Congress to do if the Muslims do not care to go into it? The Congress is based on adult franchise, and any adult, Hindu or Musalman, can join the Congress. No community is excluded. Ask the Muslim friends who are members of the Congress, and they will tell you that they have not come to grief by having joined the Congress. I ask you therefore, not to suspect that the Congress is a Hindu organization.

I ask every one of you to join the Congress and to take charge of it. But one cannot take charge of it by force. It can be done only by willing service. Ever since the Congress was started, those who have served it have had charge of it. And yet the Congress does not belong only to them, does not stand only for them, it belongs to and stands for all...

If you want to be in power under Swaraj, I invite you to assume the reins of the Congress now by joining it in large numbers. It is the most powerful organization in the country, join it. We will welcome you.[41]

At the present moment, if you were to examine the records of the prisons of India, you would find that the Congress represented and represents on its register a very large number of Musalmans; several thousand Musalmans went to gaol last year under the banner of the Congress.

Represents Muslims too

The Congress today has several thousand Musalmans on its register. The Congress has Indian Christians also on its register. I do not know that there is a single community which is not represented on the Congress register... Even landlords and even mill-owners and millionaires are represented there. I admit that they are coming to the Congress slowly, cautiously, but the Congress is trying to serve them also. The Congress undoubtedly represents this labour. Therefore, this claim that the proposals set forth in memorandum are acceptable to well over 115,000,000 of people needs to be taken with a very great deal of reservation and caution.[42]

Congress and League

I do not agree with the contention imputed to Mr. Jinnah [that 'the Indian National Congress has a large Hindu majority in it, cannot, adequately and justly represent and safeguard the interests of the Muslim minority and that, therefore, a separate and communal organization like the Muslim League is absolutely necessary']. In my opinion the Congress has from its birth gone out of its way to solicit Musalman co-operation, even patronage. The existence of the League must, therefore, be justified on other grounds.[43]

The Muslim League is a great organization. Its president was at one time an ardent Congressman. He was the rising hope of the Congress. His battles with Lord Willingdon cannot be forgotten. The Jinnah Hall of the Bombay Congress is a standing monument of the president's labours for the Congress and a mark of Congressmen's generous appreciation of his services. The League contains many members who were whole-heartedly with the Congress during the memorable Khilafat days. I refuse to think that these erstwhile comrades can be as bitter in their hearts towards their fellow workers of yesterday as their speeches and writings of today will show. It is, therefore, wrong of the Congressmen and the Congress organs if they are bitter against the League or its individual members. The Congress policy of non-violence should put an easy restraint upon the speeches, writings and actions of Congressmen in their dealings with the League and its members. They must resolutely believe and hope that sooner or later, and sooner rather than later, there is to be communal unity, not superficial but real and lasting.[44]

Hindu-Muslim unity means communal unity. No pact seems to be in front of us. Janab Jinnah Saheb looks to the British power to safeguard the Muslim rights. Nothing that the Congress can do or concede will satisfy him. For, he can always, and naturally from his own standpoint, ask for more than the British can give or guarantee. Therefore, there can be no limit to the Muslim League demands...

The Congress should have no quarrel with the League for getting all it can through the British power. An institution that is fighting that power will never put itself in the wrong by fighting the Muslims.[45]

I have ...shown how the Congress could not shirk a duty devolving upon it. I must dissent from the view that the status of the Congress has been lowered by its attempt

to solve a difficult national problem. I invite all well-wishers to refrain from doing anything to hinder the progress of the talks that are about to take place between Jinnah Saheb and Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru.[46]

An English critic condemns the Congress for not coming to terms with the Muslim League. It is a pity that even responsible Englishmen will not take the trouble to study questions which they judge freely. The Congress has never given up the effort to solve the communal question. It is even now engaged in the difficult task. But it is wrong to use Congress inability to reach a solution for keeping India from her destined goal.[47]

Congress Ministries

There is no mistaking the fact that any non-congress Muslims honestly think that the Congress ministers did not pay enough heed to Muslim complaints. Congressmen wedded to non-violence have to give special heed to the complaints of non-Congress Muslims. It is no use saying that they are frivolous. I know myself that many complaints have been frivolous. But we have to be patient and courteous enough to take them seriously and endeavour to show clearly that they are frivolous. I do not wish to suggest that pains were not taken to deal with them. I am just now concerned with the phenomenon that the complaints persist. We must, therefore, give time to demonstrating that there never has been anything in the complaints. If in the course of further investigation we discover errors, we must make amends. We must prove to the Muslim countrymen and to the world that the Congress does not want independence at the sacrifice of a single legitimate interest, be it Muslim or other. We may leave no stone unturned to carry the minorities with us. This meticulous care for the rights of the least among us is the *sine qua non* of non-violence.

If it is true that for the British Government to plead want of communal unity as a bar to independence is wrong, it is equally true that this discord is, nevertheless, a serious handicap in our march towards Swaraj. If we had the Muslim League and others with us, our demand would become irresistible.[48]

Communal fellowship

What do I mean by communal fellowship? How is it to be obtained when the Jinnah-Nehru talks have failed? They may or may not have failed. Pacts are meant for big

people. They do not affect men in the street, the ground down millions. In cultivating fellowship among these, written pacts are not needed.

Do Congressmen cultivate goodwill towards all without political motive? This fellow-feeling should be natural, not born out of fear or expedience, even as fellowship between blood-brothers, not being born out of any ulterior motive, is natural and lasting. Nor is it to be applied only as between Hindus and Muslims. It has to be universal. It must be extended to the least among us. It is to be extended to Englishmen. It is to be extended to political opponents.[49]

Non-communal alignment of Parties

I had the pleasure of wiring him [Jinnah] congratulations on his excellent Id-day broadcast. And now he commands further congratulations on forming pacts with parties who are opposed to the Congress policies and politics. He is thus lifting the Muslim League out of the communal rut and giving it a national character. I regard his step as perfectly legitimate. I observe that the Justice Party and Dr. Ambedkar's Party have already joined Jinnah Saheb. The papers report too, that Shree Savarkar, the President of the Hindu Mahasabha, is to see him presendy. Jinnah Saheb himself has informed the public that many non-congress Hindus have expressed their sympathy with him. I regard this development as thoroughly healthy. Nothing can be better than that we should have in the country mainly two parties—the Congress and the non-Congress, or anti-Congress, if the latter expression is preferred. Jinnah Saheb is giving the word 'minority' a new and good content. The Congress majority is made up of a combination of caste Hindus, non-caste Hindus, Muslims, Christians, Parsis and Jews. Therefore, it is a majority drawn from all classes, representing a particular body of opinion, and the proposed combination becomes a minority representing another body of opinion. This may any day convert itself into a majority by commending itself to the electorate. Such an alignment of parties is a consummation 'devoutly to be wished. If the Quaid-i-Azam can bring about the combination, not only I but the whole of India will shout with one acclamation 'Long live Quaid-i-Azam Jinnah." For he will have brought about permanent and living unity for which, I am sure, the whole nation is thirsting.[50]

Share of minorities

The fact is that the majority in all the provinces is a mixed majority. The parties are not Muslims and Hindus; they are Congressmen, Independents, Muslim Leaguers, Muslim Independents, Labourites, etc. The Congress majority everywhere is a mixed majority and could be better balanced if there was no tension. The tension is a distemper. A distemper can never be a permanent feature of any growing society which India is. Whatever the outcome of the Muslim League demonstration and its claim, some day or other there will be a solution of the issues raised. The outcome will never be pure Muslim or Hindu majorities in any single province. The parties will be mixed and aligned according to different policies, unless democracy is crushed and autocracy reigns supreme in India as a whole or India is vivisected into two or more dead parts. If you have followed my argument, it must be clear to you that there will never be a denial of power to any party or group so far as the Congress is concerned. Minorities are entitled to full protection of their rights, for so long as they have to divide power with others, they run the risk of their special rights being adulterated.[51]

Congress objective

[Liaquat Ali Khan] was in haste in suggesting that ..."the sole objective of the Congress under Mr. Gandhi's fostering care has been the revival of Hinduism and the imposition of Hindu culture on all and sundry". My own objective is not the issue in the terrible indictment... The objective of the Congress is wholly political. Nothing is to be gained by making statements that are incapable of proof.[52]

I do not think... ['that the attitude of the Congress has precipitated the Muslim League resolution about partitioning India']. But if it has, it is a distinct gain. It is good that what was in should come out. It is easier now to deal with the problem. It will solve itself. One distinct gain is that nationalist Muslims have become awakened to a sense of their duty.[53]

I have never understood the reason behind the demand for the recognition by the Congress of the All-India Muslim League as the sole and authoritative Muslim body. Why should such an admission be demanded or expected? How is it compatible with a genuine desire for a settlement?

The Congress attempts to represent all. But it has never demanded recognition as such from anybody. The All-India status has to be deserved. But whether it be deserved or not, admission thereof is a superfluity. The Congress has never claimed that it represents the whole of Indian Muslims. It has not claimed to represent any single community wholly. But it does claim to represent every single national interest irrespective of class, caste, colour or creed. Even that claim need not be admitted by those who deal with it. It should be sufficient consolation to each party that it is considered by the other important enough to seek friendship with.

The Congress has always frankly admitted that it has not on its register as many Muslims as it would like. But it has been proud to have had the support of many eminent Muslims. Hakim Saheb Ajmal Khan was the tallest among them. Quaid-i-Azam himself was a great Congressman. It was only after Non-co-operation that he, like many other Congressmen belonging to several communities, left it. Their defection was purely political. They disliked direct action.[54]

Nationalist Muslims

It is wrong to swear at the nationalist Muslims simply because they are attached to the Congress. If they become members of the League, they will become worthy Muslims!!! My correspondent simply does not know how much Congress Muslims are trying to bring about unity. When unity is re-established, as it must be, I have no doubt that nationalist Muslims will get their due both from Hindus and Muslims.

It is torture of truth to suggest that they are so many Mir Jafars. They are betraying neither Islam nor India. They are as true Muslims according to their lights as members of the League claim to be. It is equal torture of truth to suggest that the Congress is following the British method of divide and rule. The Congress is a political party with one single aim. It would be a bad day for India if the Congress could be proved to have mean motives. Is it mean to woo Muslim opinion by the fairest means imaginable? Rightly or wrongly, the Congress does not believe in watertight compartments on a communal basis.[55]

Congress-League talks

I have no hesitation in endorsing Maulana Saheb's suggestion ['that the Congress Working Committee will nominate five representatives to meet the representatives of

the Muslim League when the latter so desire to do']. No one would be more glad than I if, with or without my endorsement, the two can come together. I have always felt that there is something radically wrong with both that the most obvious thing, viz., the coming together of the wise men of both, with a will to find a solution of the deadlock, has not happened.[56]

...It was a point of honour with Congressmen that there could be no joint consultation in which Maulana Saheb was not associated with the talks. You said it was a sore point with Quaid-i-Azam Jinnah and I replied that the soreness was wholly unwarranted and that the Congress could not be expected to sacrifice its faithful servant of twenty-five years' standing whose self-sacrifice and devotion to the national cause had never been in question... [57]

"Would the issue not be solved if Congress' right to nominate anyone were conceded but they were asked not to exercise it?"—A right is negatived if it cannot be exercised at the crucial moment. The Congress is reduced to a caste Hindu body according to Jinnah's wholly wrong appraisement of it. such an admission belies all its past history.[58]

4 THE SIKHS

Sikh minority claims

I venture to suggest that the non-violence creed of the Congress is the surest guarantee of good faith, and our Sikh friends have no reason to fear that it would betray them. For, the moment it did so, the Congress would not only thereby seal its own doom but that of the country too. Moreover the Sikhs are a brave people. They will know how to safeguard their rights by the exercise of arms if it should ever come to that.

Sardar Madhusudan Singh in his speech has asked for an assurance that the Congress would do nothing that might alienate the sympathies of the Sikhs from the Congress. Well, the Congress in its Lahore session passed a resolution that it would not endorse any settlement with regard to the minority question that failed to satisfy any of the minorities concerned. What further assurance can the Congress give you to set you at ease I really fail to understand.

Then there is the controversy about the inclusion of the Sikh colour in the national flag. No blame can possibly attach to the Congress in this respect. The present design was suggested by me.

The Congress has not even formally adopted it. I had offered to the Sikh friends to place before the A.I.C.C. their viewpoint if they could apprise me of it. But as it turned out, the A.I.C.C. could not meet after that and no one knows as to when it will be able to meet at all. Even the Working Committee is out today on sufferance. To raise this controversy at this time, the time when the Congress is fighting for its very existence, would be, to say the least, an unseemly act. You may not obstruct if you cannot help.

The Sikhs have given their loyal and unstinted co-operation to the Congress in many parts of India like Bombay, Delhi etc. But these brave people have never bothered themselves about the flag question. The flag controversy is being conducted mostly by those who have held aloof from the present movement. A brave man always gives credit to the other party for its bona fides. Why won't you have faith? If the Congress should play false afterwards, you can well settle scores with it, for you hold the sword. I would ask you therefore to cast out suspicion and distrust from your mind and to

plunge into this sacred *yajna* of freedom whole-heartedly. You will find that when you are ready to make the extreme sacrifice you will disdain to ask for guarantees. It will be for others to look up to you as the champions of their rights as it will be for you to fulfil their expectations...

...I ask you to accept my word and the resolution of the Congress that it will not betray a single individual much less a community. If it ever thinks of doing so, it will only hasten its own doom. No nation determined to immolate itself at the altar of freedom can be guilty of breach of faith. My life has been an open book. I have no secrets and I encourage no secrets. I pray you, therefore, to unbosom yourselves of all your doubts and apprehensions and I shall try to meet you as best I can. What more shall I say? What more can I say than this, 'Let God be witness of the bond that binds me and the Congress with you?'[59]

What I have said about the Muslims applies equally to Sikhs. If thirty lakhs of Sikhs will obstruct Indian independence, we shall deal with them non-violently. Non-violent Swaraj cannot be won except by non-violence. [60]

5 COMMUNAL SETTLEMENT AND SWARAJ

Hindu-Muslim unity and Swaraj

The Hindu-Muslim question is the question on the proper solution of which hangs the destiny of India in the immediate future.[61]

Hindu-Muslim unity is not less important than the spinning wheel. It is the breath of our life. I do not need to occupy much of your time on this question, because the necessity of it for Swaraj is almost universally accepted. I say 'almost' because I know some Hindus and some Musalmans, who prefer the present condition of dependence on Great Britain if they cannot have either wholly Hindu or wholly Musalman India. Happily, their number is small.[62]

The views that I have held for the last 40 years remain unchanged. I hold that there is no Swaraj without communal unity, as without several other things I have repeatedly mentioned.[63]

I have striven for Hindu-Muslim unity because India cannot live free without it, and because we would both deny God if we considered one another as natural enemies.[64]

India will have freedom whether the communal question is solved or not solved. No doubt we would have difficult times after the attainment of freedom, but freedom itself cannot be held up by the question, for we can get freedom as soon as we are worthy of it and being worthy of it means suffering enough for it, paying a rich price for the rich prize of freedom. But if we have not suffered, if we have not paid the price, even a solution of the question would be of no help to us. If we have suffered enough, and offered sufficient sacrifices, no argument or negotiation would be necessary. But who am I to determine that we have suffered enough? [65]

My belief is unshaken that without communal unity Swaraj cannot be attained through non-violence. But unity cannot be reached without justice between communities. Muslim or any other friendship cannot be bought with bribery. Bribery would itself mean cowardice and therefore, violence. But if I give more than his due to my brother, I do not bribe him nor do I do any injustice. I can disarm suspicion only by being generous. Justice without generosity may easily become Shylock's justice. I must, however, take care that the generosity is not done at the expense of the very cause for which it is sought to be done.

I cannot, therefore, drop the idea, of unity or the effort for it. But what is wanted is not so much justice as right action.[66]

Muslims and Swaraj

We are all equal before our Maker—Hindus, Musalmans, Parsis, Christians, worshippers of one God. Why then do we fight among ourselves?

We are all brothers—even the Quaid-i-Azam is my brother. I have meant all that I have said about him, never has a frivolous word escaped my lips, and I say that I want to win him over. A speaker said that I would not fight until I had won him over, and he was right. There was a time when there was not a Muslim whose confidence I did not enjoy. Today I have forfeited that confidence and most of the Urdu press pours abuse on me. But I am not sorry for it. It only confirms me in my belief that there is no Swaraj without a settlement with the Musalmans.[67]

In the present instance, there is nothing to prevent the imperial rulers from declaring their will in unequivocal terms that henceforth India will govern herself according to her own will, not that of the rulers as has happened hitherto. Neither the Muslim League nor any other party can oppose such a declaration. For the Muslims will be entitled to dictate their own terms. Unless the rest of India wishes to engage in internal fratricide, the others will have to submit to Muslim dictation if the Muslims will resort to it. I know no non-violent method of compelling the obedience of eight crores of Muslims to the will of the rest of India, however powerful a majority the rest may represent. The Muslims must have the same right of self-determination that the rest of India has. We are at present a joint family. Any member may claim a division.

Thus, so far as I am concerned, my proposition that there is no Swaraj without communal unity holds as good today as when I first enunciated it in 1919.[68]

Civil Disobedience and Muslims

There can be no civil resistance so long as the Muslim League blocks the way...

The...condition should not offend Muslim friends. So long as there is no workable arrangement with the Muslim League, civil resistance must involve resistance against the League. No Congressman can be party to it. I observe that my note in the *Harijan* has shocked Jinnah Saheb. I am sorry for it. But at this stage I would not defend

myself. I do not want to mar in any way the negotiations between him and Pandit Nehru, which, I hope, will be resumed soon and pray, will lead to communal peace.[69] They cannot indefinitely do so ['hold up the movement assuming that there will be Hindu-Muslim riots']. I have enough faith in Musalmans to hope that they would rebel against being an obstacle in the way of independence. There is enough love of freedom and democracy in them to make them ashamed of that state of things.[70]

I still believe that there can be no Swaraj by non-violent means without communal unity. And eight crores of Muslims can certainly bar the way to peaceful freedom.

If, then, I still talk of civil disobedience, it is because I believe that the Muslim masses want freedom as much as the rest of the population of this country. And assuming that they do not, civil disobedience will be a powerful means of educating public opinion whether Muslim, Hindu or any other. It will also be an education of world opinion.[71]

There is a message I should like to reach the ears of every Musalman. India cannot win independence if eight or more crores of Musalmans are opposed to it. But I cannot believe that all of them are so opposed, until it is proved to me by the vote of every adult Musalman.[72]

The idea of killing the Muslims if they do not remain in subjection may have been all right in bygone days; it has no meaning today. There is no force in the cry of driving out the English if the substitute is to be Hindu or any other domination. That will be no Swaraj.[73]

Third Party bar to Communal unity

That unity is strength is not merely a copy-book maxim but a rule of life is in no case so clearly illustrated as in the problem of Hindu-Muslim unity. Divided we must fall. Any third power may easily enslave India so long as we Hindus and Musalmans are ready to cut each other's throats.[74]

What is the alternative to Hindu-Muslim unity? A perpetuation of slavery? If we regard one another as natural enemies, is there any escape from eternal foreign domination for either of us? Is not the present domination worse than the possibility of forcible conversions or worse? Is Hinduism worth anything if it cannot survive force? Cannot the Musalmans, too, ask the same question...? Is there no possibility of a repetition

of pillage and murder on the part of Hindus...? Is not the remedy therefore, clearly Hindu-Muslim unity at all hazards? [75]

My case is that alien rulers have ruled India on the principle of divide and rule. No alien imperial rule could go on in India unless the rulers coquetted now with one and then with the other party. We will continue to be divided so long as the wedge of the foreign rule remains there, and sinks deeper and deeper. That is the way of the wedge. But take out the wedge and the split parts will instantly come together and unite...

Let the Government declare that they are going to withdraw from India whether Indians agreed or not, and you will see that we shall then soon agree. The fact of the matter is that no one feels that he is going to get real, live liberty. What is offered is simply a share in the power of the bureaucracy to exploit India, and this sets up an apple of discord in our midst.[76]

Do not talk of a majority or a minority community. The Congress alone is the biggest majority community. You want us to have regard to the claims of minorities. Do you want the Congress to parcel out India in small sections for Anglo-Indians and Indian Christians, and among them I suppose, Protestants and Catholics and Europeans, and among them also Protestants and Catholics, and then as many subsections of Hindus as you please—Jains and Buddhists, Sanatanists and Samajists, and so on? I, for one, will be no party to this heartless process of vivisection. Is that how you propose to make a nation by your policy of Divide and Rule? [77]

No! [I do not think 'the British Government should suggest a solution of the communal question'.] But I am the only party to say no. It is a humiliating thing, and neither the Congress nor I can be a party to it.[78]

Freedom larger question

This bugbear of communalism is confined largely to the cities which are not India, but which are the blotting sheets of London and other Western cities, which consciously or unconsciously prey upon villages and share with you in exploiting them by becoming the commission agents of England. This communal question is of no importance before the great question of Indian freedom of which the British ministers are studiously fighting shy. They forget that they cannot go on for long with a

discontented, rebellious India—true, ours is a non-violent rebellion, but it is rebellion none the less. Freedom of India is superior to the disease which for the time is corroding some portions of the community, and if the constitutional question is satisfactorily solved, the communal distemper will immediately vanish. The moment the alien wedge is removed, the divided communities are bound to unite. There is, therefore, no Hindu case, and if there is one, it must go by the board. If you study this question it will profit you nothing, and when you go into its exasperating details you will, very likely, prefer to see us drowned in the Thames.[79]

I urge you, then, to read that writing on the wall. I ask you not to try the patience of a people known to be proverbially patient. We speak of the mild Hindu, and the Musalman also, by contact for good or evil with the Hindu, has himself become mild...

The baffling problem of minorities, believe me, exists here, and I repeat what I used to say in India—I have not forgotten those words—that without the problem of minorities being solved there is no Swaraj for India, there is no freedom for India. I know that; I realize it; and yet I came here in the hope that, perchance, I might be able to pull through a solution here. But I do not despair of some day or other finding a real and living solution in connection with the minorities' problem. I repeat what I have said elsewhere that, so long as the wedge in the shape of foreign rule divides community from community and class from class, there will be no real living solution, there will be no living friendship between these communities.

It will be, after all, and at best, a paper solution. But immediately you withdraw that wedge, the domestic ties, the domestic affections, the knowledge of common birth—do you suppose that all these will count for nothing?[80]

Vicious circle

British officials including Viceroys have admitted that they have ruled by following the policy of 'divide and rule'. The British established themselves by taking advantage of our internal quarrels and have remained by keeping them alive. It is unnecessary for my argument to prove that the policy is being followed deliberately.

The British have made themselves believe that they are ruling because of our quarrels, and that they will gladly retire when we have ceased to quarrel. Thus, they are moving in a vicious circle. British rule must be permanent if the adjustment of the communal

quarrel is a condition precedent to India becoming independent. It is a purely domestic problem which we are bound to solve if we are to live at peace with one another. May I remind the critic and those who argue like him that, only a short while ago, it was said that, if the British withdrew, the Hindus would be left to the mercy of the virile races from the north, that not a virgin would be safe or a moneyed man retain his wealth. Now Princes and Muslims, who are able enough to protect themselves against the unarmed millions whom the Congress claims specially to represent, are sought to be protected by the British bayonet against the latter!! Be that as it may, the Congress must pursue its even course. It must work for communal unity in spite of odds against it. It is a plank in its programme. It is a part of the non-violent technique.

British bona fides

Another English critic has put the problem in a truer way. He says among many other things: "British people feel that Great Britain needs to carry the Muslim world with her at this time of immense struggle." I have no difficulty in sympathizing with this position. Only let us clear the issues. Great Britain cannot afford to risk defeat for the sake of doing justice. This is just what an overwhelming number of Indians feel. The Congress, before it can offer ungrudging support to Britain, wants to feel sure that hers is an absolutely just cause. The recent events have created a grave doubt about it...

But British policy may make a just solution impossible at the present moment.[81]

The British Government can do much. They have done much by force. They can make the parties come to a solution by force. But they need not go so far. What they have done hitherto is to prevent a proper solution. In proof of my statement I commend the esteemed correspondent to the columns of *Harijan*. The only thing the British Government have to do is to change their attitude. Will they? They can retain their hold on India only by a policy of divide and rule. A living unity between Muslims and Hindus is fraught with danger to their rule. It would mean an end of it. Therefore, it seems to me that a true solution will come with the end of the rule, potentially if not in fact.[82]

Your question ['why not divide India into two sections as far as population goes...'] reads well on paper; but your suggestion, if acted upon, must break down in practice.

The act of government is not the simple thing you seem to imagine. What you suggest may work as a toy when the strings are pulled by armed authority. It won't be our government. The puller of the strings will govern. That is the old way. I have presented the better way—the non-violent method.

British withdrawal

In either case, the first condition is that every trace of foreign authority should be removed from the land. Then and then only shall we know our real selves—our strength as well as our weaknesses. When we are untrammelled by foreign or other authority and free, we shall know how to deal with the day-to-day problems. We won't, then, be governed in the neat way mentioned by you. The arbiter then will be either the sword or reason.[83]

What will happen thereafter, if ever we reach that stage, will depend upon how we act when the all-powerful British hand is withdrawn. We may quarrel among ourselves or we may adjust our quarrels and agree to set up ordered rule on behalf of the people. It may be a democratic constitution or unadulterated autocracy or oligarchy. The conception is not that of a settlement with the British Government. That could happen only if there is a settlement between the principal parties, and as a preliminary, the Congress and the League. But that, so far as I can see, is not to be.

Therefore, the only settlement with the British Government can be that their rule should end leaving India to her fate. Thus, assuming that the British leave, there is no government and no constitution, *British* or other. Therefore, there is no Central Government. Militarily the most powerful party may set up its rule and impose it on India, if the people submit. Muslims may declare Pakistan and nobody may resist them. Hindus may do likewise, Sikhs may set up their rule in territories inhabited by them. There is no end to the possibilities. And to all this idle speculation let me suggest one more addition. The Congress and the League, being the best organized parties in the country, may come to terms and set up a provisional government acceptable to all. And this may be followed by a duly elected Constituent Assembly.

The movement has only one aim—that is of displacing the British power. If that happy event comes about and if it is followed by a stable government, it will most assuredly decide the fate of the war—I shall hope, in a non-violent manner. India can show no other strength during this war at any rate. Why should not the Muslims who believe in

Pakistan but also believe in independent India join such a struggle? If on the other hand, they believe in Pakistan through British aid and under British aegis, it is a different story. I have no place in it.[84]

I do not admit its claim (the concern of the British for minorities) to do so. It is an unconscious relic, if you like, of imperialism. You had independence even when you heaped disabilities on Roman Catholics. Which outsider dared to interfere with your independence? What right have the English rulers, who have deliberately sown the seeds of discord and brought about these interminable dissensions into our structure, now to concern themselves with our differences so-called? Not until and unless you discard this "whiteman's burden" notion will you be able truly to assist India.[85]

Congress-League rapprochement

The British, imagining that they can bring the League and the Congress together, are attempting the impossible.

If you think deeply enough, you will see that I am quite consistent. My faith in human nature is quite consistent with my holding that men with diametrically opposite views cannot coalesce. I have called Pakistan a sin. Can I co-operate to make sin a success? God cannot belie Himself. Truth cannot work for untruth. That all things are possible with God cannot be used to make God break His law.

I have said, and I think rightly, that the connotation of independence of India as meant by the British, the Muslim League and the Congress is different. Muslim League independence means splitting India first and independence after. The Congress stands for inmediate, unconditional independence for the whole of India.

No. ['My misgivings are not due to a fundamental distrust of Britain doing the right thing.'] But I have a fundamental distrust of their doing it *at any cost*. I said that the statement they issued was the best they were capable of but it was not intrinsically the best. Then, at the outset, it bore three interpretations. The Congress put one, the League another and the author a third one. That makes it a dangerous document. The law rightly does not accept the intention of the framer of a law outside what the text bears. That [re-wording the document 'in order to make the intention clear'] is impossible. It would mean perpetual changing and chopping. [86]

British role

The only constituted authority is the British. We are all puppets in their hands. But it would be wrong and foolish to blame that authority. It acts according to its nature. That authority does not compel us to be puppets. We voluntarily run into their camp. It is, therefore, open to any and every one of us to refuse to play the British game.

Let us also admit frankly that the British authority is struggling to quit India. It does not know how. It honestly wants to leave India but wants, before leaving, to undo the wrong it has been doing for so long. Being in the position of the 'toad under the harrow', I must know where it hurts. I have been telling the authority, if it will undo the wrong quickly, to leave India to her fate. But those who compose the British Services cannot realize this obvious fact. They flatter themselves with the belief that they know India better than we do ourselves. Having successfully kept us under subjection for over a century, they claim the right to constitute themselves judges of our destiny. We may not grumble, if we are to come into our own through the way of peace. Satyagraha is never vindictive. It believes not in destruction but in conversion. Its failures are due to the weaknesses of the Satyagrahi, not to any defect in the law itself. The British authority having decided to quit, (whatever the reason), will show growing defects and weaknesses. Parties will find that it is more and more a broken reed. And, when parties quarrel as Hindus and Muslims do, let one or the other or both realize that, if India is to be an independent nation, one or both must deliberately cease to look to British authority for protection.[87]

We are not yet in the midst of civil war. But we are nearing it. At present we are playing at it. War is a respectable term for *goondaism* practised on a mass or national scale. If the British are wise, they will keep clear of it. Appearances are to the contrary. Even the English members in the Provincial Assemblies refuse to see that they were given seats by the Act of 1935, not because it was right but in order that they might protect British interest and keep Hindus and Muslims apart. But they do not see this. It is a small matter. Nevertheless, it is a straw showing the way the wind is blowing.[88]

I appeal to Englishmen, too, not to imagine that they can keep us apart. If they do, they are disloyal to both India and Britain. Hindus and Muslims are all one, of the

same soil, blood-brothers, who eat the same food, drink the same water and talk the same language. They have to live together.[89]

I fully mean what I have said. Whilst there is an outside power ruling India, there is neither Pakistan nor Hindustan but bare slavery is our lot. And if anybody maintains that the measure of provincial autonomy they enjoy is equal to independence, they are unaware of the contents of independence. It is true that the British Power is certain to go. But if we cannot patch up our quarrels and indulge in blood-baths, a combination of powers is certain to hold us in bondage. Those powers will not tolerate a country so vast and populous as India and so rich in potential resources to rot away because of internal disturbances. Every country has to live for the rest. Days when they can drag on the frog-in-the-well existence are gone.[90]

Britain was once undisputed mistress of the seas. If she plays true by India, she can become mistress of the morals of the world, which will be a very much bigger honour. She can then decide the fate of the world. I believe she has the capacity. I know the British well. I have passed some of the best years of my life among them and I have always voted against the name of 'Perfidious Albion' for them and have preferred to subscribe to Cowper's well-known verse: 'Hypocrisy is an ode to virtue.' But Britain has yet to rise to those heights.[91]

It would be a good thing if the British were to go today—thirteen months means mischief to India. I do not question the nobility of the British declaration, I do not question the sincerity of the Viceroy, but facts are facts. Neither the British Cabinet nor the Viceroy, however outstanding he may be, can alter facts. And the facts are that India has been trained to look to the British power for everything. Now, it is not possible for India to take her mind off that state all of a sudden. I have never appreciated the argument that the British want so many months to get ready to leave. During that time all parties will look to the British Cabinet and the Viceroy. We have not defeated the British by force of arms. It has been a victory for India by moral force. Assuming, of course, that every word of what has been said is meant to be carried out, then the British decision will go down in history as the noblest act of the British nation. That being so, the thirteen months' stay of the British power and British arms is really a hindrance rather than a help, because everybody looks for help to the great military machine they have brought into being. That happened in Bengal, in

Bihar, in the Punjab, and in the North-west Frontier Province. The Hindus and the Muslims said in turn: "Let us have the British troops." It is a humiliating spectacle. I have often said before but it does not suffer in value through repetition, because every time I repeat it, it gains force: the British will have to take the risk of leaving India to chaos or anarchy. This is so because there has been no Home Rule: it has been imposed on the people. And when you voluntarily remove that rule, there might be no rule in the initial state. It might have come about if we had gained victory by the force of arms. The communal feuds you see here are, in my opinion, partly due to the presence of the British. If the British were not here, we would still go through the fire no doubt, but that fire would purify us.[92]

I only paraphrase the idea in my speech. Bernard Shaw's banter is by no means exhaustive nor are the Englishman's resources. I have no doubt that he is quitting India on principle. Man has the supreme knack of deceiving himself. The Englishman is supremest among men. He is quitting because he has discovered that it is wrong on economic and political grounds to hold India in bondage. Herein he is quite sincere. It will not be denied, however, that sincerity is quite consistent with self-deception. He is self-deceived in that he believes that he cannot leave India to possible anarchy if such is to be her lot. He is quite content to leave India as a cockpit between two organized armies. Before quitting, he is setting the seal of approval on the policy of playing off one community against another. And he lacks the courage to do the right so far as the States are concerned. I hope that, before he finally leaves on the 15 of August, he will bring the two parties together, now that one has got all it wants. He can do so, if he wills it. Travancore and Hyderabad have not yet become independent States. I admit freely that, if the Englishman left India in an uncertain condition and left the possibility of several warring States, all independent of England and, therefore, of one another, he cannot conceive a greater reflection on the British name than this would be. Dominion Status will then stink in the nostrils. But I have not given up hope that British statesmanship would not have declared utter bankruptcy before August 15th. Till then I prefer to defer judgment, in spite of the correspondent's profound distrust of British declarations, however high-minded they might be to read. Let their acts be the real judge of their words. I will believe a man's word unless I have good reason to doubt it. That 'Mr. Churchill & Co.' are disposed to bless the Bill for Indian Independence proves that they have realized the economic and political

necessity of the step. I however, have no hesitation in admitting that recent signs are portentous enough to rouse suspicions. I do not, however, believe in dying before my death.[93]

6 SEPARATE ELECTORATES

Communal representation

Our goal must be the removal, at the earliest possible moment, of communal or sectional representation. A common electorate must impartially elect its representatives on the sole ground of merit.[94]

What the Musalmans want is not separate electorate for its own sake, but they want their own real representatives to be sent to the legislatures and other elective bodies. This can be done by private arrangement rather than legal imposition. There is flexibility about private arrangement. A legal imposition tends to become more and more rigid. Private arrangement will continually test the honour and good faith of each party. Legal imposition avoids the necessity of honour and good faith. Private arrangement means a domestic settlement of domestic quarrels and a solid wall of united opposition against a common enemy—the foreign rule. I am told that the law prevents the working of the private arrangement I have in view. If it is so, we must seek to remove legal obstacle and not create and add a new one. My plan, therefore, is to do away with separate electorates but secure the election of the desired and agreed numbers of Musalman and other candidates in a given constituency under a joint ticket, Musalman candidates to be nominated by previously known Musalman associations. I need not enter into the question of representation in excess of numbers at the present stage.

It can be considered and all difficulties in that direction can be met when the principle of private arrangement is accepted by all.

No doubt my proposal presupposes a sincere desire on the part of all concerned to reach a solution in terms of Swaraj. If communalism is the goal, then any private arrangement must break down. If, however, Swaraj is the goal and the parties approach the question purely from a national standpoint, there need be no fear of breakdown. On the contrary, every party will be interested in its faithful working.

What the law should, however, provide is a just franchise whereby every community can have, if it wishes, voters on the roll in proportion to its numbers. Our voters' rolls should answer the number of representatives in proportion to its population. But that

question requires a critical examination of the working of the existing franchise. For me the existing franchise is wholly untenable for any Swaraj scheme.[95]

It seems to have been represented that I am opposed to any representation of the "Untouchables" on the legislatures. This is a travesty of the truth. What I have said and what I must repeat is that I am opposed to their special representation. I am convinced that this can do them no good and may do much harm; but the Congress is wedded to adult franchise. Therefore, millions of them can be placed on the voters' roll. It is impossible to conceive that, with untouchability fast disappearing, nominees of these voters can be boycotted by the others. But what these people need more than election to the legislatures is protection from social and religious persecution. Custom, which is often more powerful than law, has brought them to a degradation of which every thinking Hindu has need to feel ashamed and to do penance. I should, therefore, have the most drastic legislation rendering criminal all the special persecution to which these fellow-countrymen of mine are subjected by the so-called superior classes. Thank God the conscience of the Hindus has been stirred, and untouchability will soon be a relic of our sinful past.[96]

The small minorities have a perfect right to demand full civic rights. But don't encourage them to ask for separate representation. They can enter the legislatures by the open door of election. Why are Anglo-Indians afraid of their interests being neglected? Because they are Anglo-Indians? No, they are afraid because they have not served India. Let them follow the example of the Parsis who have served India and who will not ask for separate electorates. That is because they know that they will be in the legislatures by sheer right of service. Dadabhai Naoroji's whole life was dedicated to the service of India and his four granddaughters, all cultured and educated like any English gids, are slaving for the peasants of India. One of them was the dictator of a province, and when she stood for election to the provincial council she topped the polls. She is at the present moment spreading the cult of the Charkha among the Frontier Pathans and ruling their hearts. Let the Anglo-Indians, too, enter the legislatures by the open door of service. And even so Englishmen. Is it not a shame that Englishmen still claim privileges in a country they have helped to impoverish and claim separate elections in a poor nation's legislature? No, I will never be guilty of parcelling out my country to these groups. It will be nothing short of vivisection of a whole nation.[97]

Special reservation

I would like to repeat what I have said before, that, while the Congress will always accept any solution that may be acceptable to the Hindus, the Musalmans and the Sikhs, the Congress will be no party to special reservation or special electorates for any other minorities. The Congress will always endorse clauses or reservations as to fundamental rights and civil liberty. It will be open to everybody to be placed on the voters' roll and to appeal to the common body of the electorates. In my humble opinion, the proposition enunciated by Sir Hubert Carr is the very negation of responsible government, the very negation of nationalism. He says that, if you want a live European representative on the legislature, then, he must be elected by the Europeans themselves. Well, Heaven help India if India has to have representatives elected by these several special, cut-up groups. That European, and that European only, who commands the approval of the common electorate and not that of the mere Europeans will serve India as a whole. This very idea suggests that responsible government will always have to contend against these interests which will always be in conflict with the national spirit—with this body of 85 per cent of agricultural population. To me, it is an unthinkable thing. If we are going to bring into being responsible government and if we are going to get real freedom, then, I venture to suggest, that it should be the proud privilege and the duty of every one of these so-called special classes to seek entry into the legislatures through this open door, through the election and approval of the common body of electorates. You know that the Congress is wedded to adult suffrage, and under adult suffrage it will be open to all to be placed on the voters' list. More than that nobody can ask.[98]

If we Hindus, Muslims and others are to evolve democracy, we shall do so only by the representatives elected under the broadest franchise possible, and that either through British goodwill or in the teeth of its opposition.[99]

Separate electorates have resulted in the separation of hearts. They presupposed mutual distrust and conflict of interests. They have tended to perpetuate differences and deepen the distrust...

Congressmen, if they are not to merge in the Hindus as Hindus, must rigidly abstain from the legislatures and local bodies governed by separate electorates. In these provinces the separate electorates must be taken to have come from the Hindu

demand and in the supposed Hindu interest. But a Congress Hindu has no interest apart from his Muslim brother. Therefore, he must not enter the electoral bodies where Hindu and Muslim interests are falsely regarded as separate and even antagonistic. If he enters these bodies, he can do so only to divide the majority members, i.e., to take sides with one Muslim party or another. If I could make all Hindus Congress-minded, I would withdraw every Hindu member from these bodies and put the Muslim members on their honour. I would seek to influence them from outside these bodies by being friends with them and rendering disinterested service. I would be indifferent to their manning all the services. At the most an infinitesimal percentage can have a share in them. And it is a superstition to suppose that these services can oppress a people who have become conscious of human dignity and human rights and know how to enforce them. Since the vast majority of Congressmen are Hindus in at least three Muslim-majority provinces, they have a rare opportunity of showing their non-violent strength, their disinterestedness, their utter freedom from the communal taint, and their ability to submit to the rule of their Muslim fellow countrymen. They will do this not in a huff but as true nationalists and friends of the Muslims. Remaining outside they will probably better protect the just interests of the Hindus as citizens. For a Congress Hindu is not any the less a Hindu because he claims to represent equally, as he must, all the other faiths in himself. For as I have said, so far as the State is concerned, its capacity for service stops short of the service of the different faiths, and the services it can render apply to all irrespective of their faiths. Therefore, Congressmen have a rare opportunity of showing undefiled nationalism in these provinces. They will, incidentally, show the other minorities that they have nothing to fear from the majorities if they know the true way. We must get out of the miasma of religious majorities and minorities. Why Parsi's is an interest different from a Hindu's or Muslim's so far as the State is concerned? Did not Dadabhai and Pherozeshah rule the Congress while they lived, not by Congress grace or patronage, but by right of service and merit? Did their rule injure any Hindu or Muslim interest? Were these interests ever in conflict on the Congress platform? And is not the Congress a voluntary State? [100]

Congress and Legislatures

I do not expect all the Hindus to abstain [from the legislatures or only a part]. I know that all Hindu seats will be filled by non-congress Hindus. Congress Hindus, if they go

in, will be ground down between the two stones of the communal *chakki* without doing any good to anybody.

I do not approach the question as a Hindu. I approach it as a Congressman seeking to represent equally all communities. But for the artificial system introduced in the composition of the Indian legislatures, all the members would be representing not communities but their parties grouped according to their non-communal shibboleths. As one representing all communities, I would expect not only Hindus but Congress-minded Muslims and others, too, to avoid the legislatures and elective bodies. These abstainers will hold the scales evenly between all communities and seek to affect the legislatures from outside. Whether they are many or only a few, they will play the role of wise men. If all listened to me, the communal question would disappear from our midst.[101]

V. Communal Disturbances

1 TRAGEDY OF RIOTS

The springs of life in India appear to be dry today. We would be foolish to imagine that all is well because we have a Congress ministry at the Centre. It is as if God has come to us with His awful light and His thunder to awaken us at a time when our minds are blinded with delusion and dust.[1]

For a thousand Hindus to surround a hundred Musalmans or for a thousand Musalmans to surround a hundred Hindus and oppress them is not bravery but cowardice. A fair fight means even numbers and previous notice. That does not mean that I approve their fighting.[2]

In my opinion, the riots are due to the idiocy of both the communities.[3]

Today, alas! All that the Congress tricolour stood for, viz., Hindu-Muslim-Sikh unity and the Charkha were nowhere to be found except in my humble hut.[4]

If the British are going, as they surely are, what should be the duty of Indians? Are we to return blow for blow among ourselves, and thus perpetuate our slavery, only to tear up our Motherland, in the end, into bits which go by the name of Hindustan and Pakistan, Brahmanistan and Achhutistan (land of untouchable)? What greater madness can there be than what has taken place in Bengal and Bihar, or what is taking place in the Punjab or the Frontier Province? Shall we forget our humanity and return a blow for a blow? [5]

I confess that I do not yet know what the full meaning of dividing India really is. But what I want to impress upon you is that, supposing it were only a so-called political struggle, does it mean that all rules of decency and morals should be thrown to the winds? When human conflicts are divorced from ethical considerations, the road can only lead to the use of the atom bomb where every trace of humanity is held completely in abeyance.[6]

The aim of life is that we should serve the Power that had created us, and on whose mercy or consent depends our very breath, by heartily serving its creation. This means love, not hate which one sees everywhere. We have forgotten that aim and are either actually fighting each other or preparing for that fight. If we cannot escape that calamity, we should regard India's independence as an impossible dream. If we

thought that we will get independence by the simple fact of the British power quitting the land, we are sadly mistaken. The British are leaving India. But if we continue fighting one another, some other power or powers will step in. If we think we can fight the whole world with its weapons, it is a folly.[7]

Certainly, the carnage that is going on before our very eye is a shameful things.[8]

India's traditions

It [the Asian Conference now being held] is a big thing and our jewel, Jawaharlal, is very beloved of the delegates because of his love for you and his dream of a United Asia. Only, however, if India is true to her traditions can she be worthy of the role she ought to play. It will be cruel to spoil Jawaharlal's dream of a United Asia by internal strife in this land.[9]

The second chapter of the Gita describes in its ending *shlokas* how the God-fearing man should live and move and have his being. I want you to read, mark, learn and inwardly digest the meaning of every one of those *shlokas*. You will then realize what their ideals are and how far short of them you have fallen today.[10]

I have to hang my head in shame when foreigners ask me about the communal strife in India. All I can say is that it is not everybody that has gone mad. The mad orgies are the work of a few and I pray and believe that all will become one in God's good time. I hope that the people of Delhi will take their full share in bringing about that heart unity.[10]

The scene that we witness is a symptom of the disease that has got hold of India. Intolerance, impatience and retaliation are in the air.[12]

No resort to violence

If the majority of the Muslims obey Quaid-i-Azam Jinnah, a violent conflict should be out of the question, or if the majority of the Hindus take their stand on non-violence, no matter how much violence the Muslims use, it is bound to fail. One thing, however, should be perfectly understood. The votaries of non-violence cannot harbour violence in thought, let alone the question of doing it.[13]

There is an additional reason why no vital change in the shape of Hindustan is possible in the present state of the country. There is the joint statement issued by the Quaid-i-Azam and me. It enunciates a sound principle that there should be no violence

employed in the pursuit of political aims. If in the teeth of that document the country continues the mad career of violence of the worst kind, and if the British Power is weak enough to submit to it in the vain hope that after the mad thirst is quenched things will run smooth, it would have left a bloody legacy for which not only India but the whole world will blame her. We shall then have learnt the cruel lesson that everything was to be got if mad violence was perpetrated in sufficient measure. I would, therefore, urge every patriot and certainly the British Power to face out the worst violence and leave India, as it can be left under the Cabinet Mission document of 16th May of last year. Today, in the presence of the British Power we are only demoralized by the orgy of blood, arson and worse. After it is withdrawn, let me hope, we shall have the wisdom to think coherently and keep India one, or split it into two or more parts. But if we are bent even then on fighting, I am sure we will not be so demoralized as we are today, though admittedly all violence carries with it some amount of demoralization. I shall hope against hope that India free will not give the world an additional object-lesson in violence with which it is already sick almost unto death.[14]

I am an irrepressible optimist. We have not lived and toiled in vain all these years that we should become barbarians as we appear to be becoming, looking at all the senseless bloodshed in Bengal, Bihar and the Punjab. But I feel it is just an indication that, as we are throwing off the foreign yoke, all the dirt and froth is coming to the surface. When the Ganges is in flood, the water is turbid. The dirt comes to the surface. When the flood subsides, you see the clear blue water which soothes the eye. That is what I hope for and live for. I do not wish to live to see Indian humanity becoming barbarian.[15]

I am told, with what truth I do not know, that the parties [in Lahore] are fairly matched and are bent on fighting it out. What the 'it' is I do not know; Is the suicidal strife to continue, Pakistan or no Pakistan? Why cannot the combatants honestly come together and decide to stop arson and murder? Must we look to the ruling race to suppress the riots? The end of alien rule is imminent. Would to God our people stop this savagery and show mankind the better and the braver way! [16]

Torn between conflicts

I am torn between several conflicts. I feel that Bihar is calling me, so is Noakhali where I had commenced work among the riot-affected refugees and tried to specialize in the work. When a month ago I left Patna, I was under the impression that I would return to Bihar inside of a week. But events have taken place during the month in such quick succession that perhaps a generation has been packed into a month. So I am vegetating in New Delhi, hoping that thereby I am serving both Bihar and Noakhali. Then I fancy that the Punjab is also calling me. I see no guiding star unmistakably telling me which way to take. I, therefore, go by the saying that had gripped me years ago—"When in doubt stay where you are."[17]

It is said that my speeches nowadays are depressing. Some even suggest that I should not speak at all. This multitude of advisers reminds me of a painter who had exposed his painting in a shopwindow without glass, inviting critics to mark the parts they did not like. The result was a daub. The painter had simply tried to show that it was impossible to please all parties. He was, therefore, satisfied that he had painted a good picture. His business was to produce a work which satisfied his artistic taste. Mine is a similar case. I hope I never speak for the sake of speaking. I speak because I feel that I have something to say to the people.[18]

I am sorry to say that I am ashamed of my countrymen, be they Hindu or Muslim. Neither becomes my enemy because either chooses to call himself so.[19]

Avoidance of fratricide

India knows, the world should, that every ounce of my energy has been and is being devoted to the definite avoidance of fratricide culminating in war. When a man vowed to non-violence as the law governing human beings dares to refer to war, he can only do it so as to strain every nerve to avoid it. Such is my fundamental position from which I hope never to swerve even to my dying day.[20]

I am constrained to say that the suffering of humanity could have been greatly minimized if one side at least had retained sanity. The spirit of revenge and retaliation has started a vicious circle and brought hardships on increasing numbers. The Hindus and the Muslims today seem to vie with each other in cruelty. Even women, children and the aged are not spared.[21]

The senseless blood-bath through which India is still passing, though the original fury seems to have abated, may be nothing unusual as history goes. What India is passing through must be regarded as unusual. If we grant that such liberty as India has gained was a tribute to non-violence as I have repeatedly said, non-violence of India's struggle was only in name, in reality it was passive resistance of the weak. The truth of the statement we see demonstrated by the happenings in India.[22]

2 RIOTS AND INDEPENDENCE

Freedom a mirage if...

If you continue quarrelling with each other, Independence will vanish into thin air and that will firmly implant the third power in India, be it the British or any other. India is a vast country, rich in minerals, metals and spices. There is nothing in the world that India does not produce. If you keep on quarrelling, any of the big powers of the world will feel tempted to come and save India from Indians and at the same time exploit her rich resources.[23]

If you really wish to see India independent in every sense of the term, you must not imitate barbarous methods. Those who resort to such methods will find that they are retarding the day of India's deliverance.[24]

After all, the freedom for which I had fought all my life is at our door. I know that there can be no economic freedom or moral betterment without political freedom. Therefore, why do I not rejoice? There is some force in this argument. But as a *Satyagrahi* wedded to Truth, I can never say what does not come from the depths of my heart.[25]

I implore you all to stop your insane actions at once. Let not future generations say that you lost the sweet bread of freedom because you could not digest it. Remember that unless you stop this madness the name of India will be mud in the eyes of the world.[26]

India has two governments. It is the duty of the citizens to allow the two governments to fight it out among themselves. The daily toll of lives is a criminal waste which does nobody any good and does infinite harm.

If the people become lawless and fight among themselves, they will prove that they are unable to digest freedom.[27]

It is the duty of the Union Government to see that the Pakistan Government does its duty as it is that of Pakistan to ensure justice by the Union. They cannot secure justice by copying the evil ways of one another. If two men go out riding and one falls down, is the other to follow suit? This will merely result in breaking the bones of both. Supposing the Muslims will not be loyal to the Union, nor will they surrender arms, are they to continue murder of innocent men, women and children on this account? It

is for the Government to see that the traitors are dealt with properly. By taking to savagery the people in both the States have tarnished the fair name that India has earned in the world. They are thereby bargaining for slavery and destruction of their great religions.[28]

3 PARTITION RIOTS

(1) *Direct action in Calcutta*

Calcutta has given an ocular demonstration of what direct action is and how it is to be done.

Who is the gainer? Certainly not the Muslim masses, nor the sober follower of Islam, which itself means sobriety and peace. The very salute '*salam alaikum*' means peace be unto you.

Violence may have its place in life but not that which we have witnessed in Calcutta, assuming, of course, that newspaper accounts are to be trusted Pakistan of whatever hue does not lie through senseless violence. When I write of senseless violence, I naturally assume the possibility of sensible violence, whatever the latter may be. The Calcutta demonstration was not an illustration of sensible violence.

What senseless violence does is to prolong the lease of the life of British or foreign rule. I believe that the authors of the State Paper issued by the Cabinet Mission desire peaceful transfer of power to representative Indian hands. But if *we* need the use of the British gun and bayonet, the British will not go or, if they do, some other foreign power will take their place. We shall make a serious mistake, if, every time the British bayonet is used, we trot out the *agent provocateur*. No doubt he has been at work. Let us not ride that horse to death.

Calcutta has earned a bad repute of late. It has seen too many wild demonstrations during the past few months. If the evil reputation is sustained for some time longer, it will cease to be the city of palaces, it will become the city of the dead.

Would that the violence of Calcutta were sterilized and did not become a signal for its spread all over! It depends upon the leaders of the Muslim League, of course, but the rest will not be free from responsibility. They can retaliate or refrain. Refraining is easy and simple, if there is the will. Retaliation is complicated. Will it be tooth against tooth or many against one? [29]

As one drives through the deserted streets with garbage heaps, at places banked up nearly two feet high against the pavements, and entire rows of gutted shops and burnt-out houses in the side-streets and by-lanes as far as the eye can reach, one feels overcome with a sinking feeling at the mass madness that can turn man into less

than the brute. By its very nature this state of things cannot last. Human nature won't stand it. As Abraham Lincoln said, "You cannot fool all the people for all time." There seem to be indications that the people are already beginning to sicken of the carnival of blood and bestiality. They have been fighting amongst themselves like wild beasts. The fighting can do no good to Calcutta, Bengal, India, or the world. [30]

(2) *Outrages in Noakhali*

Sufferings of women have always melted my heart. I want to go to Bengal and wipe their tears and put heart into them, if I can.[31]

It is the cry of outraged womanhood that has peremptorily called me to Noakhali.[32]

If I can wipe away the tears of the outraged womenhood of Noakhali, I shall be more than satisfied. [33]

I have come to you in sadness. What sin has Mother India committed that her children, Hindus and Muslims, are quarrelling with each other? I have learnt that no Hindu woman is safe today in some parts of East Bengal. Ever since I have come to Bengal, I am hearing awful tales of Muslim atrocities.[94]

I know the women of Bengal better than probably the Bengalis do. Today they feel crushed and helpless. The sacrifice of myself and my companions would at least teach them the art of dying with self-respect. It might open, too, the eyes of the oppressors and melt their hearts. I do not say that the moment my eyes are closed theirs will open. But that will be ultimate result I have not the slightest doubt. If Ahimsa disappears, Hindu Dharma disappears.[35]

This fratricide is more awful than anything in my experience. I have carried on a grim struggle for 20 years in South Africa and for the last 30 years in India. But this mutual slaughter has non-plussed me. I do not know how I can induce the two communities to live in peace and harmony again. I have come to Bengal to find a solution for the problem. Bengal is a big province. If the communal problem can be solved here, it will be solved elsewhere also. If I succeed here, I will go away from Bengal with a new lease of life. If not, I wish God to remove me from this earth. I do not wish to leave Bengal empty—handed. The word 'pessimism' is not to be found in my dictionary.[36]

Laboratory far crucial experiment

I do not propose to leave East Bengal till I am satisfied that mutual trust has been established between the two communities and the two have resumed the even tenor of their life in their villages. Without this there is neither Pakistan nor Hindustan—only slavery awaits India, torn asunder by mutual strife and engrossed in barbarity.[37]

I myself am sceptical about it [my attempt to raise humanity from the lowest level]. I may succeed, I can perish in the attempt. Success or failure is not the final test. And attempt up to the last is the only real test.[38]

From London, too, I have heard to the same effect. [Noakhali has now become a laboratory where a crucial test is being made; the remedy will apply to situations all the world over where disputes arise between communities and nationalities and a new technique is needed for peaceful adjustment.'] People are interested in what happens in Noakhali. I feel that my responsibility is great and that our work has to ring true.[39]

Mission for communal peace

Two days ago, I had tried to refute a rumour that a Satyagraha movement of an extensive character was secretly planned by me in Noakhali. I have already said that nothing can be done by me in secret. If recourse were taken to secrecy and falsehood, Satyagraha will degenerate into *duragraha*.

Today, I find it necessary to answer the second charge levelled against me to which reference has already been made. I would like to proclaim that I have come to Bengal solely with the object of establishing heart-unity between the two communities, who have become estranged from one another. When that object is satisfactorily achieved, there will no longer be any necessity for me to prolong my stay.

My intention can never be to embarrass the League Government in Bengal. On the other hand, my relations with the Ministry, as well as with the officials, have been very cordial and I have been able to gather the impression that all of them looked with favour upon my peace mission. I have discovered no indication yet of my presence causing embarrassment to anyone. It is open to the Government to ask the magistrate and the superintendent of police to convince me of my error if they were

themselves convinced. As yet they have said not a word to such effect. If I feel convinced of any error on my part, I shall leave.

Profound significance

I have enough work to do elsewhere which demands my attention. There is Uruli-Kanchan, the seat of my nature cure experiments, and Sevagram, and there is Delhi, again, where I may be of some service. I shall love to spare trouble to the leaders who have to come to this out-of-the way place in order to consult me. But, personally, I feel convinced that the work undertaken by me here is of the greatest important for all India. If I succeed in my present mission, it is bound to have a profound influence on the future of India, and, if I may be permitted to say so, even on the future peace of the world, for it is to be a test of faith in non-violence. [40]

The task I have undertaken in Bengal is most serious. Here a community which was friendly to me previously has now looked upon me as its enemy. I am out to prove that I am "a real friend of the Muslims". So I have chosen for my greatest experiment a place where the Muslims are in majority.

Village tour

For the fulfilment of my mission, it will suffice if I tour the countryside alone. The presence of the workers from outside soliciting my advice and directions raises fresh problems for me instead of assisting me to solve the already complicated task I have undertaken. Much of the misunderstanding can be removed if those really keen on serving the people of Noakhali will directly approach the Bengal Ministers with their plan of work and obtain not only their written permission to carry on their work but also their approval of the plan.[41]

I pray to God, and request you all to join with me in praying that the tour which I commenced yesterday should go on uninterrupted till the end and be successful in achieving its purpose. But before praying, you should know that purpose. I have only one object in view and it is a clear one: namely, that God should purify the hearts of Hindus and Muslims, and the two communities should be free from suspicion and fear towards each other. Please join with me in this prayer and say that God is the Lord of us both and that He may give us success.

You might well ask me why it is necessary to undertake a tour for this purpose; or how can one, who is not pure in heart himself, ask others to become pure; or how can one, who himself is subject to fear, give courage to others; one, who himself moves under armed escort, call upon others to cast away their arms. All these questions are relevant and have been put to me.

My answer is that, during my tour, I wish to assure the villagers to the best of my capacity that I bear not the least ill-will towards any. I can prove this only by living and moving among those who distrust me. I admit that the third question is a little difficult for me to answer; for, I do happen to be moving under armed protection, I am surrounded by armed police and military, keenly alert to guard me from all danger. I am helpless in the matter as it is arranged by the Government which, being responsible to the people, feels that it is their duty to keep me guarded by the police and the military. How can I prevent them from doing so? Under the circumstances, I can declare only in words that I own no protector but God. I do not know whether you will believe my statement. God alone knows the mind of a person; and the duty of a man of God is to act as he is directed by his inner voice. I claim that I act accordingly...

The particular object-lessons, which I propose to give you during my tour, are how you can keep the village water and yourself clean; what use you can properly make of the earth which our bodies are made of; how you can obtain the life-force from the infinite sky spreading over your heads; how you can reinforce your vital-energy from the air which surrounds you; and how you can make proper use of the sun-light. This is to say that I shall try to teach you how we can convert our impoverished country into a land of gold by making the right use of the various elements around us. I pray to God that I may succeed in serving you in the manner set forth above.[42]

Consistent with Ahimsa

In the first place your assumption [that Bengal Ministers may regard his very presence there 'as an oppression and that whatever they do out of their own sense of justice towards the rehabilitation of the refugees may be regarded by the outside world as being done under the pressure of his presence'] is gratuitous. But if it is not, and the assumption were to accord with facts, your deduction would be correct and my stay here would not be consistent with Ahimsa.

I claim that I have come as much as a friend of the Muslims as of the Hindus in his part of the world. You may recall my visit to Champaran in the very early period of my return to the motherland. I was even served with a notice to quit. The conviction against me was cancelled on the orders of the then Viceroy, and the magistrate was instructed to permit and even help in my unofficial enquiry with the result that I was invited to become a member of the official Sly Commission and a century-old wrong was removed.[43]

Non-violence on trial

I feel I shall find my bearings only on seeing things for, myself at Noakhali. My technique of non-violence is on trial. It remains to be seen how it will answer in the face of the present crisis. If it has no validity, it were better that I myself should declare my insolvency.[44]

I am in no way ashamed of my Ahimsa. I have come to Bengal to see how far in the nick of time my Ahimsa is able to express itself in me.[45]

I am afraid you must give up all hope of my early returning or returning at all to the Ashram. The same applies to my companions. It is a herculean task that faces me. I am being tested. Is the Satyagraha of my conception a weapon of the weak or really that of the strong? I must either realize the latter or lay down my life in the attempt to attain it. That is my quest. In pursuit of it I have come to bury myself in this devastated village. His will be done. [46]

It is no prerogative of the Hindus. Listlessness is common to us all. Even if I am the only one, I shall fight this listlessness that has come over the Hindus of East Bengal. I have not come here to do a good turn to this community or that. I have come to do a good turn to myself. Non-violence is not meant to be practised by the individual only. It can be and has to be practised by society as a whole. I have come to test that for myself in Noakhali. Has my Ahimsa become bankrupt? If I fail here, it won't be any proof that the theory is wrong. It will simply mean that my *sadhana* has been imperfect, that there is some fault some where in my technique.[47]

Groping for light

I am groping for light. I am surrounded by darkness—but I must act or refrain as guided by truth. I find that I have not the patience and the technique needed in these tragic

circumstances—suffering and evil often overwhelm me and I stew in my own juice. Therefore, I have told my friends that they should bear with me and work or refrain as guided by wisdom which is now utterly demanded of us—

For me, if this thing is pulled through, it will be the crowning act of my life. I had to come down to the soil and to the people of East Bengal. The first person to whom I mentioned this was Jawaharlal. Without a moment's hesitation he replied: 'Yes, your place is there. Although we need you so much here, we need you more in Noakhali.' I asked him, 'When?' 'As soon as you feel like it,' he replied. In two days I started. [48]

I am still groping...I see I have not the knack. I have not yet quite found the key to Ahimsa. Here I am out to perform a stupendous *yajna,* but my unfitness for the task is being demonstrated at every step. There can, however, be no running away. And where can I run away? Success or failure is not in our hands. It is enough if we do our part well. I am leaving no stone unturned. Ours is but to strive. In the end it will be as He wishes. [49]

I don't want to return from Bengal in a defeatist way. I would rather die, if need be, at the hands of an assassin. But I do not want to court it, much less wish it. [50]

A friend has been telling me that my reference to "darkness" surrounding me is very confusing to many. The friend thinks that people at a distance see light shimmering through my plan, and there is enough proof that confidence is slowly returning in that affected area.

I would tell this friend and others who think like him that they have misunderstood me to some extent. The darkness in which I am surrounded is of a character the like of which has never faced me before. It is, indeed, now a vital test that my Ahimsa is passing through. I would not be able to say that I have come out successful until the object is reached.

It is true that the night is darkest before the dawn. I myself feel that and although friends at a distance can see glimpses of the breaking dawn. I myself feel that I am surrounded in complete darkness.

Acid test for Ahimsa

Many years ago, a friend of mine used to carry Patanjali s Yogasutras constantly in his pocket. Although I did not know Sanskrit, yet the friend would often come to me to

consult about the meaning of some of the *sutras*. In one of the *sutras* it is stated that, when Ahimsa has been fully established, it will completely liquidate the forces of enmity and evil in the neighbourhood. I feel that the stage has not been reached in the neighbourhood about me and this leads me to infer that my Ahimsa has not yet succeeded in the present test.[51]

Outside circumstances have never overwhelmed me. The reason for the present darkness lies within me. I find that my Ahimsa does not seem to answer in the matter of Hindu-Muslim relations. This struck me forcibly when I came to learn of the events in Noakhali.

The reported forcible conversions and the distress of the Bengali sisters touched me deeply. I could do nothing through pen or speech. I argued to myself that I must be on the scene of action and test the soundness of the doctrine which has sustained me and made life worth living.

Was it the weapon of the weak as it was often held by my critics or was it truly the weapon of the strong? The question arose in me when I had no ready-made solution for the distemper of which Noakhali was such a glaring symptom.

And so setting aside all my activities, I hastened to Noakhali to find out where I stood. I know positively that Ahimsa is a perfect instrument. If it did not answer in my hands, the imperfection was in me. My technique was at fault. I could not discover the error from a distance. Hence I came here trying to make the discovery. I must, therefore, own myself in darkness till I see light. God only knows when it will come. More I cannot say.[52]

Mission in Noakhali

I have come here to put my Ahimsa to the acid test in this atmosphere of rank distrust and suspicion.[53]

My mission is for the establishment of friendship between the sister communities living here and not to organize any one community against the rest. So long the non-violence which has been practised is the non-violence of the weak, but the new experiment in which I have been engaged here is the non-violence of the strong. If it was to be successful, it should succeed in creating a moral atmosphere helpful to both the communities round me.[54]

I acquit myself from the charge of being the modern Buddha. I am and claim to be a simple man having extensive experience at my back, but on this account claim to be no better than any member of the audience. I am an equal servant of both the communities or all the communities of India. I wish I had the power to stop 'internecine war' and consequent 'blood-bath'. Buddha or the prophets that followed him had gone the way they went in order to stop wars. The fact that I cannot do so is proof positive that I have no superior power at my back. It is true that I swear by non-violence and so I have come to Noakhali in order to test the power of my non-violence. As I have repeatedly said ever since my arrival in Bengal, I have no desire to leave Bengal unless both the communities show by their action that they are like blood-brothers living together in perfect peace and amity.[55]

Anyway, that is the mission that brought me to Noakhali. I want to pass my examination in pure Ahimsa. If it is pure, it must result in establishing that friendship which I desire at heart. Therefore, if it is not established, the failure will be mine. And as Ahimsa knows no failure, I have said I will do or die in Noakhali.[56]

No way but Ahimsa

The only way [to restore normal life] is at least for one party to be wholly truthful and non-violent. Then, they will fear no one but God. Such men are the men of courage. All parties will make friends with them and even *goondas* will shed their *goondaism* before them. I know of no other better way. I have appealed to the Muslims, who are in a majority, to take the lead.[57]

Ahimsa is always infallible. When, therefore, it appears to have failed, the failure is due to the inaptitude of the votary. I have never felt that my Ahimsa has failed in Noakhali, nor can it be said that it has succeeded. It is on its trial. And when I talk of my Ahimsa, I do not think of it as limited to myself. It must include all my co-workers in Noakhali. Success or failure would, therefore, be attributable to the aggregate of the activities of my co-workers and myself.

What I have said about Noakhali applies to Calcutta. It is too early to state that the application of Ahimsa to the communal problem in this great city has succeeded beyond doubt. As I have already remarked, it is wrong to contend that the establishment of friendliness between the two communities was a miracle. Circumstances were ready and Shaheed Saheb and I appeared on the scene to take

the credit for what has happened. Anyway, it is premature to predicate anything about the application. The first thing, naturally, is that we, the two partners, have one mind and are believers in Ahimsa. That being assured, I would say that, if we know the science and its application, it is bound to succeed.[58]

(3) *Bihar betrays past*

It was in Bihar that mass Satyagraha in India was born. It was in Bihar that my political career in India had practically commenced. And now it is the people of Bihar, for whom I had indefatigably laboured and who have showered upon me such love and affection—Bihar of Brijkishore Babu and Rajendra Babu—that has gone mad and besmirched the fair name of India. I have declared times without number that if the people of India should run amok against the English, they might find me dead. How can I be a witness to the same in regard to innocent Musalmans who are after all our own countrymen, our own kith and kin? [59]

Bihar is the land of Tulasidas' Ramayana. However uneducated or poor a Bihari may be, his voice ever rang with the music of that mighty epic. You know what is sin and what is also meant by religious merit. The misdeeds which have come out of your hands have been of terrible proportions. Should not, then, your *prayashchitta* be of the same order? There is a saying: "The greater the sinner, the greater the sin". It is in this spirit that you should approach those who have suffered at your hands and try to do the right by them...

This much I can surely expect from Biharis who live in the land of the Ramayana and who try to set their lives in accordance with the teachings of hat noble book.[60]

If I am so minded, I will be able to show that there are to be found in history examples of human monsters having done crimes even worse than those of the Hindus of Bihar. But I do not want to be guilty of making comparisons and weigh the greatness of crimes in golden scales. On the contrary, a truly repentant man will never want to flatter himself by even thinking that he is not as bad as his predecessors. There is a legitimate place for rivalry in doing good and outdoing one’s predecessors, and one’s own labours in the act of service. I am, therefore, grieved to find that there are thoughtless Hindus in all parts of India who falsely hug the belief that Bihar has arrested the growth of lawlessness that was to be witnessed in Noakhali. I wish to remind them in forcible terms that that way of thinking and doing is the way to

perdition and slavery, never to freedom and bravery. It is a cowardly thing for a man to believe that barbarity such as is exhibited can ever protect a civilization or a religion, or defend freedom. I am able, from recent first-hand knowledge, to say that where there is cowardice on the one hand there is cruelty on the other. The way, therefore, to take reprisals upon Noakhali is to learn how not to copy the barbarous deeds such as Noakhali has proved itself capable of, but to return barbarism by manliness which consists in daring to die without a thought of retaliation, and without in any way compromising one's honour.[61]

Call for penitence

I have come to Bihar in order to help the people in realizing the extent of the madness to which they have stooped. My object is to induce them to repent and thus undo the wrongs which have been perpetrated. The ruined houses of the Muslim families I have just visited have almost brought tears to my eyes. But I have steeled my heart and have come to teach the Hindu his duty towards his Muslim brother. True repentance requires true courage. And Bihar, which has risen to great heights during the Satyagraha in Champaran and which was the land over which the Buddha had roamed and taught, is surely capable once more of rising to heights from which it can radiate its effulgence over the rest of India. Only unadulterated non-violence can raise it to that status.[62]

I am surprised at the madness which has temporarily swept over the otherwise peaceful inhabitants of Bihar. To anyone who felt that Bihar is avenging Noakhali by what it did, I would firmly say that this is not the way of vengeance. The mentality which makes one section of Indians look upon another as enemies is suicidal; it can only serve to perpetuate their slavery. In the end, such a mentality may even lead a person into the parochial feeling, when he would prize the freedom of his own village above everything else, if that were at all possible. What I really want every Indian to develop is the sense that an evil deed committed anywhere in India is the concern of every other Indian. Each should hold himself personally responsible for it and share the burden of undoing the wrong. Any other course can only lead them to happenings which the Punjab is witnessing today.[63]

For, if Bihar remains sane in the midst of possible madness throughout India, Bihar will raise India in the estimation of the world and leave to the world a singular

example of sanity in the midst of surrounding insanity. This I have a right to expect by right of service and more so because the Bihar Hindus, howsoever illiterate they may be, are votaries of Rama, the incarnation of all the good in the world although evil seems at times to rule the world, the eternal truth is that the world lives so long as goodness resides even in one person. Evil is naught. If Bihar remains good in the midst of temptation, it is well with it, and well with the whole of India.[64]

(4) *Tragedy in the Punjab*

I had to hang my head in shame in Noakhali when I was told of the cruelties perpetrated on the Muslims in Bihar. And now, as if in answer to Bihar, comes the tragedy of the Punjab. Death is a companion and friend. It is well with those who have died bravely. Whether any died as cowards is immaterial now. They too are gone. But it is the guilty living who are responsible and they are responsible to God. He alone knows the hearts of men.[65]

Anger is not going to lead them anywhere. Anger breeds revenge and the spirit of revenge is today responsible for all the horrible happenings there and elsewhere. What good will it do to the Muslims to avenge the happenings in Delhi, or for the Sikhs and the Hindus to avenge cruelties on their co-religionists in the Frontier and West Punjab? If a man or a group of men go mad, should everyone follow suit? [66]

(5) *Recrudescence of riots in Calcutta*

You know that I prolonged my stay in Calcutta by two days at the instance of Muslim friends. Last night Shaheed Saheb Suhrawardy came to see me. He suggested that it would be contrary to my practice to leave Calcutta while it is going through the horrors of communal strife. Shaheed Saheb suggested that I should prolong my stay in the city and work until real peace is restored. I replied that Suhrawardy Saheb and I should live under the same roof in the disturbed parts. It would be best to live unprotected by the police or the military. In brotherly fashion, we will approach the people, argue with them and tell them that now that partition has taken place by agreement, there is no longer any reason why the parties should quarrel. The decision of the Boundary Commission is going to be announced in a day or two, and it is in the fitness of things that all the parties should abide by the decision in a becoming manner. After all, the parties have appointed an arbitration tribunal. They are in honour bound to abide by the award whatever it is. [67]

I now return to the reason for my postponing the visit to Noakhali and coming to stay here. Shaheed Saheb had come to see me and induce me to do my bit in bringing about peace in Calcutta which is burning. The appeal had its effect upon me. I agreed provided Shaheed Saheb went with me to the affected areas and stayed there under the same roof with me till the fury had abated and till complete friendship between the two communities was restored. Therefore, we were to work with one mind without mental reservations and without any secrets in the matter from one another. Do not think that we are to neglect the parts of Calcutta which are deserted by their Hindu inhabitants and are occupied by Muslims. We are working for the peace of the whole of Calcutta and I invite you to believe with us that, if Calcutta returns to sanity and real friendship, then Noakhali and the rest of India will be safe. Shaheed Saheb is in the building, but he has, with my consent, kept himself away from the meeting as I want to avoid being the slightest cause of irritation to the meeting. But I am glad that the audience has exhibited becoming tolerance and gave me the courage to bring Shaheed Saheb to the meeting. After all, we must live and work together in the open and in perfect co-operation if our difficult mission is to succeed.[68]

Nectar of friendliness

I congratulate Calcutta on Hindus and Muslims meeting together in perfect friendliness. Muslims shout the same slogans joy as the Hindus. They fly the tricolour without the slightest hesitation. What is more, the Hindus are admitted to Mosques and Muslims are admitted to the Hindu *mandirs*. This news reminds me of the Khilafat days when Hindus and Muslims fraternized with one another. If this exhibition ill from the heart and is not a momentary impulse, it is better than the Khilafat days. The simple reason is that they have both drunk the poison cup of disturbances. The nectar of friendliness should, therefore, taste sweeter than before. I am, however, sorry to hear that in a certain part the poor Muslims experienced molestation. I hope that Calcutta, including Howrah, will be entirely free from the communal virus forever. Then, indeed, they need have no fear about East Bengal and the rest of India. I am sorry, therefore, to hear that madness still rages in Lahore. I can hope and feel sure that the noble example of Calcutta, if it is sincere, will affect the Punjab and the other parts of India.[69]

Miracle or accident?

Shaheed Saheb Suhrawardy and I are living together in a Muslim *manzil* in Beliaghata where Muslims have been reported to be sufferers. We occupied the house on Wednesday the 13th instant, and on the 14th it seemed as if there never had been bad blood between the Hindus and the Muslims. In their thousands they began to embrace one another and to pass freely through places which were considered to be points of danger by one party or the other. Indeed, Hindus were taken to *masjids* by their Muslim brethren and the latter were taken by their Hindu brethren to the *mandirs*. Both with one voice shouted 'Jai Hind!' or 'Hindu- Muslims! Be one'. As I have said above, we are living in a Muslim's house and Muslim volunteers are attending to our comforts with the greatest attention. Muslim volunteers do the cooking. Many were eager to come from the Khadi Pratisthan for attendance, but I prevented them. I was determined that we should be fully satisfied with whatever the Muslim brothers and sisters were able to give for our creature comforts, and I must say that the determination has resulted in unmixed good. Here, in the compound, numberless Hindus and Muslims continue to stream in shouting the favourite slogans. One might almost say that the joy of fraternization is leaping up from hour to hour.

Is this to be called a miracle or an accident? By whatever name it may be described, it is quite clear that all the credit that is being given to me from all sides is quite undeserved; nor can it be said to be deserved by Shaheed Saheb. This sudden upheaval is not the work of one or two men. We are toys in the hands of God. He makes us dance to His tune. The utmost, therefore, that man can do is to refrain from interfering with the dance and that he should tender full obedience to his Maker's will. Thus considered, it can be said that in this miracle He has used us too as His instruments, and, as for myself, I only ask whether the dream of my youth is to be realized in the evening of my life.

For those who have full faith in God, this is neither a miracle nor an accident. A chain of events can be clearly seen to show that the two were being prepared, unconsciously to themselves, for fraternization. In this process, our advent on the scene enabled the onlooker to give us credit for the consummation of the happy event.

Be that as it may, the delirious happenings remind me of the early days of the Khilafat movement. The fraternization then burst on the public as a new experience.

Moreover, we had then the Khilafat and Swaraj as our twin goals. Today we have nothing of the kind. We have drunk the poison of mutual hatred and so this nectar of fraternization tastes all the sweeter and the sweetness should never wear out.

In the present exuberance one hears also the cry of 'Long Live Hindustan and Pakistan' from the joint throats of the Hindus and the Muslims. I think it is quite proper. Whatever was the cause for the agreement, three parties accepted Pakistan. If then the two are not enemies one of the other, and here evidently they are not, surely there is nothing wrong in the above cry. Indeed, if the two have become friends, not to wish long life to both the States would probably be an act of disloyalty. [70]

(6) *Riots in Delhi*

Delhi can solve the question, for the others are likely to follow what Delhi might do.[71]

Some people imagine that I am engaged in big tasks here and have forgotten the suffering areas. God alone knows how my heart weeps and what agony I suffer at the madness the people had indulged in Noakhali, Bihar and, now, in the Punjab. I assure you that I am working for those areas wherever I am, even in my talks with the Viceroy, There is no bigger task for me than to strive for Hindu-Muslim unity. I cannot serve India if I forget Noakhali, Bihar or the Punjab. I claim to be a servant of God. I neither eat nor drink nor do anything else except at God's bidding. You will, perhaps, understand my work better in the fullness of time. Meantime, I must continue my duty wherever God takes me.[72]

Some abused me, some thought I had grown too big even to reply to their letters, and others accused me of enjoying myself in Delhi while the Punjab was in flames. How could these persons understand that I was working day and night for them wherever I was? I cannot dry their tears. God alone can do that, but I will go at once to the Punjab when the call comes.[73]

"Man proposes, God disposes" has come true often enough in my lifetime as it must have done in many others'. I knew nothing about the sad state of things in Delhi when I left Calcutta on Sunday last. On reaching Delhi, I have been listening the whole day long to the tale of woe that is Delhi today. I saw several Muslim friends who recited their pathetic story. I heard enough to warn me that I must not leave Delhi for the Punjab until Delhi regained its former self.

'Do or die'

I must do my little bit to calm the heated atmosphere. I must apply the old formula "Do or Die" to the Capital of India. I am glad to be able to say that the residents of Delhi do not want the senseless destruction that is going on. I am prepared to understand the anger of the refugees whom fate has driven from West Punjab. But anger is short madness. It can only make matters worse in every way. Retaliation is no remedy. It makes the original disease much worse. I, therefore, ask all those who are engaged in the senseless murders, arson and loot to stay their hands.

The Central Government, the ablest, the most courageous and the most self-sacrificing team that the Union could produce, have not been in the saddle for even a month after the declaration of Indian independence. It is criminal and suicidal not to give them a chance to set the house in order. I am fully aware of the shortage of food. Mob rule is dislocating everything, making distribution of foodstuffs all but impossible. May God restore peace to distracted Delhi. [74]

It pains me to see Muslim men and women there in deep distress. I tried to comfort the sufferers by saying that death has to come to all. It is no good weeping for the dead. It will not bring back the dead. It is up to everyone to save the future of this great land. Many Muslim friends come to see me daily. I advise them to state their position frankly and fully. I am sorry that the lives of Muslims should be in danger in Delhi or any part of India. It is a big tragedy. I implore you to listen to an old man who has been through many experiences during his long life. I am absolutely convinced that to return evil for evil leads nowhere. To return good for good is no virtue. The true way is to return good for evil. Many Muslim friends will like to help. But it is impossible to requisition their active services in Delhi today.[75]

During day I had seen many Muslim and Hindu friends. It is the same sad tale of woes whether recited by Hindu sufferers or Muslim. It is a shame for both.

Mission in Delhi

I beg of you all to bring about peace quickly in Delhi so that I may be able to proceed to both East and West Punjab. I have only one mission and my message is the same for everyone. Let it be said of them that the inhabitants of Delhi had gone mad temporarily but that sanity has now returned. Let them allow their Prime Minister

and Deputy Prime Minister to hold up their heads again. Today they are bowed in shame and sorrow. They have a priceless heritage. Let them remember that it is a joint one. It is their duty to guard it and keep it unsullied.[76]

Have the citizens of Delhi gone mad? Have they no humanity left in them? Have love of the country and its freedom no appeal for them? I must be pardoned for putting the first blame on the Hindus and the Sikhs. Could they not be men enough to stem the tide of hatred? I would urge the Muslims of Delhi to shed all fear, trust God and discover all the arms in their possession which the Hindus and the Sikhs fear they have. Not that the former, too, do not have any. The question is one of degree. Either the minority rely upon God and His creature man to do the right thing or rely upon their fire-arms to defend themselves against those whom they must not trust.[77]

I am the friend and servant of the Muslims as of the Hindus and others. I will not rest till every Muslim in the Union, who wishes to live as a loyal citizen of the Union, is back in his home living in peace and security, and the Hindus and the Sikhs return likewise to their homes. I have served the Muslims for a lifetime in South Africa and in India. I can never forget the unity of the Khilafat days. It did not last, but it demonstrated the possibilities of lasting friendship between the Hindus and the Muslims. That is what I live for and work for. I am on my way to the Punjab to see that all the Hindus and the Sikhs who have been turned out of Pakistan should be able to return to their homes and live there in safety and honour. But on my way I was held up at Delhi, and I will not leave it till real peace returns to the capital.[78]

Hidden arms

Why are the Muslims of Delhi frightened into leaving their homes? Have both the Governments broken down? Why do the populace ignore its Government? The Muslims have unlicensed arms. There is the Government to see to it that those arms are taken away from the unlawful possessors. If they are incompetent, they are to give place to better men. The Government is what they, the people, make it. It is wholly wrong and undemocratic for individuals to take the law into their own hands. This lawlessness bodes no good for India whether it is rampant in Pakistan or the Union. I am in Delhi to 'Do or Die'. I have no desire to witness the mad fratricide, this national suicide, your betrayal of our own Government. May God help you to regain your lost sanity! [79]

This brings me to the bugbear of unlicensed, hidden arms. Some have undoubtedly been found. Driblets have been coming to me voluntarily. Let them be unearthed by all means. So far as I know, the haul made up-to-date is not much to speak of for Delhi. Hidden arms used to be possessed even during the British regime. No one worried then. By all means explode all the hidden magazines, when you have made sure beyond doubt that they are hidden in a particular place. Let there be no repetition of much cry and little wool. Nor let us apply one code to the British and set up another for ourselves when we profess to be politically free. Let us not call a dog a bad name in order to beat him. After all is said and done, to be worthy of the liberty we have won after sixty years of toil, let us bravely face all the difficulties that confront us, however hard they may be. Facing them squarely will make us fitter and nobler.[80]

I know that you are anxious that I should go to the Punjab at the earliest moment. I want to do so. But if I fail in Delhi, it is impossible for me to succeed in Pakistan. For, I want to go to all the parts and provinces of Pakistan under the protection of no escort save God. I will go as a friend of the Muslims as of others. My life will be at their disposal. I hope that I shall cheerfully die at the hands of anyone who chooses to take my life. Then I will have done as I advise all to do.[81]

I want all Hindu and Sikh friends to help me in restoring real peace in Delhi. Then I shall proceed to Western Pakistan with fresh strength. I shall go to Lahore, Rawalpindi, Sheikhpura and other places in Western Punjab, I shall go to N.W.F.P. and to Sindh. I am the servant and well-wisher of all. I am sure no one will prevent me from going anywhere. And I shall not go with a military escort. I shall put my life in the hands of the people. I shall not rest till every Hindu and Sikh who has been driven away from Pakistan returns to his home with honour and dignity.[82]

I have no desire to outlive the India of my dreams. We are steadily losing hold on Delhi. If Delhi goes, India goes and with that the last hope of world peace. It is intolerable to me that a person like Dr. Zakir Hussain, for instance, or for that matter, Shaheed Suhrawardy should not be able to move about in Delhi as freely and with as much safety as myself.[83]

Delhi is the Metropolis of India. If, therefore, we really in our hearts do not subscribe to the two-nation theory, in other words, if we do not regard the Hindus and the

Muslims as constituting two distinct nations, we shall have to admit that the picture that Delhi presents today is not what we have envisaged always of the capital of India. Delhi is the Eternal City, as the ruins of its forerunners—Indraprastha and Hastinapur—testify. It is the heart of India. Only a nit-wit can regard it as belonging to the Hindus or the Sikhs only. It may sound harsh but it is the literal truth. From Kanya Kumari to Kashmir and from Karachi to Dibrugarh in Assam, all Hindus, Muslims, Sikhs, Parsis, Christians and Jews who people this vast sub-continent and have adopted it as their dear motherland have an equal right to it. No one has a right to say that it belongs to the majority community only and that the minority community can only remain there as the underdog. Whoever serves it with the purest devotion must have the first claim. Therefore, anyone who wants to drive out of Delhi all Musalmans as such must be set down as its enemy No. 1 and, therefore, enemy No. 1 of India. We are rushing towards that catastrophe. It is the bounden duty of every son and daughter of India to take his or her full share in averting it.[84]

Delhi has done a great thing and I hope that the signatories to the Peace Pledge have given their signature with God in the form of Truth as their witness. I have heard that there is a repudiation of the pledge on behalf of an official of the Hindu Mahasabha. I am sorry. If the inhabitants of Delhi and the refugees in the capital will remain steadfast and not be swayed by happenings elsewhere, they will save India and also Pakistan. Delhi is an ancient city. If Delhi acts truthfully and non-violently, the effects of its action will be felt all the world over.[85]

VI. The Causes of Communal Riots

1 SPECIFIC CAUSES

I think I have... examined all the causes, both original and continuing, of the tension between the two communities.[1]

The Shuddhi movement.

The most potent cause being tiredness of non-violence and the fear that the communities might, by a long course of training in non-violence, forget the law of retaliation and self-defence.

Musalman cow-slaughter and Hindu music.

Hindu cowardice and consequent Hindu distrust of Musalmans.

Musalman bullying.

Musalman distrust of Hindu fairplay.[2]

2 PSYCHOLOGY OF FEAR

There is no doubt in my mind that in the majority of quarrels the Hindus come out second best. My own experience but confirms the opinion that the Musalman as a rule is a bully, and the Hindu as a rule is a coward. I have noticed this in railway trains, on public roads, and in the quarrels which have had the privilege of settling. Need the Hindu blame the Musalman for his cowardice? [3]

Quarrels must break out so long as the Hindus continue to be seized with fear. Bullies are always to be found where there are cowards. The Hindus must understand that no one can afford them protection if they go on hugging fear.

Running away for fear of death, leaving one's dear ones, temples or music to take care of themselves, is irreligion; it is cowardice. It is not manly, it is unmanly. Non-violence is the virtue of the manly. The coward is innocent of it. [4]

The remedy against cowardice is not physical culture but the braving of dangers. So long as the parents of the middle-class Hindus, themselves timid, continue to transmit their timidity by keeping their grown-up children in cotton-wool, so long will there be the desire to shun danger and run no risks. They will have to dare to leave their children alone, let them run risks and even at times get killed in so doing. The puniest individual may have a stout heart. The most muscular Zulus cower before English lads. Each village has to find out its stout hearts.[5]

Cure far cowardice

It is common cause between the correspondent and myself that the average Hindu is a coward. How is he to be turned into a brave man? Is he to become brave by muscular development or by developing the bravery of the soul? My correspondent says, 'The world has no place for the weak'. He means, I imagine, 'physically weak'. If so, the proposition is unsound. There are many animals physically stronger than man and yet man lives. Many muscular races have died out and some of them are even now in the process of dying out. The proposition should therefore be, so far as man is concerned, 'The world has no place for the weak in spirit'.[6]

Non-violence vs. Violence

Fear of man argues want of faith in God. Only he trusts to his physical strength who has no faith or very little faith in God's omnipresence. The Hindu must cultivate either

of these two—faith in God, or faith in one's physical might. If he does neither, it will spell the ruin of the community.

The first, viz., reliance on God and shaking off the fear of man, is the way of non-violence and is the best way.

The second, viz., reliance on one's physical might, is the way of violence. Both have a place in the world. It is open to us to choose either. One man cannot try both at the same time. If all the Hindus and Musalmans both elect the way of violence, we had better cease to talk of winning Swaraj in the immediate future. Armed peace means not a little fighting that will end with the breaking of a few heads or of a dozen temples. It must mean prolonged fighting and rivers of blood.[7]

Cowardice behind riots

These cases [of cowardice] have nothing to do with the inveterate enmity between the Hindus and Musalmans. Where there are fools there are bound to be knaves, where there are cowards there are bound to be bullies, whether they are Hindus or Musalmans. Such cases used to happen even before the outbreak of these communal hostilities. The question here, therefore, is not how to teach one of the two Communities a lesson or how to humanize it, but how to teach a coward to be brave.

If the thinking sections of both the communities realize the cowardice and folly at the back of the hostilities, we can easily end them. Both have to be brave, both have to be wise. If both or either deliberately get wise, theirs will be the way of non-violence. If both fight and learn wisdom only by bitter experience, the way will be one of violence. Either way there is no room for cowards in the society of men, i.e., in a society which loves freedom. Swaraj is not for cowards.[8]

Cowardice should have no place in the national dictionary.[9]

Fearlessness

According to the teaching of the Gita, the first requisite for spiritual conduct is fearlessness. I want you to make a firm resolve to shed all fear. Without fearlessness all other virtues are turned into dust. Attainment of truth or non-violence is impossible without fearlessness.

Fearlessness does not mean arrogance or aggressiveness. This in itself is a sign of fear. Fearlessness presupposes calmness and peace of mind. For this it is necessary to have a living faith in God.[10]

It is a shame for both the Hindus and the Musalmans that the Hindus should have to run away from their homes as they have done. It is a shame for the Muslims because it is out of fear of the Muslims that the Hindus have run away. Why should a human being inspire another with fear? It is no less a shame for the Hindus to have given way to craven fear. I have always said that man should fear none but God.[11]

The verses of the Shrimad Bhagawadgita (II 54—72) describe the characteristics of one who has attained knowledge and brought his senses under full control. The lesson of the Bhagawadgita is meant not for those who have forsaken the world, but for every householder, irrespective of his birth and state. Everybody's duty should be to attain the state described therein, and this can only be done if life is built on the rock of fearlessness.[12]

Anatomy of fear

Fear is a thing which I dislike; why should one man be afraid of another? Man should stand in fear of God alone, and then he can shed all other fears.[13]

The more I go about in these parts, the more I find that your worst enemy is fear. It eats into the vitals of the terror-stricken as well as the terrorist. The latter fears something in his victim. It may be his different religion or his riches he fears. The second kind of fear is otherwise known as greed. If you search enough, you will find that greed is a variety of fear. But there has never been and will never be a man who is able to intimidate one who has cast out fear from his heart. Why can no one intimidate the fearless? You will find that God is always by the side of the fearless. Therefore, we should fear Him alone and seek His protection. All other fear will then by itself disappear. Till fearlessness is cultivated by the people there will never be any peace in these parts for the Hindus, or for the Musalmans.[14]

In it [a writing by a Musalman] the writer has rightly contended that a man of God is never afraid to die or to lose his possessions for the sake of his self-respect or religion. God has given us life and can take it away. That teaching is universal and applied to all, Hindu as well as Musalman. Those who have in God their sole refuge cast out all

fear. Then there can be lasting friendship between the two. I have been trying all these days to din this lesson into the ears of my listeners. There was a time when Musalmans also listened to me, but now things seem to have changed and even among Hindus there are not many who will follow my advice. But I feel sure, lasting peace can come only when men of whatever community refuse to surrender to any fear save the holy fear of God.[15]

Only when the Hindus and Muslims shed their fear and mutual suspicion can real unity of heart come. There should not be any cause for hostility because their hearts are one.[16]

Atmosphere of hatred

The fact is that when blood boils, prejudice reigns supreme; man, whether he labels himself a Hindu, Musalman, Christian or what not, becomes a beast and acts as such.[17]

I would like them to observe the laws of the game. Just as there is such a thing as honour among thieves, there should surely be honour between combatants. One hears so often of children and old men being butchered, women being outraged. If men must become beasts, there might even then be some decency observed.[18]

The recent happenings are due, I am sure, to the atmosphere of hate that pervades the land today. If we remain calm in the midst of the storm, then only will we grow in strength.[19]

It grieves me to sense the existing hatred and spirit of revenge. I warn you that unless you calm and purify your hearts, you will light such a fire throughout the land as will consume us all. I remind you of the story of the Mahabharata which is not a history of India but of man. It is the story of the fight between the worshippers of Rama, the embodiment of good, and Ravan, the embodiment of evil. They fought—the Pandavas and the Kauravas—blood-brothers, and what was the result? While evil was certainly defeated, only seven of the victors remained to tell the tale. This is the state of the country today.[20]

3 DISTRUST

In many places we see that each community harbours distrust against the other. Each fears the other. It is an undoubted fact that this anomalous and wretched state of things is improving day by day. The time spirit is ceaselessly working on unchecked, and willy-nilly we have to live together.[21]

I know that there is much, too much distrust of one another as yet. Many Hindus distrust Musalmans' honesty. They believe that Swaraj means Musalman Raj, for they argue that without the British, Musalmans of India will aid Musalman Power to build a Musalman empire in India. Musalmans, on the other hand, fear that the Hindus being in an overwhelming majority will smother them. Such an attitude of mind betokens impotence on either's part. If not their nobility, their desire to live in peace would dictate a policy of mutual trust and mutual forbearance.[22]

There is still too much mutual distrust and consequent fear. I am not disappointed. The progress we have made in that direction is indeed phenomenal. We seem to have covered in eighteen months' time the work of a generation. But infinitely more is necessary. Neither the classes nor the masses feel instinctively that our union is necessary as the breath of our nostrils.[23]

Another potent cause of the tension is the growing distrust even among the best of us.[24]

The leaders distrusted one another. Distrust never comes from well-defined causes. A variety of causes, more felt than realized, breeds distrust. We have not yet visualized the fact that our interests are identical. Each party seems vaguely to believe that it can displace the other by some kind of manoeuvring. But I freely confess...that our not knowing the kind of Swaraj we want has also a great deal to do with the distrust. I used not to think so...I am now a confirmed convert.[25]

I can only guess and my guess [as to the real cause, whether remote or immediate, of the frequent riots and differences between Musalmans and Hindus in North India and of their absence or infrequency in South India] is that the two communities quarrel more frequently in the North because they are more equally balanced than in South. Where riots do take place, they occur because both think communally and because either fears and distrusts the other, and because neither has the courage or the

foresight to forgo the present for the sake of the future, or the communal interests for the sake of the national.[26]

4 TIREDNESS OF NON-VIOLENCE

The immediate cause is the most dangerous. The thinking portion seems to be tired of non-violence. It has not as yet understood my suspension of Satyagraha after the Ahmedabad and Viramgam tragedies, then after the Bombay rowdyism, and lastly after the Chauri Chaura outrage. The last was the last straw. Thinking men imagined that all hope of Satyagraha, and therefore of Swaraj, too, in the near future, was at an end. Their faith in non-violence was skin-deep. Two years ago a Musalman friend said to me in all sincerity, "I do hot believe your non-violence. At least I would not have my Musalmans to learn it. Violence is the law of life. I would not have Swaraj by non-violence as you define the latter. I must hate my enemy." This friend is an honest man. I entertain great regard for him. Much the same has been reported of another very great Musalman friend of mine. The report may be untrue, but the reporter himself is not an untrue man.

Nor is this repugnance to non-violence confined to Musalmans. Hindu friends have said the same thing, if possible, with greater vehemence.

What I see around me today is, therefore, a reaction against the spread of non-violence. I feel the wave of violence coming. The Hindu-Muslim tension is an acute phase of this tiredness.[27]

5 PROPAGANDA OF VILIFICATION

Members of one community, when talking about those of the other, at times indulge in terms so vulgar that they but accentuate the strained relations between the two. In Hindu society, we do not hesitate to indulge in unbecoming language when talking of Mahomedans and *vice versa*.[28]

Fear has become a part of the national character. Non-co-operators will make a serious mistake if they seek to convert people to their creed by violence. They will play into the hands of the Government, if they use the slightest coercion towards anybody in the course of their propaganda.[29]

...To what pass some of us have come in our blind zeal for our respective faiths. We refuse to see anything wrong in ourselves. When such becomes the normal state of a majority of people belonging to a particular faith, that faith is dying. For nothing based on a lie can persist for any length of time. [30]

Studies in distortion

I have before me volumes of Agakhani literature which I have not yet had the time to study carefully, but I am assured that it is a distortion of Hinduism. I have seen enough of it to know that it describes H.H. the Agakhan as a Hindu *avatar*. It would be interesting to learn what the Agakhan himself thinks of all this literature. I have many Khoja friends. I commend this literature to their attention...

But the worst form is that preached by a gentleman of Delhi. I have read his pamphlet from cover to cover. It gives detailed instructions to preachers how to carry on propaganda. It starts with a lofty proposition that Islam is merely preaching of the unity of God. This grand truth is to be preached, according to the writer, by every Musalman irrespective of character. A secret department of spies is advocated whose one business is to be to pry into the privacy of non-Muslim households. Prostitutes, professional singers, mendicants, Government servants, lawyers, doctors, artisans are pressed into the service. If this kind of propaganda becomes popular, no Hindu household would be safe from the secret attention of disguised misinterpreters (I cannot call them missionaries) of the great message of the Prophet of Islam. I am told by respectable Hindus that this pamphlet is widely read in the Nizam's dominions and that the methods advocated in it are extensively practised there.

As a Hindu, I feel sorry that methods of such doubtful morality should have been seriously advocated by a gentleman who is a well-known Urdu author and has a large circle of readers. My Musalman friends tell me that no respectable Musalman approved of the methods advocated. The point, however, is not what the respectable Musalmans think. The point is whether a considerable number of Musalman masses accept and follow them. A portion of the Punjab Press is simply scurrilous. It is at times even filthy. I have gone through the torture of reading many extracts. These sheets are conducted by Arya Samajists or Hindu and Musalman writers. Each vies with the other in using abusive language and reviling the religion of the opponent. These papers have, I understand, a fairly large circulation. They find place even in respectable reading rooms.

I have heard it said that the Government emissaries are at the back of this campaign of calumny. I hesitate to believe it. But even assuming the truth of it, the public of the Punjab should be able to cope with the growing disgrace.[31]

The language in some parts is simply revolting. I cannot disfigure these pages by reproducing it. I have also been favoured with a life, by a Musalman, of Swami Dayanand. I am sorry to say it is largely a distortion of the great reformer. Nothing that he did has escaped the author's venom. [32]

Role of the Press

The newspaper man has become a walking plague. He spreads the contagion of lies and calumnies. He exhausts the foul vocabulary of his dialect, and injects his virus into the unsuspecting, and often receptive minds of his readers.[33]

The newspaper cuttings in which partition is preached describe Hindus as practically untouchable. Nothing good can come out of Hindus or Hinduism. To live under Hindu rule is a sin. Even joint Hindu-Muslim rule is not to be thought of. The cuttings show that Hindus and Muslims are already at war with one another and that they must prepare for the final tussle.[34]

League propaganda

If newspaper reports are to be believed, responsible Ministers in Sindh and other equally responsible Leaguers almost all over are preaching violence in naked language. Nakedness is itself a virtue as distinguished from hypocrisy. But when it is

a hymn of obscenity, it is a vice to be shunned, whether it resides in a Leaguer or any other person. Any Muslim who is not in the League is a traitor, says one. The Hindu is a kafir deserving the fate of such, says another.[35]

The Muslim League may call Hindus names and declare India to be *Dar-ul-Harb*, where the law of *Jehad* operates, and all Muslims who co-operate with the Congress as Quislings fit only to be exterminated. But we must not cease to aspire, in spite of this wild talk, to befriend all Musalmans and hold them fast as prisoners of our love.[36]

By "Muslim" I mean the Muslim League. For, not all the Muslims are Muslim Leaguers. The Muslim Leaguers have today raised the slogan that ten crores of Indian Muslims are in danger of being submerged and swept out of existence, unless they constitute themselves into a separate State. I call that slogan scare-mongering pure and simple. It is nonsense to say that any people can permanently crush or swamp out of existence one-fourth of its population, which the Musalmans are in India.[37]

Others said that some Muslim officials are being kept here in order to keep all Muslims in India loyal to Pakistan. Some said that the Muslims looked upon all the Hindus as kafirs. Learned Muslims have told me that this is wholly incorrect. The Hindus are as much followers of inspired scriptures as the Muslims, the Christians and the Jews.[38]

An Urdu magazine published in the Union a verse to the effect that everyone is talking of the Somnath temple today. But in order to avenge the happenings in Junagadh, a new Ghaznavi will have to come from Ghazni. This has deeply hurt me. How can any Muslim worth the name in the Union entertain such thoughts? Why should he not be proud to associate himself with the act of renovation of Somnath? I hope that no true Muslim will be proud of the acts which are imputed to Mahmud Ghaznavi. I have pledged my life to secure safety for the Muslims in the Union. I will not swerve from my pledge, because I believe in returning good for evil. I ask the Hindus and the Sikhs not to be carried away by passions. But I ask my Muslim friends not to make the task of reconciliation more difficult than it is. I would not have referred to the mischievous couplet but for the fact that it is to be found in an important publication.[39]

Leaders 'intoxicated with the exuberance of their own language' have not known to put a curb upon their tongues or pens. Secret and insidious propaganda has done its dark and horrible work, unchecked and unabashed. It is, therefore, we the educated

and the semi-educated class that are responsible for the hot fever which possessed Abdul Rashid.[40]

Responsibility of leaders

I hold strong views about Government protection. Time was when we knew better and disdained the protection of law courts in such matters. To stop anti-Muslim writings like the *Rangila Rasul* is the work of the Hindus, as to stop anti-Hindu writings is the work of the Musalmans. The leaders have either lost control over mud-flingers or are in sympathy with them. In any case, Government protection will not make us tolerant of one another. Each hater of the other's religion will, under a stiffer law, seek secret channels of making vicious attacks on his opponent's religion, or writing vilely enough to provoke anger but veiled enough to avoid the penal clauses of the law. But, then, I recognize that at the present moment we are not acting as sane nationalists or as men of religion. We are seeking under cover of religion to wreak mad vengeance upon one another.[41]

But I cannot help uttering a word of warning that leaders of public opinion have a serious responsibility. Their word will be believed by the credulous public, and they all know the tragic consequences. This I say irrespective of whether the leaders belong to the Congress or the Muslim League.[42]

Golden rule

I advise my Muslim friends to be most careful about sending complaints. They should meticulously avoid all exaggeration. The golden rule in life is to exaggerate one's own faults and belittle those of others. That is the only way to Self-purification. Those who indulge in exaggeration will discredit their community.[43]

I advise Muslim friends and others not to indulge in exaggerations, but if anything, to understate their grievances. From my long experience I can say that that is the way for all communities to live in mutual harmony.[44]

6 THE THIRD PARTY

Safeguard against communal strife?

We would ill learn our history if we conclude that, because we have quarrelled in the past, we are destined so to continue unless some such strong power like the British keep us by force of arms from flying at each other's throats. But I am convinced that there is no warrant in Islam or Hinduism for any such belief. True it is that interested or fanatical priests in both religions have set the one against the other.[45]

Let us recognize that there is an interest actively working to keep us—Hindus and Musalmans—divided.[46]

It is unfortunately true that there are still Hindus and Musalmans who out of fear of one another consider foreign domination a necessity. And that has not a little to do with the delay in the attainment of our goal. We do not yet clearly perceive that the possibility of a free fight between the two communities is a lesser evil than the existence of foreign domination. And if it is the interposition of the British Government which keeps us from fighting one another, the sooner we are left free to fight, the better for our manhood, our respective religions and our country. It will not be a new phenomenon if we fought ourselves into sanity. The English carried on internecine warfare for twenty-one years before they settled down to peaceful work. The French fought among themselves with a savage ferocity hardly excelled during recent times. The Americans did nothing better before they evolved their commonwealth. Let us not hug our unmanliness for fear of fighting amongst ourselves.[47]

Official fomenting of dissension

It has been suggested to me that the Government are fomenting these dissensions. I should hope not. But assuming that they are, surely it is up to us to neutralize such efforts by ourselves acting truly and faithfully.[48]

The question of Hindu-Muslim unity is getting more and more serious every day. One thing should be made clear at the outset. In the case of many of these disturbances, we hear of Government agents being at the back of them. The allegation, if true, would be painful to me, not surprising. It should not be surprising if the Government fomented the troubles, it being their policy to divide us. It would be painful because

of the necessary implication that neither of the communities realizes wherein lies its interest. Only those can be set by the ears by a third party who are in the habit of quarrelling. The Government has never been heard of having fomented a quarrel, say, between the Brahmanas and Baniyas, nor amongst the Sunni Musalmans. The suspicion or fear of their having set the Hindus and Musalmans by the ears is always entertained, because both have quarrelled so often. It is this habit of quarrelling that needs to be abandoned if we want to have Swaraj and retain it.[49]

You may be certain that they [the disturbances] will end. If the British influence were withdrawn, they would end much quicker. While the British influence is here, both parties, I am sorry to confess, look to the British power for assistance.[50]

The British officials should know what the people are whispering. Many believe that their hand is in the riots. I must refuse to believe the serious charge unless it is established beyond doubt.[51]

Our weakness

It is a sign of weakness—not of fitness for Swaraj—to go to the foreign ruling power to arbitrate between us or to enforce the peace between us at the point of the bayonet.[52]

Largely, or I should say half and half, ['the British attitude towards the communal question is an obstacle in my path']. There has been consciously or unconsciously that policy of divide and rule working here as in India. The British officials have sometimes coquetted with one party, sometimes with another. Of course, if I were a British official, I would probably do the same and take advantage of dissensions to consolidate the rule. Our share of responsibility lies in the fact that we fall easy victims to the game.[53]

To Britain: Quit India:

Britain has hitherto held India by producing before the world Indians who want Britain to remain in India as ruler and arbiter between rival claimants. These will always exist. The question is whether it is right for Britain to plead these rivalries in defence of holding India under subjection, or whether she should now recognize the mistake and leave India to decide upon the method of her own government.[54]

But you have the whole British nation and your army of occupation to look to. You belong to the ruling race. You are less than one hundred thousand in the midst of 350 millions over whom you rule. It is a matter of shame both for you and us. I need not weigh whose is the greater shame. The sooner we get out of it the better for both of us.

You will now understand my answer when I say that I would any day prefer Muslim rule to British rule. I have no doubt that, if British rule, which divides us by favouring one or the other as it suits the Britishers, were withdrawn today, Hindus and Muslims would forget their quarrels and live like brothers which they are. But supposing the worst happened and we had a civil war, it would last for a few days or months and we would settle down to business. In status we are equal. With you it is different. You have disarmed us. Those of us who have been trained by you really belong to you rather than to us. We are no match for you in military power. You do not know how the rule has stunted the nation. Immediately British rule is really ended, we shall grow as never before, in spite of all forebodings.[55]

Obstacle to unity

I am firmly of opinion that there is no unity whilst the third party is there to prevent it. It created the artificial division and it keeps it up. In its presence both Hindus and Muslims and, for that matter, all seemingly conflicting or disgruntled interests and elements will look to it for support and will get it. Their interest is greater than the independence of their country. No one need throw my other statement in my face viz., that there is no independence without unity. I do not withdraw a word of it. It is an obvious truth. From its contemplation I have discovered the formula of inviting the British power to withdraw. Their withdrawal does not by itself bring independence. It may induce unity or it may lead to chaos. There is also the risk of another power filling in the vacancy if it is there. If, however, the withdrawal is orderly and voluntary, the British not only gain a moral height but secure the ungrudging friendship of a great nation. I wish all conflicting elements and interests will make a combined effort to rid India of foreign domination. If they do not, any understanding with them will be like a house built on sand.[56]

But it is from the frustration of every effort made to bring about unity by me, among many others, that has arisen the—for me—logical step that not until British power is

wholly withdrawn from India can there be any real unity, because all parties will be looking to the foreign power. For the time being it is British, but it may be French, Russian, Chinese, even then it would be the same thing. I have, therefore, come to the conclusion that real heart unity, genuine unity, is almost an impossibility unless and until British power is withdrawn and no other power takes its place, that is to say, when India not only feels but is actually independent without a master in any shape or form. Nevertheless, I shall try and welcome every effort for peace, well knowing that it is likely to be fruidess.[57]

Freedom a prerequisite

As for communal unity, the third party being removed, unity will follow as day follows night. Unity will not precede but will succeed freedom.[58]

I have not asked the British to hand over India to the Congress or to the Hindus. Let them entrust India to God or, in modern parlance, to anarchy. Then, all the parties will fight one another like dogs, or will, when real responsibility faces them, come to a reasonable agreement. I shall expect non-violence to arise out of that chaos.[59]

Time is a merciless enemy, if it is also a merciful friend and healer. I claim to be amongst the oldest lovers of Hindu-Muslim unity and I remain one even today. I have been asking myself why every whole-hearted attempt made by all, including myself, to reach unity has failed, and failed so completely that I have entirely fallen from grace and am described by some Muslim papers as the greatest enemy of Islam in India. It is a phenomenon I can account for only by the fact that the third power, even without deliberately wishing it, will not allow real unity to take place. Therefore, I have come to the reluctant conclusion that the two communities will come together almost immediately after the British power comes to a final end in India. If independence is the immediate goal of the Congress and the League, then, without needing to come to any terms, all will fight together to be free from bondage.

National Government

When the bondage is done away with, not merely the two organizations but all parties will find it to their interest to come together and make the fullest use of the liberty 'in order to evolve a national government suited to the genius of India. I do not care what it is called. Whatever, it is, in order to be stable, it has to represent the masses

in the fullest sense of the term. And, if it is to be broad-based upon the will of the people, it must be predominandy non-violent. Anyway, up to my last breath, I hope I shall be found working to that end, for I see no hope for humanity without the acceptance of non-violence. We are witnessing the bankruptcy of violence from day to day. There is no hope for humanity if the senseless, fierce, mutual slaughter is to continue.[60]

VII. Social Implications of Communal Riots

1 THE GOONDAS AND RIOTS

Reform

It is easy enough to dig out a few criminals from their hiding places and hand them over to the police, but it does not protect society against the repetition of them. It is necessary to remove the causes by undertaking a thorough process of reform. There must arise in Islam as well as in Hinduism men who, being comparatively pure in character, would work among such men.[1]

We would not then try to shift blame for ugly happenings on the hooligan elements. We would convert and control the hooligan elements too.[2]

There is not a man, however cruel and hard-hearted, but would give his admiration to a brave man. A *goonda* is not the vile man he is imagined to be. He is not without his noble traits.

['A *goonda* does not understand reason.'] But he understands bravery. If he finds that you are braver than he, he will respect you.[3]

Fight goondas

What I detest is the match between the *goondas* of both the parties. Any peace based upon such a trial of strength will turn to bitterness in the end. The way to get rid of the Hindu cowardice is for the educated portion to fight the *goondas*. We may use sticks and other clean weapons. My Ahimsa will allow the use of them. We shall be killed in the fight. But that will chasten both the Hindus and the Musalmans. That would remove the Hindu cowardice in a moment. As things are going, each party will be the slaves of their own *goondas*. That means dominance of the military power. England fought for the predominance of the civil power and won and lived. Lord Curzon did much harm to us. But he was certainly brave and right when he stood out for the predominance of civil authority. When Rome passed into the hands of the soldiery, it fell.

My whole soul rises against the very idea of the custody of my religion passing into the hands of *goondas*. Confining myself, therefore, for the present to the Hindus, I must respectfully but earnesdy warn the thinking Hindus against relying upon the assistance of *goondas* for the protection of their temples, themselves and their wives

and children. With the weak bodies they have, they must be determined to stand at their post and to die fighting or without fighting. It would have been a glorious death for Jamnalalji and his colleagues, if they had died in the act of securing peace. It will be a glorious death for Dr. Moonje or me, when we defend temples single-handed. That were bravery of the spirit indeed.[4]

The *goondas* came on the scene because the leaders wanted them.[5]

Goondas do not drop from the sky, nor do they spring from the earth like evil spirits. They are the product of social disorganization, and society, is therefore responsible for their existence. In other words, they should be looked upon as a symptom of corruption in our body politic. To remove the disease we must first discover the underlying cause. To find the remedy will then be a comparatively easy task. So far we have not even attempted a proper beginning. But it is never too late to mend. It is enough that we are at last alive to the necessity of it. We have now to follow it up with prompt action. Let everyone who is interested make a prompt beginning in his own neighbourhood.[6]

Moral alibi

I deprecate the habit of procuring moral alibi for ourselves by blaming it all on the *goondas*. We always put the blame on the *goondas*. But it is we who are responsible for their creation as well as encouragement. It is therefore not right to say that all the wrong that has been done is the work of the *goondas*. [7]

It would be wrong and misleading to underestimate the trouble by calling it the work of *goondas*.[8]

It [the habit of taking refuge behind moral alibis by blaming it all on the *goondas]* is a dangerous expedient.

It is the cowardice or passive sympathy of the average citizen or the "man with a stake" that gives the so-called *goondas* the power to do mischief.[9]

2 COMMUNAL CRIME AND TRUTH

Expose wrong-doing

From my earliest childhood **I** had learnt to dislike the wrong, never the wrong-doer. Therefore, even if the Muslims have done any wrong, they still remain my friends, but it is my duty to tell them that they have done wrong. I have always applied that rule in life with regard to my nearest and dearest. I hold this to be the test of true friendship.[10]

I never said or did anything merely to please others. I have always taught that one should do one's duty irrespective of the reaction it...may have on others. A man who always does what he believes to be right never fears anyone.[11]

As a Satyagrahi, I stand by truth and it will be wrong on my part to hide any suspicion or simply nurse a grievance in my heart. I cannot serve the Hindus and the Muslims of Bengal without the Chief Minister's help, and I hope this will not be withheld. In the same way, I will not put my Ahimsa in my pocket and not advise the true path to the Hindus and the Sikhs in the Punjab if I am to be their friend.[12]

Why this secrecy?

I confess that the question [why, when mutual slaughter between brother and brother is going on, should the names of the respective communities be withheld?] has often occurred to me. There seems to me to be no reason for this hush-hush policy save that it is a legacy from the autocracy which, let us hope, the national Governments have displaced. Those who ought not to know, know who stabs whom. And those who should know are kept in the dark. I am sure there are many Hindus and Muslims, and even members of other communities, taking pride in being Indians first and last without ceasing to be devoted followers of their own religions and who love to do their best to dissuade blind fanatics from making mischief. I know many such. They have no means of ascertaining facts except through the Press. Let darkness be exposed to light. It will be dispelled quicker.[13]

How I wish that all those who call themselves the sons of the soil will think well and act bravely—a very difficult performance at the moment when newspapers give gruesome details about senseless arson and murder.[14]

It is unfortunate that the Interim Government has inherited a bad tradition and, therefore, we do not know who killed whom. It was the deed of "the members of a certain community".[15]

Duty of newspapers

I am sorry that there is poison administered to the public by some newspapers. Newspapers today have almost replaced the Bible, the Koran, the Gita and the other religious scriptures. It is wrong but the fact has to be faced. Such being the case, I hold it to be the duty of newspaper men to give nothing but facts to their readers. [16]

I have a suggestion to make to the *Dawn* and all the newspapers, whatever their hue, that they should avoid all exaggeration. In order to give effect to the suggestion, they should appoint a Joint Board to which all reports about communal trouble would be submitted and even passed on to responsible ministers and, when necessary, given publicity. My suggestion can find favour only if the editors realize their duty to the public and are anxious that a peremptory stop should be put to all communalism. Division having become a settled fact, it is surely time that the country is allowed to settle down to the constructive work feeding and clothing the ill-fed and ill-clad millions. The editors have a weighty part to play in the noble task. To foment trouble is ignoble.[17]

...At this time when we are sitting on a powder magazine, the Fourth Estate has to be extra-wise and reticent. Unscrupulousness will act as a lighted match. I hope, every editor and reporter will realize his duty to the full.[18]

Newspapers are a powerful influence. It is the duty of the editors to see that no false report, or report likely to excite the public, is published in their newspapers. I refer to the news published in a newspaper alleging that the Meos have attacked the Hindus in Rewari. When I read it, it had upset me. But the next day I was pleased to see in the papers that the news was untrue. What I say is only one of several such instances. The editors and their assistants have to be extra-careful about the news they give and the manner in which they dress it. In a state of independence, it is practically impossible for Governments to control the Press. It is the duty of the public to keep a strict watch on the newspapers and keep them on the right path. An enlightened public will refuse to patronize inflammatory or indecent newspapers.[19]

3 CRIMES AGAINST WOMEN

Woman's honour

Everyone, and therefore every Hindu, is bound to defend with his life, the honour of his mother, sister, wife or daughter, in fact, all those who are under his exclusive or special protection. My *dharma* teaches me for the sake of others to give my life without even attempting to kill. But my *dharma* also enables me to say that where choice lies between running away to the neglect of one's charge and killing the would-be ravisher, it is one's duty to kill and be killed, never to desert the post of duty. I have had the humiliation of meeting tall, well-built fellows coming to me and innocently telling me they had witnessed the rape of Hindu women by dissolute Musalmans. In a society of brave men, evidence of completed rape should be almost impossible. Not a man should be alive to report such a crime.[20]

Self-defence

Recourse to law courts in such matters is a broken reed. If I allow my daughter to be kidnapped and then go to court for protection, the latter would be powerless, or, if the judge got angry over my cowardice, he would dismiss me from his presence with deserved contempt. Courts deal with ordinary crimes. General kidnapping of girls or boys is not an ordinary crime. People in such cases are expected to look after themselves. Courts help those who are largely able to help themselves. Theirs is supplementary protection.[21]

So long as there are weak people so long will there be someone to prey upon their weakness. The remedy, therefore, lies in organizing for self-defence. I could find it in me to justify the most violent defence in such cases unless the people concerned are capable of a non-violent defence. No doubt where girls or boys of poor and helpless parents are kidnapped, the case becomes much more complicated. There the remedy has to be found not by the individual but by a whole clan or caste. A presentation, however, of authentic cases of kidnapping is a prime necessity before public opinion can be well organized.[22]

Ever since my experience of the distortion of Ahimsa in Bettiah in 1921, I have been repeating over and over again that he who cannot protect himself or his nearest and dearest or their honour by non-violently facing death, may, and ought to, do so by

violently dealing with the oppressor. He who can do neither of the two is a burden. He has no business to be the head of a family. He must either hide himself, or must rest content to live forever in helplessness and be prepared to crawl like a worm at the bidding of a bully...

He is innocent of Ahimsa. He who for fear of being beaten, suffers the women of his household to be insulted, is not manly but just the reverse. He is fit neither to be a husband nor a father, nor a brother. Such people have no right to complain.[23]

I do not want Swaraj at the cost of women's honour. If what passes as non-violence does not enable you to protect the honour of women or if it does not enable the women to protect their own honour, it is not non-violence. Believe me, it is something quite different. The reader should read the argument on pages 44 to 51 of the Navajivan Press edition [of *Hind Swaraj*]. Experience has added force to the argument. After all, who protected Sita from Ravan? The Poet tells us that her purity was such that Ravan dared not compass his end without her consent.

I warn you, in the end, that if anybody comes to me with the plea that they could not protect the honour of their womenfolk because they had taken the vow of non-violence, I will give them no quarter. Non-violence should never be used as a shield for cowardice. It is a weapon of the brave. I would rather they died fighting violently than became helpless witnesses to such atrocities. A truly non-violent man will never live to tell the tale of such atrocities. He will have laid down his life on the spot in non-violent resistance.

[If the miscreant does not kill me but ties me up instead and gags me so that I am forced to be a silent witness of his misdeed,] I will struggle, so that I will either break the bonds or break myself in the effort. In no case will I remain a helpless witness. When that intensity of feeling is there, God will come to your aid and somehow or other spare you the agony of being a witness to such a deed.[24]

In a society of my imagination, outrage [on women]. . . cannot take place. But in the society in the midst of which we are living, such outrages do take place. My answer is unequivocal. A non-violent man or woman will and should die without retaliation, anger or malice, in self-defence or in defending the honour of his womenfolk. This is the highest form of bravery.[25]

It is not death that matters but how you meet death. To die at the hands of one's brother is a privilege, provided you die bravely. [But what about women who were being abducted and forcibly converted? That no one can be 'converted' forcibly is here beside the point.] And why should Indian women feel so helpless? Is bravery the monopoly of men only? Women, of course, do not generally carry swords, though the Rani of Jhansi did and outdid all her contemporaries in the valour of the sword. Still all cannot become Ranis of Jhansi. But all women can emulate the example of Sita whom even the mighty Ravan dared not touch. Ranis of Jhansi could be subdued.

Let no one dismiss the example of Sita as legendary. [We have] the example of Olive Doke, who dared to go and live among the unclad primitive Negro tribes in the heart of Africa without fear of molestation.[26]

Bravery of death

Woman in our country is brought up to think that she is well only with her husband or on the funeral pyre. I will far rather see India's women trained to wield arms, than that they should feel helpless. The vogue of carrying daggers and revolvers by women is on the increase. I know, however, that arms are a poor weapon when it comes to the matter of defending one's honour against odds. Arms are a symbol of one's helplessness, not strength. When one is deprived of them, generally there is nothing left but surrender.[27]

Inner strength

Women should depend on God and on their own strength and not on others. They should be more courageous and should have more confidence in their own strength. If they are afraid, they will fall easy victims to the onslaughts of the miscreants.

Indian women are not *abalas*. They are famous for their heroic deeds of the past, which they did not achieve with the help of the sword, but of character.[28]

For me there can be no preparation for violence. All preparation must be for non-violence if courage of the highest type is to be developed. Violence can only be tolerated as being preferable always to cowardice. Therefore, I would have no boats ready for a flight in emergency. For a non-violent person there is no emergency, but quiet, dignified preparation for death. Hence, whether it is a man or a woman, he or she will defy death even when he or she is unassisted; for the real assistance is from

God. I can preach no other thing and I am here to practise what I preach. Whether such an opportunity will occur to me or be given to me I do not know. If there are women who, when assailed by miscreants, cannot resist themselves without arms, they do not need to be advised to carry arms. They will do so.[29]

Readiness to die

It is that higher type of valour which I want Indian womanhood to cultivate. The military and police may protect them from abduction, but what about those who have already been abducted or who may be abducted in spite of the police and the military? They ought to learn to die before a hair of their head can be injured...

I ...will advise every one running the risk of dishonour to take poison before submission to dishonour. I have, however, heard from those given to *yogic* practices that if is possible by some *yogic* practice to end life... Mine is not an idle idea mean all I say. The very fact of steeling oneself for death before dishonour braces one for the struggle.[30]

Their very preparedness should make them brave. No one can dishonour a woman who is fearless of death. They have two ways of self-defence—to kill and be killed or to die without killing. I can teach them the latter, not the former. Above all, I want them to be fearless. There is no sin like cowardice.

But there is a moral code even for those who believe in violence. I do not wish them to copy the methods said to have been adopted in East Bengal.[31]

I know the women of Bengal better than probably the Bengalis do. Today they feel crushed and helpless. The sacrifice of myself and my companions would at least teach them the art of dying with self-respect. It might open, too, the eyes of the oppressors and melt their hearts. I do not say that the moment my eyes are closed theirs will open. But that will be the ultimate result, I have not the slightest doubt.[32]

Not the men of Noakhali only are responsible for all that has happened, but women too are equally responsible. I ask them all to be fearless and have faith in God like Draupadi and Sita of the past.[33]

'Death before dishonour'

A woman would most certainly take her own life rather than surrender. In other words, surrender has no room in my plan of life. But I was asked in what way to take one's

own life. I promptly said it was not for me to prescribe the means and behind the approval of suicide under such circumstances was and is the belief that one whose mind is prepared for even suicide will have the requisite courage for such mental resistance and such internal purity that her assailant will be disarmed. I could not carry the argument any further because it does not admit of further development. It requires positive proof which, I own, is lacking.[34]

The art of dying bravely and with honour does not need any special training, save a living faith in God. Then there would be no abductions and no forcible conversions.[35]

Abduction

It has been conveyed to me that there are Muslim women even now kept perforce in Hindu homes. If that is true and if, of course, such women are still living, I will expect every one of them to be restored to their homes. The miscreants should show true repentance and every Hindu should consider it his duty to impress upon them that they should repent and courageously face punishment for their misdeeds. If that is too much for them, I will at least expect the women to be restored to me or to Rajendra Babu in perfect safety...[36]

It will indeed be a brave thing if the miscreants come forward and openly confess their sins and are prepared to bear all punishment justly meted out to them. But if such courage is lacking, they can at least restore the girls to me without any fear of harm coming to them.[37]

God alone knows what awful things the abducted girls were being subjected to. The Hindus and the Sikhs in the Union have not behaved better. I have learnt that the Muslim girls who were abducted were subjected to unnameable ill-treatment by their lustful captors. I would like the East Punjab Government and its officers to deliver every one of such girls from indecent captivity. Every abduction or capture should be regarded by both the Governments as illegal and *ab initio* void. It is the peremptory duty of the two Governments not to rest till every such girl is freed from captivity and returned 'to the respective Governments.[38]

It is said that 25,000 Hindu and Sikh women have been abducted in Pakistan and 12,000 Muslim women were abducted in the Eastern Punjab. Some say that the figures are not quite so high. For me even a single abduction is bad enough. How can man

stoop so low? The lowest figure, i.e., 12,000 for either province is high enough. The conference agreed that all these women must be rescued and restored to their families. Raja Gaznafarali has said that both the Dominions have been disgraced by this episode. Who did more evil and who started it are irrelevant questions when both the parties are agreed that these women should be returned. The important thing is how the evil is to be undone.

Return of abducted women

...25,000 women must have been abducted by at least an equal number of men. Are they all *goondas?* I discredit the hypothesis. They are men passing as good who have disgraced themselves. They have lost their balance and all sense of propriety. Public opinion has to be created in favour of restoration. The two Governments should stake their all on the rescue of these women. They can ask for the help of other individuals or organizations. But the task is so big that none but the Governments can tackle it.[39]

I have been told that many Muslim girls have been abducted in Patiala and Kashmir and other places by Hindus and Sikhs. Some of them are girls from well-known families. If my voice can reach the places where these girls are, I would strongly advise the guilty parties to restore them without delay. There is no doubt that they will be accepted back by their families.

I have heard that some Hindu and Sikh girls are with a Muslim Pir, who says that they will not be ill-treated in any way, but that they will not be returned till the Muslim girls are returned. Can there be a bargain in such matters? Both sides should rescue and return the abducted girls at the earliest opportunity, irrespective of what the other side is doing. Then alone can we hope to live as respectable and respected citizens. Otherwise, we will become a nation of forty crores of *goondas*. A society that tolerates such crimes will be judged according to the pattern of its *goondas*.[40] Friendship demands that all prisoners and women should be returned to either Dominion without regard to their number. The number of abducted women kept in the West Punjab may be larger, but so long as there is one such sister in the East Punjab, it will be sinful to withhold her from her kith and kin. Why should there be a competition in wrong behaviour? [41]

Acceptance of abducted women in society

Several women have been abducted in Pakistan and some of them have been cruelly molested and dishonoured. Their upbringing is such that those rescued women feel ashamed, and society also looks down upon them. To do so is cruel. While it is true that no one can touch a woman who has the purity and the *tejas* of Sita, it is hard to find a Sita in this age. At any rate, every woman cannot rise to these heights. A woman who is forcibly molested has nothing to be ashamed of. She is in no way unchaste or immoral. It is strange that while immoral men or women go unpunished and the lapses of some society men and women never come to light, people go out of their way to outcast innocent victims of brutality! Such an outlook pains me. I can never turn out or look down upon my daughter or wife if she has been subjected to such evil treatment and has escaped or been liberated. I have met such women, both Hindus and Muslims, and have told them that they had nothing to feel ashamed of.[42]

There can be no question of voluntary conversion or association on the part of the girl concerned.[43]

It is said that in some places some of the abducted women do not wish to return. They have changed their religion and are married. I do not believe it. Such marriages and such conversions must be considered null and void. It is the duty of the two Governments to see that each one of these women is restored to her family. The families should receive them with open arms. To ostracize them for having fallen into evil hands is inexcusable cruelty.[44]

When contacted, some are reported to have said that they do not wish to return. They are afraid that they will not be accepted back by their society. Their husbands, parents and friends will look down upon them. Society should welcome those girls back. Some of them are pregnant. It is no fault of theirs. Their children, when born, should be treated with the same regard and respect as any other children. The religion of these children will be that of the mother. On growing up they are to change it if they wish. If any such girl comes to me, she will be treated by me as any other girl in my party. To castigate these girls for having fallen a victim to the lust of some monster is less than human. No shame attaches to them.[45]

4 RESTORATION OF PEACE

War results when peace fails. Our effort must always be directed towards peace. But it must be peace with honour and a fair security for life and property. On these two conditions alone will the refugees return. Of course, if they develop enough courage, they will return without any safeguard. Today I have suggested one Hindu and one Muslim standing surety for each village. If the people have the requisite courage, they would depend on none but God and their own strength of spirit for their defence. If they did that, all the *goondas* in Noakhali will feel the change in the atmosphere and behave decently. I know what I am saying. I come from Kathiawad, a province notorious for its bandits. I know that they are not beyond redemption. Nor do I believe that *goondas* are responsible for all that has happened.[46]

"No" [They should not have only Muslims on the Peace Committees as the Hindus had played no part in breaking the peace.] The Hindus must be there to play their part, else the Peace Committees will be a farce.[47]

The reality has to be faced and a determined effort made by everyone of you to root out the least trace of the feeling of hostility and make it possible for your Muslim neighbours to live in brotherly love once more.[48]

Real penitence

True repentance, with the consequent reparatory action, alone can restore abiding peace between the two sister communities.[49]

Contemplate on what internal strife means, to forgive and forget what has happened and to bear no malice in your hearts for all the tragic and bestial happenings of Noakhali, Bihar and the Punjab.[50]

The riots are matter of great shame and sorrow. But the shame of the sin can be turned to good account by adequate repentance. All the religions that have studied are full of instances proving the maxim: "The greater the sinner the greater the saint." For the poignancy of the pain, of the guilt enhances the joy that a guiltless life brings with it. I wish that the maxim can be proved true in the reformed life of the people of Hilsa. You will be repelled by physical dirt. Surely the repulsion caused by mental dirt which the insanity of the Hindus of Hilsa meant is much greater than the pain caused by any physical dirt however great. I am wondering how I can awaken genuine

repentance in the hearts of the Hindus of Hilsa. It has been suggested to me that, if I settled down in Hilsa and went from house to house, I would be able to effect the desired transformation. Although there is truth in the remark, I must own my physical weakness and consequent inability to follow the advice. You are none the better for my confession. I hope, therefore, that my remarks will penetrate the hearts of the large audience and that you will invite the Muslim sufferers to return.[51]

Change of heart after riots

What does it matter, if you know everything but do not know how to live in brotherliness with your neighbours? [52]

If some people have committed grievous mistakes in their dealings with their neighbours, they should repent and ask their pardon of God. If He granted it but the world did not, even then it did not matter to a man who had learnt to depend on God; such punishment nobly borne serves to elevate a man. In a book of sayings of the Prophet I have found that a man should never leave an error uncorrected. If they did, they will be hauled up on the Day of judgement and find no favour in the eyes of God.[53] It is an effective substitute for martial law which deals with the symptoms but not with the disease itself. The parties, if they bring about peace, will be dealing with the disease.[54]

Peace committee

The Central Peace Committee should consolidate results so far achieved. They have to see that poor Muslims are rehabilitated, just as the Hindus have to be rehabilitated in the areas from which they have been evacuated. Local peace committees should be set up in each *mohalla;* and they must find at least one Hindu and one Muslim of clean heart to work together. These committees must tour the areas under their jurisdiction. They should work to create the feeling of friendliness wherever it is lacking. For the purpose of rehabilitation, they will have to go into details. Food, shelter and clothing have to be found for the evacuees returning to their homes. It will be a great day, indeed, for Calcutta if its men and women co-operate in this manner to consolidate their good feelings, which have been so much in evidence during the last few days. In this task all the parties are to co-operate. For, now that all the parties concerned have come to an agreement with regard to the division of

India into two Dominions, there is no longer any reason to quarrel and they can join hands in the task of restoring peaceful conditions.[55]

Let the Premiers of the two divisions of Bengal meet often enough and jointly devise means to preserve peace in the two States and to find enough healthy food and clothing for the inhabitants and enough work for the masses in East and West Bengal. When the masses, Hindu and Muslim, see their chiefs acting together and working together honestly, courageously and without intermission, the masses living in the two States will take the cue from the leaders and act accordingly.[56]

How can real peace be established? You may feel pleased that peace appears to have returned to Delhi. I cannot share the satisfaction. The Hindus and the Muslims have become estranged from one another. They used to fight in the past too. But it lasted a day or two and then everybody forgot all about it. Today they have become so embittered that they feel as if they have been old enemies. I call this feeling weakness. They must shed it. Then alone can they become a great power. They have two choices before them. They can become a great military power, or if they followed my way, they can become a great, non-violent and invincible power. In either case, the first condition is the shedding of all fear.

The only way to get near each other is that each must forget the mistakes of the other party and magnify its own. I recommend it to the Muslims, as I do to the Hindus and the Sikhs, with all the force at my command. Enemies of yesterday can become friends of today provided they make a clean breast of their guilt. The policy of tit for tat is not conducive to friendship.[57]

Establishment of communal peace

We have to be correct in our behaviour irrespective of what others do. I am not unaware of the sufferings of the Hindus and the Sikhs in Pakistan. But knowing that, I want to overlook them. Otherwise, I will go mad. I will not be able to serve India. We are to look upon the Muslims in the Union as our blood-brothers...

Surely, they should feel as safe among us as we ourselves. This cannot happen until we learnt the art of magnifying our own faults and minimizing those of our neighbours. All eyes rest on India, which has become the hope of Asia and Africa, nay, of the whole world. If India is to realize the hope, it has to stop the fratricide and all Indians

have to live like friends and brothers. Clean hearts are the first condition of this happy state.[58]

I look forward to the day when all enmities will be forgotten and all hatred buried underground, and all those who have been driven away from their hearths and homes will return to them and resume their avocations in perfect security and peace as before. My heart will then dance with joy. I will never give up that hope so long as I live. [59]

Restoration of mutual trust

The citizens of Delhi and the refugees have a heavy task in front of them. Let them seek occasions for meeting together as often as possible in perfect mutual trust. It was a soul-stirring sight for me to meet Muslim sisters in large numbers yesterday. Girls in my party told me that the sisters were sitting in Birla House uncertain whether they could come to me. They were in purdah, most of them. I asked them to be brought in and they came. I suggested that they would not have the purdah before their fathers or brothers. Why should they think me less? And off went the purdah without exception. This is not the first time that the purdah has disappeared before me. I mention the incident to illustrate what genuine love, as I claim mine to be, is able to do.

Hindu and Sikh women should go to the Muslim sisters and establish friendship with them. They should invite them on ceremonial occasions and be invited. Muslim girls and boys should be attracted to common schools, not communal. They should mix in sports.

Not only should there be no boycott of Muslims, but they should be induced to resume their previous occupations. Delhi is poorer for the disappearance of the exquisite workmanship of the Muslims. It is a miserable and miserly thing for the Hindus and the Sikhs to wish to take away from them their means of livelihood. On the one hand there should be no monopoly, and on the other, there should be no attempt at deprivation. In this great country of ours there is room for all.

Conditions for peace

The Peace Committees that have been formed must not go to sleep as many committees unfortunately do in all countries. The condition of keeping me in your

midst is that all the communities in India live at peace with one another, not by force of arms but that of love than which there is no better cement to be found in the world.[60]

All breach of communal peace in any corner of India should make us and our Government hang our heads in shame.[61]

Reparations

All I can say is that not one single case of maltreatment of Muslims by Hindus having been reported to me has remained without investigation by me. This has been my practice since the days of the Khilafat. I have not always succeeded in finding the truth or in giving satisfaction to the aggrieved parties that I had done my best. The Bihar charge is too vague to be answered more fully. If a particular instance were mentioned, I should be able to say what I had done about it. But supposing that I had failed in my duty to do justice, supposing further that I did not "feel equally keenly about Hindu injustice to Muslims", would that justify indifference about Bihar? I have said that there is nothing like Bihar in all the previous cases of Hindu-Muslim clashes, assuming of course that the allegations made were true. All I have asked is that full justice and reparation should be made through a tribunal *admittedly* impartial. My proposal in the case of Bihar should be applicable to all such cases.[62]

I am interested in elucidation of truth, not in the punishment of the guilty. But I am sorry I cannot forgo the suggestion for compensation. Compensation has been asked because it is alleged that the authorities failed to do their duty. The question of compensation has, naturally, to be referred to the proposed tribunal.[63]

Compensation for murder

I have been asked whether the brother or other near relatives of the late Bhai Rajabali should demand compensation in money from Government for his murder. The deceased himself would not have counted such a death as loss. As a matter of fact, it is murders such as this which, if wholly unavenged, will ultimately put an end to murder. The moment any compensation or revenge is sought, the good of the willing sacrifice is wiped out. And how, then could the spirit of the deceased rest in peace?

Murder can never be avenged by either murder or taking compensation. The only way to avenge murder is to offer oneself as a willing sacrifice, with no desire for

retaliation. Those who believe in this premise will never dream of demanding or taking any compensation for the loss of their dear ones. The principle of taking life for life will, on the contrary, only lead to an increase of murders. This is apparent to all today. Revenge or compensation may furnish some satisfaction to the individual, but I am quite definite that it can never restore peace to or uplift society.

The question arises as to what the individual should do in a society where revenge is the rule. The answer lies not in precept but in example. And those alone can set the example who have been wronged. Therefore, the final decision must rest with Bhai Rajabali's relatives. My duty lay in pointing them the way of Ahimsa as I know it.[64]

Pyarelal and his colleagues have, in my opinion, done very good work in Noakhali. They have stayed there at my instance even at the risk of their lives, if necessary. It has given great comfort and courage to the Hindus and it has also enabled the Muslims to realize that these volunteers are the friends of all, and wanted to restore peace and goodwill. Pyarelalji has told me of one incident which I want to share with you in his own words:

> What may be termed the first act in restitution in Shahpur, which was the starting point and storm centre during the riots and where I have been working for the last thirteen months in pursuance of Gandhiji's "Do or Die" mission in Noakhali, was performed the other day when the local Muslims with their own hands removed a mosque which they had erected on a site belonging to the Hindus out of dismantled material of the house of a local Hindu businessman. Both the dismantled material and the site have been restored to the rightful owners. In a signed declaration which the leading local Muslims have issued, they have described the act as "a gesture of goodwill towards our Hindu brethren and a step towards their rehabilitation". The step was not taken without some vigorous heart-searching and even at the eleventh hour there was some talk of having a joint meeting of the Hindus and the Muslims of the locality to "explore means" of "amicable" settlement by "compromise". But they at once saw the point when it was pointed out to them that compromise could have no place in a matter which called for restitution on the part of the majority community, specially when it was the offender. Even if there were no demand on the part of the minority, still the majority community would be bound to do full redress. Before the dismantling commenced I told the leading Muslim that unless

they did the restitution from their hearts, I would far rather that they left it alone for the time being. Physical restoration was nothing unless it symbolized a heart change and carried with it the guarantee of the goodwill of the majority community. On my part I assured them that I would not let the authorities use coercion on them, so long as I was there. They, however, assured me that they really meant to do the reparation from their hearts and proceeded with the dismantling with *Bismillah* on their lips. The credit for the performance was due to the commendable good sense shown by the local Muslims and the exertions of the district officers, particularly the District Magistrate, who is untiring in his efforts to promote peace and goodwill between the two communities. This is not to say as yet that "God's in His heaven" and "all's right with the world" in Noakhali. The "petty done" only lends hope and encouragement in regard to the "undone vast", which has yet to be tackled.

If all in India and Pakistan followed this example, the shape of things will be changed in no time.[65]

Crime and punishment

I have met human monsters from my early youth; I have found that even they are not beyond redemption, if we know how to touch the right chord in their souls.[66]

They ['the callous perpetrators of rime'] have their own reason to be jubilant and the only way to meet their attitude is not to succumb to it, but to live in their midst and retain one's sense of truth. Goodness must be joined with knowledge. Mere goodness is not of much use, as I have found in life. One must cultivate the fine discriminating quality which goes with spiritual courage and character. One must know, in a crucial situation, when to speak and when to be silent, when to act and when to refrain.

Action and non-action in these circumstances become identical instead of being contradictory.[67]

Muslim friends who had seen me before the prayer meeting ...have asked me how I expect friendly relations between the two communities when the Hindus agitate for the arrest and trial of those who are guilty of murders, arson and loot during the disturbances. I confess that I do not like these complaints. But I sympathize with the complainants so long as the wrong-doers avoid arrest and trial and so long as Muslim opinion in Noakhali does not insist upon guilty parties disclosing themselves. I should

be glad to see Muslim opinion working actively to bring the offenders not before the courts of justice but before the court of public opinion.

Let the offenders show contrition and let them return the looted property. Let them also show to those against whom offences were committed that they need fear no molestation, that the days of frenzy are over. Muslim public opinion should be such as to guarantee that miscreants will not dare to offend against any individual and only then Hindus can be asked to return safely to their villages. I am sure that such purging before the court of public opinion is infinitely superior to a trial before a court of law. What is wanted is not vengeance but reformation.[68]

The next thing is that some friends have said that all prosecutions, initiated by the Hindus against the Muslim offenders, interfere with the progress of the peace mission between the two. This surprises me. What has peace between gentlemen to do with the prosecution of criminals? I can understand the objection if it means that false prosecutions should be withdrawn. I shall be whole-heartedly with the objectors. I go further and say that all such persons should be brought to book as perjurers. I say also that the proper course to avoid court procedure is for the guilty persons in all humility to make an open confession of their guilt and stand the judgment of the public. I shall gladly help any such movement.[69]

Even non-violent conduct cannot arrest the course of law. And non-violent conduct on the part of the frightened and injured party cannot operate until the culprits declare themselves and are penitent. The fact is that not only is there no penitence on their part, but they are absconding. I am averse to mass arrests. And I am for severe punishment of those who are proved to have manufactured complaints.[70]

About fifty persons, who are wanted in connection with the riot cases, have surrendered the day after my arrival at Masurhi. I welcome it and hope that others who have taken part in the riots will surrender to the proper authorities, making a clean breast of the crimes they have committed and taking whatever punishment may be given to them. If people have not the courage to surrender to the authorities, they can come to me or Badshah Khan or Major-General Shah Nawaz with their confessions.[71]

The people should refuse to shelter criminals who have acted barbarously or who are still threatening the returning Muslims—under the false belief that they have done something heroic. How it can be heroic I fail to understand.

As a mark of true repentance you [criminals] should surrender yourselves to the police and bear the punishment that may be meted out to you. Even otherwise it is in your interest to surrender, for if the Government and the police do their duty—which they must if they want to justify their existence—you will be arrested sooner or later. A voluntary surrender is bound to win you consideration from the court. What I have said should not be dismissed as a counsel of cowardice.[72]

Looted property

In the village [of Changirgaon, where Dr. Sushila Nayar is working], partakers of the loot of October last are of their own accord bringing back some of the looted property. I am of opinion that this is a happy omen. If the infection spread, the courts will have no work to do so far as public loot is concerned. I for one will ask Government to waive the right of prosecution if the looted property is returned. But I say the return must be sincere and full, whether by the guilty one or the public, and not a mere token to avoid prosecution. What I aim at is a change of heart and not a truce superimposed by the military or the police. A popular ministry cannot impose its will on the people.[73]

It has been reported that property worth about a crore of rupees has been looted or destroyed. It does not matter what the exact figure is. For, if a man is deprived of a couple of rupees when he has that amount only, it means that he has lost his all. It becomes then the duty of every Hindu to see that the looted property is returned and losses compensated for, wherever they have occurred in the province. If the men concerned are no longer living, the restored property or the compensation should at least reach the surviving relatives.[74]

VIII. Personal Reaction to Communal Riots

1 RELIGION AND RIOTS

Just as we do not break one another's heads in respect of civil matters, so may we not do even in respect of religious matters.[1]

The world is watching—some with glee and some with sorrow—the dogfight that is proceeding in our midst. We have listened to Satan. Religion—call it by what name you like—is made of sterner stuff.[2]

It is unnecessary to discriminate and apportion the blame between the rival parties. Where both are to blame, who can arbitrate with golden scales and fix the exact ratio of blame? It is no part of self-defence to tell lies or exaggerate.[3]

It matters little to me whether the perpetrators of shameful deeds are Hindus or Musalmans. It is enough to know that some of us are blaspheming a patient God and doing inhuman deeds in the sacred name of religion. I know too that neither assassination nor fratricidal acts can possibly save religion. Religion worth the name can only be saved by purity, humility and fearlessness of the uttermost type among its professors. It is the only *Shuddhi* and only propaganda.[4]

No sanction far strife

Poet Iqbal has written the immortal line:

> मजहब नहीं सखाता आपसमें बैर रखना |

"Religion does not inculcate mutual strife." Could there be a greater proof of our cowardice than fighting amongst ourselves? [5]

Islam means peace. Hindus claim to follow the path of Ahimsa. They both swear by God, but in practice they follow Satan.

The Muslim stabs the innocent Hindu and the Hindu stabs the innocent Muslim.[6]

We are passing through trying times. There is news of stabbings in Calcutta, Dacca, Allahabad, Bombay and so on. What is more, all this is done in the name of religion. How stabbing and murder of the innocents, whether aggressive or retaliatory, can help the cause of religion, I fail to understand. The spirit of religion requires us to make Him witness of our littlest of little acts. In Mira's song that has just been sung

at the prayer, the devotee prays to God to come to his aid and deliver him from distress. For He alone can do so, none else. Let us pray to God then to deliver us from our distress. If our prayer is sincere, we will rely on Him entirely and put away the sword. And if even one party does so, violence would cease.[7]

I ask you to consider for yourselves why innocent women and children have been killed. Is it to save any religion? No religion teaches anyone to kill his neighbours. What was done is nothing but wanton destruction— I do not stop to think whether it is done from motives of self-interest or any others.[8]

The Hindus and the Sikhs... by killing and loot and arson...are destroying their own religions. I claim to be a student of religions and I know that no religion teaches madness. Islam is no exception.[9]

2 FASTS FOR COMMUNAL PEACE

The Way of the Cross

Fasting cannot be undertaken mechanically. It is a powerful thing but a dangerous thing if handled amateurishly. It requires complete Self-purification much more than what is required in facing death with retaliation even in mind. One such act of perfect sacrifice would suffice for the whole world. Such is held to be Jesus' example.

The idea is that you appropriate to yourself and assimilate the essence of his sacrifice, symbolically represented by the bread and wine of the Eucharist. A man who was completely innocent offered himself as a sacrifice for the good of others, including his enemies, and became the ransom of the world. It was a perfect act. 'It is finished' were the last words of Jesus, and we have the testimony of his four disciples as to its authenticity.

But whether the Jesus tradition is historically true or not I do not care. To me it is truer than history because I hold it to be possible and it enshrines an eternal law—the law of vicarious and innocent suffering taken in its true sense.[10]

Genesis of fasting

The thought of a 24 hours' fast had come to me one night in a dream. I had consulted Rajaji whose guest I then was in Madras. The idea had appealed to the latter, notices had been issued at once and there had been a widespread and hearty response to the call. I had never dreamt that the country had been so awakened, and by the country I mean not the few cities of India but the seven lakhs of villages where the vast mass of Indian humanity lives. I appeal to you to respond to the call once again, but only if you understand its implications. The fast was undertaken in those days for the sake of vindicating Swaraj through Hindu-Muslim unity, and the charkha, etc.[11]

(1) Penance for communal conflict: 1924

The fact that the Hindus and Musalmans, who were only two years ago apparendy working together as friends, are now fighting like cats and dogs in some places shows conclusively that the Non-co-operation they offered was not non-violent. I saw the symptoms in Bombay, Chauri Chaura and in a host of minor cases. I did penance then. It had its effect *pro tanto*. But this Hindu-Muslim tension was unthinkable. It became unbearable on hearing the Kohat tragedy. On the eve of my departure from Sabarmati

for Delhi, Sarojini Devi wrote to me that speeches and homilies on peace would not do. I must find out an effective remedy. She was right in saddling the responsibility on me. Had I not been instrumental in bringing unto being the vast energy of the people?

I must find the remedy if the energy proved self-destructive. I wrote to say that I should find it only by plodding. Empty prayer is, 'as sounding brass or a tinkling cymbal'. I little knew then that the remedy was to be this prolonged fast. And yet I know that the fast is not prolonged enough for quenching the agony of my soul. Have I erred, have I been impatient, have I compromised with evil? I may have done all these things or none of them. All I know is what I see before me. If real non-violence and truth had been practised by the people who are now fighting, the gory duelling that is now going on would have been impossible. My responsibility is clearly somewhere.

I was violently shaken by Amethi, Shambhar and Gulbarga. I had read the reports about Amethi and Shambhar prepared by Hindu and Mahommedan friends. I had learnt the joint finding of Hindu and Musalman friends who went to Gulbarga. I was writhing in deep pain and yet I had no remedy. The news of Kohat set the smouldering mass aflame. Something had got to be done. I passed two nights in restlessness and pain. On Wednesday I knew the remedy. I must do penance. In the Satyagraha Ashram at the time of morning prayer we ask Shiva, God of Mercy, to forgive our sins knowingly or unknowingly committed. My penance is the prayer of a bleeding heart for forgiveness for sins unwittingly committed.

It is [a] warning to the Hindus and Musalmans who have professed to love me. If they have loved me truly and if I have been deserving of their love, they will do penance with me for the grave sin of denying God in their hearts.[12]

Fruit of deliberation

I wish to assure the reader that the fast has not been undertaken without deliberation. As a matter of fact my life has been a stake ever since the birth of non-co-operation. I did not blindly embark upon it. I had ample warning of the dangers attendant upon it.[13]

I have decided on this fast with deeper deliberation than I gave to any of my previous fasts. I had such a fast in my mind, even when I conceived and launched non-co-operation. At that time, I said to myself, 'I am placing this terrible weapon in the hands of the people. If it is abused I must pay the price by laying down my life.' That moment seems to have arrived today.[14]

This fast is the result of several days' continued prayer. I have got up from sleep at 3 o'clock in the night and have asked Him what to do. On the 17th of September the answer came like a flash! If I have erred, He will forgive me.[15]

A matter of religion

It is for me a pure matter of religion. I looked around me, and questioned myself, and found that I was powerless. What could I effect even by means of a long tour? The masses suspect us today. Pray do not believe that the Hindus in Delhi fully trust me. They were not unanimous in asking me to arbitrate. And naturally. There have been murders. How can I hope to be heard by those who have suffered? I would ask them to forgive those who have murdered their dearest ones. Who would listen to me? The Anjuman refuses to listen to Hakimji. When we were in the midst of negotiations about their arbitration I heard of Kohat. I asked myself, 'What are you going to do now?' I am an irrepressible optimist, but I always base my optimism oil solid facts. You are also an irrepressible optimist, but you at times base yours on sand. No one will listen to you today. In Visnagar, in Gujarat, they gave a cold shoulder to Mr. Abbas Tyebji and Mahadev. In Ahmedabad a storm was nipped in the bud. Some trouble was brewing in Umreth when I left Gujarat. That I should be a passive witness of all these shows the depth of my incapacity. There are hundreds of sisters whose love and affection I still possess. They are in mortal fear today. To them I want to show by my own example the way to die.

Fight I do not mind, if it be fair, honourable, brave fighting between the two communities. But today it is all a story of unmitigated cowardice. They would throw stones and run away, murder and run away, go to court, put up false witnesses and cite false evidence. What a woeful record! How am I to make them brave? You are trying your best. But I should also try my best. I must recover the power to react on them.[16]

No! [I am not even bound to consider what a shock it will be to the country, this long fast.] For, man so often deceives himself! He often does things to please others which he should have avoided. Religion therefore teaches him to stand before the world after having taken a particular resolve. What vanity to think that the world would be shocked at one's own great penance! And whose wishes are we to consider? There would be no limit. Had Rama stopped to consult and argue, he would never have gone on *Vanavasa* and rid the earth of its suffering. He waited for no one's advice. He went forth. For, he prized his plighted word more than his life. Only he can take great resolves who has indomitable faith in God and has fear of God.[17]

I wrestling with Him! If there is pride or defiance in me, it is all over with me...

My religion says that only he who is prepared to suffer can pray to God. Fasting and prayer are common injunctions in my religion.[18]

Fasting in Hinduism, Islam

Certainly. ['Fasting is prescribed by our religion.'] What did the Rishis of old do? It is unthinkable that they ate anything during their penances, in some cases gone through in caves, and for hundreds of years. Parvati who did penance to win Shiva would not touch even the leaves of trees, much less fruit or food. Hinduism is full of penance and prayer.[19]

But I know of this sort of penance even in Islam. In the Life of the Prophet, I have read that the Prophet often fasted and prayed, and forbade others to copy him. Some one asked him why he did not allow others to do the thing he himself was doing. 'Because I live on food divine,' he said. He achieved most of his great things by fasting and prayer. I learnt from him that only he can fast who has inexhaustible faith in God. The Prophet had revelations not in moments of ease and luxurious living. He fasted and prayed, kept awake for nights together and would be on his feet at all hours of the night as he received the revelations. Even at this moment, I see before me the picture of the Prophet thus fasting and praying.[20]

Purpose of fast

My religion teaches me to love all equally. May God help me to do so. My fast is, among other things, meant to qualify me for achieving that equal and selfless love.[21]

The object of the previous fasts was limited. The object of this is unlimited, and there is boundless love at the back of it. I am today bathing in that ocean of love.[22]

The penance of the Hindus and Musalmans is not fasting but retracing their steps. It is true penance for a Musalman to harbour no ill for his Hindu brother, and an equally true penance for a Hindu to harbour none for his Musalman brother.

I ask of no Hindu or Musalman to surrender an iota of his religious principle. Only let him be sure that it is religion. But I do ask of every Hindu and Musalman not to fight for an earthly gain. I should be deeply hurt if my fast made either community surrender on a matter of principle.[23]

But is it right for me to go through the fast under a Musalman roof? Yes, it is. The fast is not born out of ill-will against a single soul. My being under a Musalman roof ensures it against any such interpretation. It is in the fitness of things that this fast should be taken up and completed in a Musalman house.[24]

All I have done, all I am doing, is done in a fully God-fearing spirit, and in the house of a God-fearing Musalman at that.[25]

My refuge

Today is the twentieth day of my penance and prayer. Presently, from the world of peace I shall enter the world of strife. The more I think of it the more helpless I feel. So many look to me to finish the work begun by the Unity Conference. So many expect me to bring together the political parties. I know that I can do nothing. God can do everything. Oh God! make me Thy fit instrument and use me as Thou wilt.

Man is nothing. Napoleon planned much and found himself a prisoner in St. Helena. The mighty Kaiser aimed at the crown of Europe and is reduced to the status of a private gentleman. God had so willed it. Let us contemplate such examples and be humble.

During these days of grace, privilege and peace, I have hummed to myself a hymn we often sing at the Satyagraha Ashram. It is so good that I cannot resist the pleasure of sharing a free rendering of it with the reader. The words of the hymn better express my state than anything else I can write.

Here they are:

My honour, Oh God! is in Thy keeping;
Thou art ever my refuge,
For Thou art Protector of the weak.

It is Thy promise to listen to the wail of sinners;
I am a sinner of old, help me
Thou to cross this ocean of darkness.

It is Thine to remove the sin
And the misery of mankind.
Be gracious to Tulasidas
and make him Thy devotee.[*26]

(2) Atonement for Bihar tragedy, 1946

I went on spare, milkless diet, principally for reasons of health soon after coming to Calcutta. The happenings in the country induced me to prolong it. Now Bihar will send me to complete fast if things do not radically mend. There will be no time limit. Do not agitate yourself but be really glad that I feel I have the strength to go through the ordeal and live up to my creed.[27]

The news from Bihar has shaken me. My own duty seems to me to be clear. A deep bond unites me with Bihar. How can I forget that? If even half of what one hears is true, it shows that Bihar has forgotten humanity. To blame it all on the *goondas* would be an untruth. Although I have striven hard to avert a fast, I can do so no longer... My inner voice tells me, 'You may not live to be a witness to this senseless slaughter. If people refuse to see what Is clear as daylight and pay no heed to what you say, does it not mean that your day is over?' The logic of the argument is driving me irresistibly towards a fast. I, therefore, propose to issue a statement that unless this orgy of madness ceases, I must go on a fast unto death. The fast may have to be delayed for some time. When you asked me at Delhi about it, I had replied that I was not thinking of it at the time. All that has now changed. You can strive with me, if you think differently. Whatever you say will carry weight with me. But knowing as you do my temperament, I am sure you will approve of my proposed step. In any event you will

go on with your work without a moment's thought about my possible death and leave me in God's good care. No worry allowed.[28]

I regard myself as a part of you. Your affection has compelled that loyalty in me. And since I claim to have better appreciation than you seem to have shown of what Bihari Hindus should do, I cannot rest till I have done some measure of penance. Predominantly for reasons of health, I had put myself on the lowest diet possible soon after my reaching Calcutta. That diet now continues as a penance after the knowledge of the Bihar tragedy. The low diet will become a fast unto death, if the erring Biharis have not turned over a new leaf.

There is no danger of Bihar mistaking my act for anything other than pure penance as a matter of sacred duty.

No friend should run to me for assistance or to show sympathy. I am surrounded by loving friends. It would be wholly wrong and irrelevant for any other person to copy me. No sympathetic fast or semi-fast is called for. Such action can only do harm. What my penance should do is to quicken the conscience of those who know me and believe in my bona fides. Let no one be anxious for me. I am, like all of us, in God's keeping.

Nothing will happen to me so long as He wants service through the present tabernacle.[29]

Quenching hatred

If...you truly desire to extinguish the volcano of hatred that is today pouring out its poisonous lava, I hope you will join me in fasting in the true spirit. The fast signifies much more than processions and flag-hoisting ceremonies.[30]

Not lightly undertaken

I cannot fast at the dictation of anyone. Such fasts cannot be lightly undertaken. They can conceivably be wholly undesirable. They cannot be undertaken out of anger. Anger is a short madness. I must, therefore, undertake the fast only when the still small voice within me calls for it. I am a servant of the country and, therefore, of the Congress. Am I to fast because the Congress differs from my views? I have to be patient. There are occasions enough for being impatient.[31]

(3) Agony of Bengal, 1947

I have come to know fairly well the details of what has happened in various parts of the city. Some of the places which were safe ill yesterday have suddenly become unsafe. Several deaths have taken place. I saw two bodies of very poor Muslims. I saw also some wretched-looking Muslims being carted away to a place of safety. I quit see that last nights incidents ...pale into insignificance before this flare-up. Nothing that I may do in the way of going about in the open conflagration could possibly arrest it.

I have told the friends who saw me in the evening what their duty is. What part am I to play in order to stop it? The Sikhs and the Hindus must not forget what the East Punjab has done during these few days. Now the Muslims in the West Punjab have begun the mad career. It is said that the Sikhs and the Hindus are enraged over the Punjab happenings...

The weapon which has hitherto proved infallible for me is fasting. To put in an appearance before a yelling crowd does not always work. It certainly did not last night. What my word in person cannot do, my fast may. It may touch the hearts of all the warring elements in the Punjab if it does in Calcutta. I, therefore, begin fasting from 8—15 tonight to end only if and when sanity returns to Calcutta. I shall, as usual permit myself to add salt and soda bicarb to the water I may wish to drink during the fast.

If the people of Calcutta wish me to proceed to the Punjab and help the people there, they have to enable me to break the fast as early as may be.[32]

If the conflagration spreads, I shall have no alternative but to fast. Have I not often said that there is yet another fast in store for me? [33]

Ever since the 14th of August, although I have relished the fraternization between Hindus and Musalmans, yet I look on the ebullition of emotion with caution and reserve. If the feeling is due entirely to friendship newly found, to the sense of brotherhood through common citizenship newly attained, there will be more signs of it e.g., in intensified efforts for rehabilitation. That sign is lacking. The recrudescence has now come. Therefore, I feel I must fast.[34]

God has at least given me to work and die for communal peace... I fast for the restoration of communal harmony.[35]

But I cannot exclude relevant talk. Such necessary loss of energy is inevitable. I am certainly desirous of living, but not at the cost of work that duty demands. I cannot interrupt the work which has made me fast and which makes me live. If my life ebbs away in the process, I would feel happy.[36]

The men behind goondas

The conflagration has been caused not by the *goondas* but by those who have *become goondas*. It is we who make *goondas*. Without our sympathy and passive support, the *goondas* would have no legs to stand upon. I want to touch the hearts of those who are behind the *goondas?* [37]

Goondas are there because we have made them so. During one year of past anarchy, it is understandable how these elements in society have gained respectability. But the war between Pakistanis and those for Undivided India has ended. It is time for peace-loving citizens to assert themselves and isolate *goondaism*. Non-violent non-co-operation is a universal remedy. Good is self-existent, evil is not. It is like a parasite living on and round good. It will die of itself when the support that good gives is withdrawn. The heart of the anti-social elements may or may not be changed; it will be enough if they are made to feel that the better elements of society are asserting themselves in the interests of peace and in the interests of normality.

If there are anti-social elements in society, where a rowdy or a *goonda* plundered or killed a man, whether Hindu or Muslim, my fast may not affect him. I know my limitations.[38]

I do not expect to be able to control all the *goondas* in the city, though I would love to, as I have not the requisite degree of purity, detachment and steadfastness of mind. But if I cannot even make them purge themselves of the communal virus, I shall feel that life is not worth living and I shall not care to prolong it.[39]

Aim of fast

Such fasts are intended to stir the conscience and remove mental sluggishness. Truth cannot be sacrificed even for the sake of saving a life, however precious it is.[40]

The present fast is meant to activize the better, peace-loving and wise elements in society, to rescue them from mental sluggishness and make goodness active. [41]

Critical juncture

The fast had to be now or never. It would be too late afterwards. The minority Muslims cannot be left in a perilous state. My fast has to be preventive if it is to be any good.

I know I shall be able to tackle the Punjab too if I can control Calcutta. But if I falter now, the conflagration may spread, and soon, I can see clearly, two or three Powers will be upon us and thus will end our short-lived dream of independence [42]

Breaking the fast

My presence did not check the rowdies the other day. My word seemed to have lost all efficacy so far as they were concerned. My fast will now be broken only when the conflagration ends and the pristine peace of the last fifteen days returns. If the Muslims really love me and regard me as an asset, they can demonstrate their faith by refusing to give way to the instinct of revenge and retaliation even if the whole of Calcutta goes mad. In the meantime, my ordeal must continue.

Let the evil-doers desist from evil, not to save my life, but as a result of a true heart change. Let all understand that a make-believe peace cannot satisfy me. I do not want a temporary lull to be followed by a worse conflagration. In that event I shall have to go on an *unconditional* fast unto death.[43]

I shall break my fast only when you can assure me that there will never again be recrudescence of communal madness in the city even though the whole of West Bengal and, for that matter, India may go forth into a blaze, and the Muslims themselves will come and tell me that they now feel safe and secure and, therefore, I need not further prolong fast...

Stimulation, not coercion

You have referred to the oppression of my fast. I cannot understand this. Why should you have a feeling of oppression if what you have told me came right from your hearts? If a single step is taken under pressure of the fasts, not from conviction, it will cause oppression; but there should be no oppression if there is complete co-operation between the head and the heart. The function of my fast is to purify, to release our energies by overcoming our inertia and mental sluggishness, not to paralyse us or to render us inactive.

My fast isolates the forces of evil; the moment they are isolated they die, for evil by itself has no legs to stand upon. I expect you, therefore, to work with even greater vigour under the instigation of my fast, not to feel its oppression.[44]

My fast should make you more vigilant, more truthful, more careful and precise in your speech.[45]

Change of hear

Can you in all sincerity assure me that there will never be any more recrudescence of communal madness in Calcutta? Can you say that there is a genuine change of heart among the citizens of Calcutta so that they will no longer foster or tolerate communal frenzy? You should let me continue my fast if you cannot give me this guarantee, for, in the event of the present communal outbreak being followed by another, I shall have to undertake an irrevocable fast unto death. But supposing there is another communal outbreak in spite of your assurances, since you are not omniscient, would you give your word of honour that you would, in that event, suffer to the uttermost before a hair of the minority community is injured, that you would die in the attempt to put out the conflagration but not return alive to report failure? And I want this from you in writing. If you can give this guarantee, I shall break my fast.

There is no fresh condition imposed. All that is there is implied in the original terms of the fast. What I have spoken now is only a home truth to make you know what is what. If there is complete accord between your conviction and feeling, there should be no difficulty in signing that declaration. It is the acid test of your sincerity and courage of conviction. If, however, you sign it merely to keep me alive, you will be encompassing my death.[46]

Sense of common citizenship

The present occasion is not one in which there is scope for a sympathetic fast. Hindus and Musalmans have fought for one whole year, at the end of which the major parties have agreed that India should be divided into two States. Both have Hindu and Muslim subjects. It is now time for every one to create the sense of common citizenship, to rebuild the land so that men may taste the fruits of freedom. To this end all should work.

You should create real Hindu-Muslim unity by educating the people in a sense of common citizenship of the State, where every single man enjoys perfect equality of rights which flows from duty performed. If you work with this aim in view, and succeed after a few days' effort in making Muslims in Calcutta feel safe where they now do not, it will be time for me to break the fast.[47]

You should desist from a sympathetic fast, go forth among the oppressed in each quarter, assure them that they are safe, and rebuild life so that safety would be a permanent feature of the new State of India. I shall personally have loved to move about from quarter to quarter in Calcutta in order to place my views before the various bodies, but my physical condition will not permit it. If others work, how can I rest? Yet I am bound to make my contribution. I feel that it should be in the shape of a fast.[48]

No hurry to break fast

...Mind you, my blood will be upon your head if you say one thing and mean another; rather than thoughtlessly hurry, let me prolong my fast a little longer. It would not hurt me. When a man fasts it is not the gallons of water he drinks that sustain him, but God.[49]

If the friends have come to me only for the sake of saving my life, it is nothing.[50]

The sanity that has been in evidence for the last twenty-four hours is not enough for me. If the present company is going to assure me that it is a sincere affair and is going to be permanent, I shall expect you to give me something in writing. It must state that, supposing Hindu-Muslim riots break out once more in Calcutta, you should assure me that you will give your lives in the attempt to quell the riots. If you agree, that will be enough. You must so work from tomorrow that real peace and common citizenship are created as a feature of Calcutta life, no matter what happens elsewhere. Communal peace should be your prime occupation. Your other occupations or avocations must henceforth occupy a second place.

There is another matter, but that is a condition which automatically attaches itself to the situation. As in Bihar, as in Noakhali, so also in Calcutta, I want to tell the friends who are making themselves responsible for the break of my fast, that if

communal frenzy breaks out in Calcutta again, I may have to go on an *irrevocable* fast.[51]

I would close with the hope that Calcutta will fulfil the promise made on my departure and which sustains me in the midst of the surrounding madness.[52]

Result of Calcutta fast

The last [fast] was in Calcutta in the current month of September. Admittedly, the result was as it should have been. Having reference to the spirit, I regard it as permanent. Time alone would show whether the effect was of a lasting character or not. It must depend upon the purity of the fasting person and the accuracy of his perception. That enquiry would be irrelevant here. Moreover, the fasting man is not competent to undertake the enquiry. It can only be done by a properly equipped, impartial person and that, too, after my death.[53]

(4) The last fast in Delhi, 1948

One fasts for health's sake under laws governing health fasts as a penance for a wrong done and felt as such. In these fasts, the fasting one need not believe in Ahimsa. There is, however, a fast which a votary of non-violence sometimes feels impelled to undertake by way of protest against some wrong done by society, and this he does when he, as a votary of Ahimsa, has no other remedy left. Such an occasion has come my way.

Delhi, city of dead

When on September 9th, I returned to Delhi from Calcutta, it was to proceed to the West Punjab. But that was not to be. Gay Delhi looked a city of the dead. As I alighted from the train, I observed gloom on every face I saw. Even the Sardar, whom humour and the joy that humour gives never desert, was no exception this time. The cause of it I did not know. He was on the platform to receive me. He lost no time in giving me the sad news of the disturbances that had taken place in the Metropolis of the Union. At once I saw that I had to be in Delhi and 'Do or Die'. There is apparent calm brought about by prompt military and police action. But there is storm within the breast. It may burst forth any day. This I count as no fulfilment of the vow to 'do' which alone can keep me from death, the incomparable friend.[54]

What was it if it was not a disturbance for a crowd to make an organized and a determined effort to take forcible possession of Muslim houses? The disturbance was such that the Police had reluctantly to resort to tear gas and even to a little shooting if only overhead, before the crowd dispersed. It would have been foolish for me to wait till the last Muslim had been turned out of Delhi by subtle undemonstrative methods, which I would describe as killing by inches.[55]

Bidding of Inner Voice

Though the Voice within has been beckoning for a long time, I have been shutting my ears to it, lest it may be the voice of Satan, otherwise called my weakness. I never like to feel resourceless; a Satyagrahi never should. Fasting is his last resort in the place of the sword—his or other's.

With God as my supreme and sole counsellor, I felt that I must take the decision without any other adviser. If I have made a mistake and discover it, I shall have no hesitation in proclaiming it from the housetops and retracing my faulty step. There is little chance of my making such a discovery. If there is clear indication, as I claim there is, of the Inner Voice, it will not be gainsaid. [56]

Potency of the fast

I do not regard this fast as an ordinary fast. I have undertaken it after deep thought and yet it has sprung not from reasoning but God's will that rules men's reason. It is addressed to no particular section or individual and yet it is addressed equally to all. There is no trace of anger of any kind behind it nor the slightest tinge of impatience. But behind it is the realization that there is a time for everything and an opportunity, once missed, never returns. The fast is a bid for nothing less.[57]

Yearning for heart-friendship

I yearn for heart friendship between the Hindus, the Sikhs and the Muslims. It subsisted between them the other day. Today it is non-existent. It is a state that no Indian patriot worthy of the name can contemplate with equanimity...

I have no answer to return to the Muslim friends who see me from day to day as to what they should do. My impotence has been gnawing at me of late. It will go immediately the fast is undertaken. I have been brooding over it for the last three days. The final conclusion has flashed upon me and it makes me happy. No man, if he

is pure, has anything more precious to give than his life. I hope and pray that I have that purity in me to justify the step...

A pure fast, like duty, is its own reward. I do not embark upon it for the sake of the result it may bring. I do so because I must. Hence, I urge everybody dispassionately to examine the purpose and let me die, if I must, in peace which I hope is ensured. Death for me would be a glorious deliverance rather than that I should be a helpless witness of the destruction of India, Hinduism, Sikhism and Islam. That destruction is certain if Pakistan ensures no equality of status and security of life and property for all professing the various faiths of the world, and if India copies her. Only, then Islam dies in the two Indias, not in the world. But Hinduism and Sikhism have no world outside India.[58]

Cleansing of hearts all-round

I blame no individual or community for the fast. I do believe, however, that if the Hindus and Sikhs insist on turning out the Muslims from Delhi, they will be betraying India and their own faiths. And this hurts me.

Some people have taunted me that I have sympathy for the Muslims only and that I have undertaken the fast for their sake. They are right. But all my life I have stood, as everyone should stand, for minorities or those in need. Pakistan has resulted in depriving the Muslims of the Union of pride and self-confidence. It hurts me to think that this is so. It weakens a State which keeps or allows any class of people who have lost self-confidence.

My fast is against the Muslims too in the sense that it should enable them to stand up to their Hindu and Sikh brethren. In terms of the fast, Muslim friends have to work no less than the Hindus and the Sikhs...

I expect a thorough cleansing of hearts. That being assured, there will be mutual respect and trust. You are all of the Union and by right it belongs to you. I cannot break the fast for less. You must dethrone Satan from your hearts and enthrone God.

Duty of Hindus and Sikhs

What is the duty of the Hindus and the Sikhs? You have just heard Gurudev's favourite song: "If no one responds to your call, walk alone, walk alone." I shall repeat with my last breath that the Hindus and the Sikhs should be brave enough to say that, whatever

happened in Pakistan, they will not raise their little finger against a single Muslim in the Union. They will never again indulge in cowardly acts, however great the provocation.[59]

No opposition

I ask you all to bless the effort and to pray for me and with me. The fast begins from the first meal tomorrow. The period is indefinite and I may drink water with or without salt and sour limes...

Let no friend, or foe if there be one, be angry with me. There are friends who do not believe in the method of the fast for the reclamation of the human mind. They will bear with me and extend to me the same liberty of action that they claim for themselves...

I plead for an absence of argument and inevitable endorsement of the step.

Those who differ from me will be honoured by me for their resistance however implacable. Let my fast quicken conscience, not deaden it. Just contemplate the rot that has set in in beloved India and you will rejoice to think that there is an humble son of hers who is strong enough and possibly, pure enough to take the happy step. If he is neither, he is a burden on earth. The sooner he disappears and clears the Indian atmosphere of the burden, the better for him and all concerned.

I would beg of all friends not to rush to Birla House nor try to dissuade me or be anxious for me. I am in God's hands. Rather, they should turn the searchlight inwards, for this is essentially a testing time for all of us. Those who remain at their post of duty and perform it diligently and well, now more so than hitherto, will help me and the cause in every way. The fast is a process of Self-purification.[60]

No hasty decision

I am not prepared to concede that my decision to undertake the fast was hasty. It was quick, no doubt... The statement was of the nature of heart searching and prayer. Therefore, it cannot be dubbed as "hasty" in any sense of the term.

I did not need to hear any arguments as to the propriety of the fast. The fact that I did listen to arguments only bespeaks my patience and humility.

I regard this step of mine as the last word on patience. Would you regard patience that kills its very object as patience or folly?

Does it not betray sheer ignorance to attribute sudden loss of patience to one who has been as patience personified right from the beginning of September last?

It was only when in terms of human effort I had exhausted all resources and realized my utter helplessness that I put my head on God's lap... That is the inner meaning and significance of my fast. If you read and ponder in your mind the epic of *Gajendra Moksha,* you might be able properly to appraise my step.[61]

My fast is against no one party, group or individual exclusively and yet it excludes nobody. It is addressed to the conscience of all, even the majority community in the other Dominion. If all or any one of the groups respond fully, I know the miracle will be achieved. For instance, if the Sikhs respond to my appeal as one man, I shall be wholly satisfied. I shall go and live in their midst in the Punjab, for they are a brave people and I know they can set an example in non-violence of the brave which will serve as an object lesson to all the rest.[62]

My fast, as I have stated in plain language, is undoubtedly on behalf of the Muslim minority in the Union, and therefore, it is necessarily against the Hindus and the Sikhs of the Union and the Muslims of Pakistan. It is also on behalf of the minorities in Pakistan as in the case of the Muslim minority in the Union. This is a clumsy compression of the idea I have already explained.[63]

I cannot take credit for the results that have been achieved since my coming to Delhi. It would be self-delusion on my part to do so. Mere man cannot judge as to how many lives were really saved by my labours. Only the Omniscient and All-Seeing God can do that.[64]

I cannot expect the fast taken by a very imperfect and weak mortal, as I truly confess I am, to have the potency to make its proteges proof against all danger. The fast is a process of Self-purification for all. It would be wrong to make any insinuation against the purity of the step.[65]

It will end when and if I am satisfied that there is a reunion of hearts of all the communities brought about without any outside pressure, but from an awakened sense of duty. The reward will be the regaining of India's dwindling prestige and her

fast fading, sovereignty over the heart of Asia and, therethrough, the world. I flatter myself with the belief that the loss of her soul by India will mean the loss of the hope of the aching, storm-tossed and hungry world...

If the whole of India responds, or at least Delhi does, the fast might be soon ended.

The crisis

But whether it ends soon or late or never, let there be no softness in dealing with what may be termed as a crisis. Critics have regarded some of my previous fasts as coercive, and held that on merits the verdict would have gone against my stand but for the pressure exercised by the fasts. What value can an adverse verdict have when the purpose is demonstrably sound? [66]

Delhi on trial

If Delhi becomes peaceful in the real sense of the term, I shall then break the fast. Delhi is the capital of India. The ruin or downfall of Delhi I shall regard as the ruin of India and Pakistan. I want Delhi to be safe for all Muslims, even for one like Shaheed Suhrawardy, who is looked upon as the chief of *goondas*. Let all proved *goondas* be rounded up. But I am witness to the fact that Shaheedsaheb has worked for peace in Calcutta in all sincerity. He has pulled out the Muslims from Hindu houses which they had forcibly occupied. He was living with me. He would willingly join the prayer, but I would not expose him to the risk of being insulted. I want him, as I do every Muslim, to feel as safe in Delhi as the tallest of them.

I do not mind how long it takes for real peace to be established. Whether it takes one day or one month, it is immaterial. No one shall say or do anything to lure me into giving up my fast prematurely. The object should not be to save my life. It should be to save India and her honour. I shall feel happy and proud when I see that India's place is not lowered as it has become by the recent happenings which I have no wish to recall.[67]

God's will

I have not the slightest desire that the fast should be ended as quickly as possible. It matters little if the ecstatic wishes of a fool like me are never realized and the fast is never broken. I am content to wait as long as it may be necessary, but it will hurt me to think that people have acted merely in order to save me. I claim that God has

inspired this fast and it will be broken only when and if He wishes it. No human agency has ever been known to thwart, nor will it ever thwart, Divine Will.[68]

I am in no hurry to end the fast. Hurry will spoil matters. I do not want anyone to come and tell me that things have been set right while the process is incomplete. If Delhi becomes peaceful in the real sense of the term it will have its repercussions all over the country. I have no wish to live unless peace reigns in the two Dominions.[69]

India's great gesture

It is never a light matter for any responsible Cabinet to alter a deliberate, settled policy. Yet our Cabinet, responsible in every sense of the term, has with equal deliberation yet promptness unsettled their settled fact. They deserve the warmest thanks from the whole country, from Kashmir to Cape Camorin and from Karachi to the Assam frontier. And I know that all the nations of the earth will proclaim this gesture as one which only a large-hearted Cabinet like, ours could rise to. This is no policy of appeasement of the Muslims. This is a policy, if you like, of self-appeasement. No Cabinet worthy of being representative of a large mass of mankind can afford to take any step merely because it is likely to win the hasty applause of an unthinking public. In the midst of insanity, should not our best representatives retain sanity and bravely prevent a wreck of the ship of State under their management?

What then was the actuating motive? It was my fast. It changed the whole outlook. Without the fast they could not go beyond what the law permitted and required them to do.

But the present gesture on the part of the Government of India is one of unmixed goodwill. It has put the Pakistan Government on its honour. It ought to lead to an honourable settlement not only of the Kashmir question, but of all the differences between the two Dominions.

Friendship should replace the present enmity. Demands of equity supersede the letter of the law. There is a homely maxim of law which has been in practice for centuries in England that when common law seems to fail, equity comes to the rescue. Not long ago there were even separate courts for the administration of law and of equity.

Considered in this setting, there is no room for questioning the utter justice of this act of the Union Government. If we want a precedent, there is a striking one at our

disposal in the form of what is popularly known as the MacDonald Award. That Award was really the unanimous judgment of not only the members of the British Cabinet, but also of the majority of the members of the Second Round Table Conference. It was undone overnight as a result of the fast undertake in Yeravda prison.

End of fast

I have been asked to end the fast because of this great act of the Union Government. I wish I could persuade myself to do so. I know that the medical friends who, of their own volition and at considerable sacrifice, meticulously examine me from day to day, are getting more and more anxious as the fast is prolonged. Because of defective kidney function they dread not so much my instantaneous collapse as permanent after-effects of any further prolongation. I did not embark upon the fast after consultation with medical men, be they however able. My sole guide, even dictator, was God, the Infallible and Omnipotent. If He has any further use for this frail body of mine, He will keep it in spite of the prognostications of medical men and women. I am in His hands. Therefore, I hope you will believe me when I say that I dread neither death nor permanent injury, even if I survive. I do feel that this warning of medical friends should, if the country has any use for me, hurry the people to close up their ranks. And like brave men and women that we ought to be under hard-earned freedom, we should trust even those whom we may suspect as our enemies. Brave people disdain distrust.

The letter of my vow will be satisfied if the Hindus, Muslims and Sikhs of Delhi bring about a union which not even a conflagration around them, in all the other parts of India or Pakistan, will be strong enough to break. Happily, the people in both the Dominions seem to have instinctively realized that the fittest answer to the fast should be a complete friendship between the two Dominions, such that members of all communities should be able to go to either Dominion without the slightest fear of molestation. Self-purification demands nothing less. It will be wrong for the rest of the two Dominions to put a heavy strain upon Delhi. After all, the inhabitants of the Union are not superhuman. In the name of the people, our Government have taken a liberal step without counting the cost. What will be Pakistan's counter gesture? The ways are many if there is the will. Is it there? [70]

It is a happy day for me and for all of you. I am glad that due to your kindness I can break my fast on the auspicious day of Guru Govind Singh's birthday anniversary. I can never forget the kindness which is daily being showered on me by the inhabitants of Delhi, the Pakistan sufferers and the Government and administrative authorities, since the fast began. I have experienced the same love at Calcutta. I cannot forget the help that I have received from Shaheedsaheb in restoring peace in Calcutta. But for him, I would not have stopped in Calcutta.[71]

What you have told me has touched me deeply. You have given me all that I have asked for. But if your words mean that you held yourselves responsible for communal peace in Delhi only and what happened in other places is no concern of yours, then your guarantee is nothing worth and I will feel, and you too will one day realize, that it was a great blunder on my part to have given up my fast. Representatives of both the R.S.S. and the Hindu Mahasabha are among the signatories to the seven-point declaration. If they are sincere in their professions, surely, they cannot be indifferent to outbreaks of madness in places other than Delhi. It will be a fraud upon God if they do so. Delhi is the heart of the Indian Dominion and you are the cream of Delhi If you cannot make the whole of India realize that the Hindus, Sikhs and Muslims are all brothers, it will bode ill for the future of both the Dominions. What will happen to Hindustan if you quarrel with one another? [72]

Concluding message

I embarked on the fast in the name of Truth whose familiar name is God. Without living Truth God is nowhere. In the name of God we have indulged in lies, massacres of people without caring whether they were innocent or guilty, men or women, children or infants. We have indulged in abductions, forcible conversions and we have done all this shamelessly. I am not aware if anybody has done these things in the name of Truth.

With that same name on my lips I have broken the fast. The agony of our people was unbearable. Rashtrapati Dr. Rajendrababu brought over a hundred people representing the Hindus, Muslims, Sikhs, representatives of the Hindu Mahasabha, the Rashtriya Swayam Sevak Sangh and representatives of refugees from the Punjab, the Frontier Province and Sind. In this very representative company were present Zahid Hussainsaheb, the High Commissioner for Pakistan, the Chief Commissioner of Delhi

and the Deputy Commissioner, General Shah Nawaz Khan, representing the Azad Hind Fauj (I.N.A.). Pandit Nehru, sitting like a statue, was of course there, as also Maulanasaheb. Dr. Rajendrababu read a document in Hindustani signed by these representatives, asking me not to put any further strain on them and to end the agony by breaking the fast.

Telegrams after telegrams have come from Pakistan and the Indian Union urging me to do the same. I could not resist the counsel of all these friends. I could not disbelieve their pledge that come what may, there would be complete friendship between the Hindus, Muslims, Sikhs, Christians, Parsis and Jews, a friendship not to be broken. To break that friendship would be to break the nation.

Spirit of the vow

As I write, comforting telegrams are deluging me. How I wish that God will keep me fit enough and sane enough to render the service of humanity that lies in front of me! If the solemn pledge made today is fulfilled, I assure you that it will revive with redoubled force my intense wish and prayer before God that I should be enabled to live the full span of life doing service of humanity till the last moment. That span according to learned opinion is at least one hundred twenty-five years, some say one hundred thirty-three. The letter of my vow has been fulfilled early beyond expectation, through the great goodwill of all the citizens of Delhi, including the Hindu Mahasabha leaders and the Rashtriya Sevak Sangh. The result could not be otherwise when I find that thousands of refugees and others have been fasting since yesterday. Signed assurances of heart friendship have been pouring in upon me from thousands. Telegraphic blessings have come from all over the world.

Can there be a better sign of God's hand in this act of mine? But beyond the letter of fulfilment of my solemn vow lies its spirit without which the letter killeth. The spirit of the vow is sincere friendship between the Hindus, Muslims and Sikhs of the Union and a similar friendship in Pakistan. If the first is assured, the second must follow, as sure as day follows night. If there is darkness in the Union, it would be folly to expect light in Pakistan. But if the night in the Union is dispelled beyond the shadow of a doubt, it cannot be otherwise in Pakistan, nor are signs wanting in that direction. Numerous messages have come from Pakistan, not one of dissent. May God, who is Truth, guide us as He has visibly guided us during all these six days. [73]

Had fast been fatal

The writer [of a letter written to me during my fast] has said that, while I was in jail in 1942, the country had somewhat taken to violence. If I died of the fast, there will be such a violent upsurge in the country that it will stagger humanity. Therefore, the writer has argued that for the sake of humanity I should give up my fast... While it is true that the people had resorted to violence when I was locked up in jail, I do not think that my death under a fast should have the feared result. But I have rehearsed before embarking on the fast, the possibility of a wide fratricide. The Yadavas had destroyed each other before Lord Krishna's death. But I am too insignificant a mortal to produce such an effect. However, if the people have become indolent and vicious like the Yadavas and God sees that there is no way out but extermination, He may make even an ordinary person like me the instrument of such a catastrophe. Having left myself in God's hands, I worry no more about the consequences. What, however, I saw during the fast nerved me to hope that India has no such self-destruction in store for her.

Change of heart

Lastly, I am satisfied at the way the Muslims are freely moving about in Delhi. I want you to continue the process of Self-purification and convert your hearts into temples of the living God of Truth.[74]

Instances can be adduced of instantaneous change of heart. It would have been more apt to say that such heart change is transitory. Now that my fast is over, it remains to be seen what result it produces. I say this not to deprecate or detract from what the writer of the foregoing letter has said. The Hindus, Muslims, Sikhs—all may learn something from it. The ideal of communal unity is not a new one. It has always been before the country as one of the pillars of national independence. Without it independence cannot last. This has been regarded as more or less axiomatic. The transition period, which I hope, is now over, reflected our distemper. We may, therefore, expect that the unity that has been established in Delhi will prove enduring.[75]

*. The original text of the hymn of Tulasidas is 'रघुवीर तुमको मेरी लाज |...'

3 DESIRE TO LIVE FOR 125 YEARS

I would personally like to live for 125 years, not by the help of medicines but by natural ways, in which I will be able to serve the nation and humanity.[76]

The ideal of the *sthitaprajna* (man whose understanding is secure) described in the second chapter of the Gita is always before me and I am ceaseless in my efforts to reach that ideal. Whatever others may say of me, I know I am yet far from it. When one really reaches such a state, his very thought becomes charged with a power which transforms those around him. But where is that power in me now? I can only say that I am a common mortal, made of the same clay of which others are made, only ceaselessly striving to attain the lofty ideal which the Gita holds before all mankind.[77]

There can be no end to strife until and unless you make over your hearts to God. Today I feel that I myself have no following. If I had, then, these tragedies would not have happened; but even if all desert me, I know God will not and He will direct me in my duty. Only when God reigns in men's hearts will they be able to shed their anger.[78]

In the India as I see it shaping today, there is no place for me. I have given up the hope of living 125 years, I might last a year or two. That is a different matter. But I have no wish to live if India is to be submerged in a deluge of violence, as it is threatening to do. There is the communal frenzy...[79]

The dispatch from which Mr. Gregg quotes is substantially correct. The loss of hope arises from my knowledge that I have not attained sufficient detachment and control over my temper and emotions which entitle one to entertain the hope. One day I found to my cost that I had not attained the required detachment. No one has the right to live at all unless it is a life of service. And a man without detachment in terms of the Gita cannot render full service.

A faithful confession of one's failings is good for the soul. It enables one the better to get rid of those failings. Let the readers of the *Harijan* know that I am making every effort to get out of them so that I can regain the lost hope. In this connection I should also repeat that the hope is open to every one who dedicates himself to the service of his fellowmen. Nor need it be laughed out as an idle dream. That it may not be realized in me and many fellow-aspirants should be no proof of its futility.

No place in violent society

The statement that I find no place for myself in a society that bases itself on violence has nothing to do with the reported loss of hope. I deliberately use the adjective 'reported', for, I do not want to harbour the thought of hopelessness. What was true when the report was made need not be, and is not, true in an equal measure today.

It must be clear that there can be no place for a man of peace in a society full of strife. Yet he may live the full span of 125 years and may hope by ceaseless striving to make a place for himself. That is exactly the meaning of my second statement and no more. I am in that society, though not of it. The statement registers my protest.

Has the non-violent effort of the past 30 years come to naught? ... It is to be hoped that the violence has not penetrated India's villages. Be that as it may, I wholly endorse Mr. Gregg's warning that, "We may not tell God that if violence (the folly of men) does not stop within a certain time that fits our hopes, we will stop doing our utmost including living as long as we can." I very much fear that the dispatch in question tore the sentences out of their context and evoked the doubts expressed by Mr. Gregg. I hope I am incapable of judging God.[80]

Ruin of India

I have made my final choice. I have no desire to live to see the ruin of India through fratricide. My incessant prayer is that God will remove me before any such calamity descends upon our fair land.[81]

It baffles me as to why those who have lived as brothers, those whose blood has mingled in the massacre of Jallianwala Bagh, should today be enemies. As long as I have breath in my body, I will say that this should not be. In the agony of my heart I cry daily, hourly, to God to bring peace. If peace does not come, I will pray to God to take me.[82]

But I who have staked my life to gain the independence of India do not wish to be a living witness to its destruction. With every breath I pray to God either to give me the strength to quench the flames or remove me from this earth.[83]

I have worked hard for the independence of India and have prayed to God to let me live up to 125 years so that I can see the establishment of Ramarajya, the Kingdom of Heaven on earth, in India. But today there is no such prospect before us. The people

have taken the law into their own hands. Am I to be a helpless witness of the tragedy? I pray to God to give me the strength to make them see their error and mend it, or else remove me. Time was when their love for me made them follow me implicitly. Their affection has not perhaps died down, but my appeal to their reason and hearts seems to have lost its force. Is it that they had use for me only while they were slaves and have none in an independent India? Does independence mean goodbye to civilization and humanity? I cannot give them any other message now than the one I have proclaimed from the house-tops all these years.[84]

What has taken place - the orgy of murder, arson, loot, abductions, forcible conversions and worse that we have witnessed - is, in my opinion, unmitigated barbarism. True, such things were not unknown before, but there was not that wholesale communal discrimination. Tales of such happenings have filled me with grief and shame. Even more shameful is the demolition and desecration of mosques, temples and *gurudwaras*. Such madness, if it is not arrested, must spell ruin to both the communities. You are far from freedom while this madness reigns.[85]

Before I ever knew anything of politics in my early youth, I dreamt the dream of communal unity of the heart. I shall jump in the evening of my life like a child to feel that the dream has been realized in this life. The wish for living the full span of life, portrayed by the seers of old and which they permit us to set down at 125 years, will then revive. Who would not risk sacrificing his life for the realization of such a dream? Then we shall have real Swaraj.[86]

The transfer of power on the 15th of August as a result of our passive resistance struggle is a unique event in the history of the world. But then we fell from grace and the Hindus and Muslims and Sikhs behaved towards one another like barbarians. It is however, I hope, only a temporary distemper. Their hearts are sound.[87]

Birthday felicitations

I have received scores of telegrams ...both from home and abroad. It is impossible to send individual replies. But, I asked myself, "Where did the congratulations come in? Would it not be more appropriate to send condolences?" Flowers even have come to me from refugees and many tributes both in money and good wishes. There is nothing but agony in my heart. Time was when whatever I said the masses followed. Today, mine is a lone voice. All I hear from you is that you will not allow the Muslims to stay

in the Indian Union. And if the cry is against the Muslims today, what may be the fate of the Parsis, the Christians and even the Europeans tomorrow? Many friends have hoped I would live to be 125, but I have lost all desire to live long, let alone 125 years. I am utterly unable to appropriate any of the congratulations showered on me. I cannot live while hatred and killing mar the atmosphere. I therefore plead with you all to give up the present madness.[88]

> This is from one of the many messages of birthday congratulations:
>
> May I suggest that the present situation should not depress you? In my opinion this is the final attempt of the forces of evil to foil the divine plan of India's contribution to the solution of the world's distress by way of non-violence. You are today the only instrument in the world to further the divine purpose."

This is a telegram sent more out of personal affection than knowledge. Let us see.

Fulfilment of Divine Purpose

It is perhaps wrong to describe my present state of mind as depression. I have but stated a fact. I am not vain enough to think that the divine purpose can only be fulfilled through me. It is as likely as not that a fitter instrument will be used to carry it out and that I was good enough to represent a weak nation, not a strong one. May it not be that a man purer, more courageous, more far-seeing is wanted for the final purpose? This is all speculation. No one has the capacity to judge God. We are drops in that limitless ocean of mercy.

Without doubt the ideal thing would be neither to wish to live 125 years nor to wish to die now. Mine must be a state of complete resignation to the Divine Will. The ideal ceases to be that when it becomes real. All we can do is to make as near an approach to it as possible. This I am doing with as much energy as I can summon to my assistance.

If I had the impertinence openly to declare my wish to live 125 years, I must have the humility under changed circumstances openly to shed that wish. And I have done no more, no less. This has not been done in a spirit of depression. The more apt term perhaps is helplessness. In that state I invoke the aid of the all-embracing Power to take me away from this "vale of tears" rather than make me a helpless witness of the butchery by man become savage, whether he dares to call himself a Muslim or Hindu

or what not. Yet I cry—"Not my will but Thine alone shall prevail." If He wants me, He will keep me here on this earth yet awhile.[89]

To suffer with the afflicted and try to relieve their suffering has been my life's work.[90]

If the poison spread throughout India, life would not be worth living in it.[91]

Retirement to the Himalayas

A deputation of about forty refugees from Bannu... had called on me in the afternoon. Poor men, they were in an afflicted state and I prized their *darshan*...One of them ...exclaimed that they owed their miseries to me and angrily asked me to leave them alone and retire to the Himalayas. I asked him at whose bidding I should go. Some are annoyed and a few go to the length of abusing me, while many eulogize my efforts. The only course therefore open to me is to follow the dictates of God who speaks to men in the inmost chamber of the heart. There were women, too, in the company. I regarded them as my brothers or sisters. God is air one true friend. We are entirely in His hands. I will not care to go and enjoy the peace of the mountains but will be content with what peace I can extract from the surrounding turmoil. I, therefore, prefer to stay in your midst; if you all go to the Himalayas, I may follow you as your servant.[92]

4 READINESS FOR MARTYRDOM

Personal protection

You might ... ask that there was at least no reason for the Sikhs to go with me. They have not been posted by the Government. Let me inform you, first, that they have obtained the permission of the Government for going with me. They have not come here to create quarrels. In testimony, they have come without their usual *kirpans*. They have come to render service to both the communities impartially...

The Sikhs here wish to serve both the communities under my guidance. How—on what ground—can I send away such friends? They have been giving me valuable assistance and that not for making a public show thereof, but in a spirit of genuine service. If I refused that service, I should fall in my own estimate and prove myself a coward. I request you, too, to trust these people, regard them as your brethren and accept their services. They are capable of rendering much help and have plenty of experience of this kind of work. God has blessed them with physical strength and also faith.

If I find that what I have said about them was incorrect, they would go back. If, on the other hand, I am keeping them with an ulterior motive, it will prove to be my own ruin, besides making my experiment a failure.[93]

I hold that no power on earth can resist the lovers of liberty who are ready not to kill opponents but be killed by them. This is the view that I have enunciated at one time. But today we have made considerable progress.[94]

I am ashamed ['to have the police guarding my dwelling while prayers are being held'], but I am a humble subject with no powers to interfere with the law. If you want to remove the police, you should go to your Sardar who is Home Member.[95]

Invitation to immolation

A valuable colleague from Ahmedabad has invited me to immolate myself. "We believe in the non-violent way but lack the strength. Your example would steady our wavering faith and fortify us." The logic is perfect and the temptation great. But I resisted it and said 'no'. There is no inner call. When it comes, nothing will keep me back. I have reasoned with myself too about it. But I need not set forth my reasons.

Let people call me a coward if they please. I have faith that, when the hour arrives, God will give me the strength to face it and I won't be found unready.[96]

I am not afraid to die in my mission if that is to be my fate. As you have heard in the evening hymn, no doctor can make his patient live beyond the allotted span.[97]

Of course, I cannot do today what I have told them to do. I will not be permitted to. I saw that yesterday. Everybody will protect me from harm if I went in the midst of the maddened crowd. I may drop down from sheer physical exhaustion—that is nothing. It won't do for a soldier to be exhausted in the midst of battle.[98]

I have received a telegram saying that, if the Hindus and the Sikhs had not retaliated, probably even I would not be alive today. I consider the suggestion preposterous. My life is in God's good hands as yours is. No one can put an end to it till He permits it. It is not for human beings to save my life or that of anyone else. [99]

Man does not live but to escape death. If he does so, he is advised not to do so. He is advised to learn to love death as well as life, if not more so. A hard saying, harder to act up to, one may say. Every worthy act is difficult. Ascent is always difficult. Descent is easy and often slippery. Life becomes livable only to the extent that death is treated as a friend, never as an enemy. To conquer life's temptations, summon death to your aid. In order to postpone death a coward surrenders honour, wife, daughter and all. A courageous man prefers death to the surrender of self-respect. When the time comes, as it conceivably can, I would not leave my advice to be inferred, but it will be given in precise language. That today my advice might be followed only by one or none does not detract from its value. A beginning is always made by a few, even one.[100]

The bomb attack

I have been receiving anxious enquiries and praise for being unruffled at the accident. I thought that it was military practice and, therefore, nothing to worry about. I had not realized till after the prayers that it was a bomb explosion and that the bomb was meant against me. God only knows how I would have behaved in front of a bomb aimed at me and exploding. Therefore, I deserve no praise. I would deserve a certificate only if I fell as a result of such an explosion and yet retained a smile on my face and no malice against the doer. What I want to say is that no one should look

down upon the misguided youth who had thrown the bomb. He probably looked upon me as an enemy of Hinduism. After all, has not the Gita said that, whenever there is an evil-minded person damaging religion, God sends some one to put an end to his life? That celebrated verse has a special meaning. The youth should realize that those who differ from him are not necessarily evil. The evil has no life apart from the toleration of good people. No one should believe that he or she is so perfect that he or she is sent by God to punish evil-doers, as the accused seemed to flatter himself he was.

I have heard that the youth had without permission occupied a *masjid* for lack of other accommodation and now that the police are getting all mosques evacuated, he resented the act. It is a wrong thing on his part to have occupied the *masjid* in the first place and it is doubly wrong to defy the authorities who asked him to vacate it.

To those who are at the back of the youth I would appeal to desist from such activity. That is not the way to save Hinduism. Hinduism can be saved only by my method...

Some Sikh friends came and said that I should not think that the Sikhs had anything to do with the deed. I know that the youth is not a Sikh. But what does it matter whether he is a Sikh or a Hindu or a Muslim? I wish well to all perpetrators. I have told the Inspector-General of Police also not to harass him in any way. You should try to win him over and convert him to right thinking and doing. I hope that the youth and his guides will realize their error. For, it is a wrong done to Hinduism and the country. At the same time, I warn my hearers against being angry with the accused. He did not know that he was doing anything wrong. You should pity him. If you harboured resentment against my fast and have still pledged yourselves to maintain peace in order to save an old servant of the nation, the guilt is yours, not that of the young man who had thrown the bomb. If, on the other hand, you had signed the Peace Pledge whole-heartedly, persons like the young man are ultimately bound to come to your way of thinking.

I expect you to go on with the prayers in spite of bomb explosions or a shower of bullets.[101]

IX. Non-violent Approach to Communal Unity and Peace

1 UNITY THROUGH NON-VIOLENCE

This unity, in my opinion, is unattainable without our adopting non-violence as a firm policy. I call it a policy because it is limited to the preservation of that unity. But it follows that thirty crores of Hindus and Musalmans, united not for a time but for all time, can defy all the powers of the world and should consider it a cowardly act to resort to violence in their dealings with the English administrators. We have hitherto feared them and their guns in our simplicity. The moment we realize our combined strength, we shall consider it unmanly to fear them and, therefore, ever to think of striking them. Hence am I anxious and impatient to persuade my countrymen to be non-violent, not out of our weakness but out of our strength. But you and I know that we have not yet evolved the non-violence of the strong. And we have not done so because the Hindu-Muslim union has not gone much beyond the stage of policy.[1]

But I have never presented to India that extreme form of non-violence, if only because I do not regard myself fit enough to redeliver that ancient message. Though my intellect has fully understood and grasped it, it has not as yet become part of my whole being...

My strength lies in my asking people to do nothing that I have not tried repeatedly in my own life.

I am, then, asking my countrymen today to adopt non-violence as their final creed only for the purpose of regulating the relations between the different races, and for the purpose of attaining Swaraj.

No resort to violence

Hindus and Musalmans, Christians, Sikhs and Parsis must not settle their differences by resort to violence, and the means for the attainment of Swaraj must be non-violent. This I venture to place before India, not as a weapon of the weak, but of the strong.

Acceptance of non-violence, therefore, for the purposes mentioned by me, is the most natural and the most necessary condition of our national existence. It will teach us to husband our corporate physical strength for a better purpose, instead of dissipating it, as now, in a useless fratricidal strife in which each party is exhausted

after the effort. And every armed rebellion must be an insane act unless it is backed by the nation. But almost any item of non-co-operation fully backed by the nation can achieve the aim without shedding a single drop of blood...

Non-violence in communal matters

It is a sign not of strength but of weakness to take up the pistol on the slightest pretext. Mutual fisticuffs are a training not in violence but in emasculation. My method of non-violence can never lead to loss of strength, but it alone will make it possible, if the nation wills it, to offer disciplined and concerted violence in time of danger.

I have dwelt at length upon the mistaken view of non-violence, because I am sore that if we can but revert to our faith, if we ever had any, in non-violence limited only to the two purposes above referred to, the present tension between the two communities will largely subside. For, in my opinion, an attitude of non-violence in our mutual relations is an indispensable condition prior to a discussion of the remedies for the removal of the tension. It must be common cause between the two communities that neither party shall take the law into its own hands, but that all points in dispute, wherever and whenever they arise, shall be decided by reference either to private arbitration, or to the law courts if they wish. This is the whole meaning of non-violence, so far as communal matters are concerned. To put it another way, just as we do not break one another's heads in respect of civil matters, so may we not do even in respect of religious matters. This is the only pact that is immediately necessary between the parties, and I am sure that everything else will follow.[2]

No other way

For me there is no hope save through truth and non-violence. I know that they will triumph when everything else has failed. Whether, therefore, I am in the minority of one or I have a majority, I must go along the course that God seems to have shown me. Today non-violence as a mere policy is a broken reed. It answers well as a policy when there are no active forces working against it in your own camp. But when you have to reckon with those who believe in violence as a creed to be enforced under given circumstances, the expedience of non-violence breaks down. Then is the time for the out-and-out believer in non-violence to test his creed. Both my creed and I

are, therefore, on our trial. And if we do not seem to succeed, let the critic or the onlooker blame not the creed but me. I know I am often obliged to struggle against myself. I have not become incapable as yet of violence in thought at least. But I am striving with all the might God has given me.[3]

2 SELF-DEFENCE: THE VIOLENT WAY

Tradition of violence

Though the majority of the Musalmans of India and the Hindus belong to the same 'stock', the religious environment has made them different. I believe and I have noticed, too, that thought transforms man's features as well as character. The Sikhs are the most recent illustration of the fact. The Musalman being generally in a minority has as a class developed into a bully. Moreover, being heir to fresh traditions, he exhibits the virility of a comparatively new system of life. Though, in my opinion, non-violence has a predominant place in the Koran, the thirteen hundred years of imperialistic expansion have made the Musalmans fighters as a body. They are therefore aggressive. Bullying is the natural excrescence of an aggressive spirit.

The Hindu has an ages-old civilization. He is essentially non-violent. His civilization has passed through the experiences that the two recent ones are still passing through. If Hinduism was ever imperialistic in the modern sense of the term, it has outlived its imperialism and has either deliberately or as a matter of course given it up. Predominance of the non-violent spirit has restricted the use of arms to a small minority which must always be subordinate to a civil power highly spiritual, learned and selfless. The Hindus as a body are, therefore, not equipped for fighting. But not having retained their spiritual training they have forgotten the use of an effective substitute for arms, and not knowing their use nor having an aptitude for them, they have become docile to the point of timidity or cowardice. This vice is, therefore, a natural excrescence of gentleness. Holding this view, I do not think that the Hindu exclusiveness, bad as it undoubtedly is, has much to do with the Hindu timidity. Hence also my disbelief in *akhadas* as a means of self-defence. I prize them for physical culture, but for self-defence I would restore the spiritual culture.

Self-purification best means

The best and most lasting self-defence is Self-purification. I refuse to be lifted off my feet because of the scares that haunt us today. If the Hindus would but believe in themselves and work in accordance with their traditions, they will have no reason to fear bullying. The moment they recommence the real spiritual training, the Musalman will respond. He cannot help it. If I can get together a band of young Hindus with faith in themselves and, therefore, faith in the Musalmans, the band will become a shield

for the weaker ones. They (the young Hindus) will teach how to die without killing. I know no other way. When our ancestors saw affliction surrounding them, they went in for *tapasya*—purification. They realized the helplessness of the flesh and in their helplessness they prayed till they compelled the Maker to obey their call. 'Oh yes,' says my Hindu friend, 'but then God sent some one to wield arms.' I am not concerned with denying the truth of the retort. All I say to the friend is that as a Hindu he may not ignore the cause and secure the result.

It will be time to fight when we have done enough *tapasya*. Are we purified enough? I ask. Have we even done willing penance for the sin of untouchability, let alone the personal purity of individuals? Are our religious preceptors all that they should be? We are beating the air whilst we simply concentrate our attention upon picking holes in the Musalman conduct. As with the Englishman, so with the musalman. If our professions are true, we should find it infinitely less difficult to conquer the Musalman than the English. But the Hindus whisper to me that they have hope of the Englishman but none of the Musalman. I say to them, 'If you have no hope of the Musalman, your hope of the Englishman is foredoomed to failure.'[4]

'Akhada' and 'Sangathan'

The way...does not lie through *akhadas,* not that I mind them. On the contrary, I want them for physical culture. Then they should be for all. But if they are meant as a preparation for self-defence in Hindu-Musalman conflicts, they are foredoomed to failure. Musalmans can play the [same] game, and such preparations, secret or open, do but cause suspicion and irritation. They can provide no present remedy.[5]

I am against *sangathan,* and I am not. If *sangathan* means opening *akhadas* and organizing the Hindu hooligans through them, I would regard it as a pitiable condition. You cannot defend yourself and your religion with the help of hooligans. It is substituting one peril for another, and even adding another. I would have nothing to say against *akhadas* if they were used by the Brahmanas, Banias and others for the development of their physique. *Akhadas* as *akhadas* are unexceptionable. But I have no doubt that they are no good for giving training to fight the Musalmans. It will take years to acquire the physical strength to fight.

The *akhada* is, therefore, not the way. We will have to go in for *tapasya,* for self-purification, if we want to win the hearts of the Musalmans. We shall have to cast off

all the evil in us. If they attack us, we shall have to learn not to return blow for blow, but bravely to face death—not to die a craven death leaving wife and children behind, but to receive their blows and meet death cheerfully.

I would tender the same advice to the Musalmans. But it is unnecessary, as the average Musalman has been assumed to be a bully. The general impression is that the Musalmans can fight and fight well. I do not, therefore, need to tell them how they should defend themselves from the attacks of the Hindus; on the contrary I have to appeal to them to forbear.[6]

Sangathan is really a sound movement. Every community is entitled, indeed bound, to organize itself if it is to live as a separate entity. I have kept myself aloof from it because of my peculiar ideas of organization. I believe in quality rather than quantity. The fashion nowadays is to rely upon quantity even at the cost of quality. Quantity has its place no doubt in social and political economy. Only I am ill-fitted for organizing quantity in the way it is done at present.[7]

Clean fight

...In order to arrive at a solution we must not think of the man in the street. We must think of ourselves who are behind the man in the street and pulling the strings. Let us take care that *we* do nothing out of fear. I hate duelling, but it has a romantic side to it. I am engaged in bringing that side of it to the fore, I would love to engage in a duel with the Big Brother. When we are both satisfied that there is no chance of unity without bloodshed, and that even we two cannot agree to live in peace, I must then invite the Big Brother to a duel with me. I know that he can twist me round his thick fingers and dash me to pieces. That day Hinduism will be free. Or, if he lets me kill him in spite of the strength of a giant, Islam in India will be free. He will have atoned for all the bullying by the average Musalman.[8]

If each party would learn to defend itself against encroachment upon its liberty by the other, we would be well on the road to Swaraj. It would be a fine training in self-defence and self-respect, or which is the same thing, Swaraj. There are two ways of defence. The best and the most effective is not to defend at all, but to remain at one's post risking every danger. The next best but equally honourable method is to strike bravely in self-defence and put one's life in the most dangerous position. A few pitched battles between the two will soon teach them the uselessness of breaking

one another's heads. It will teach them that to fight thus is not to serve God but to serve Satan.[9]

I have not liked this constant reference to the Government by both the parties on matters, which they, by mutual settlement or appeal to the sword, can adjust. I, therefore, told the audience, that since neither party was prepared to compromise and each was afraid of the other, the best way would be, without seeking the intervention of the Government to settle the matters in dispute by the method of the lathi.[10]

No cowardice

Retreat out of fear is cowardice and cowardice will not hasten a setdement or the advent of non-violence. Cowardice is a species of violence which it is the most difficult to overcome. One can hope to persuade a violently inclined person to shed his violence and take up the superior force of non-violence, but since cowardice is a negation of all force, it is impossible to teach a mouse non-violence in respect of a cat. It will simply not understand what non-violence can be, because it has not the capacity for violence against the cat. Will it not be a mockery to ask a blind man not to look at ugly things?

Maulana Shaukat Ali and I were at Bettia in 1921. The people of a village near Bettia told me that they had run away whilst the police were looting their houses and molesting their womenfolk. When they said that they had run away because I had told them to be non-violent, I hung my head in shame. I assured them that such was not the meaning of my non-violence. I expected them to intercept the mightiest power that might be in the act of harming those who were under their protection, and draw without retaliation all harm upon their own heads even to the point of death, but never to run away from the storm centre. It was manly enough to defend one's property, honour or religion at the point of the sword. It was manlier and nobler to defend them without seeking to injure the wrong-doer. But it was unmanly, unnatural and dishonourable to forsake the post of duty, and in order to save one’s skin, to leave property, honour or religion to the mercy of the wrongdoer. I could see my way of successfully delivering the message of Ahimsa to those who knew how to die, not to those who were afraid of death.[11]

Cowardice is impotence worse than violence. The coward desires revenge but being afraid to die, he looks to others, may be the Government of the day, to do the work of defence for him.

A coward is less than man. He does not deserve to be a member of a society of men and women.[12]

What I saw and heard showed me that people are apt to forget self-respect in order to save themselves. There is no Swadeshi and Swaraj for persons who will not sacrifice themselves or their belongings for their honour.[13]

Armed defence

The other way is the way the world has followed hither-to, i.e., armed defence of life and property. God helps only those who help themselves. The Sindhis are no exception. They must learn the art of defending themselves against robbers, raiders and the like. If they do not feel safe and are too weak to defend themselves, they should leave the place which has proved too inhospitable to live in.[14]

Let the weak ones never rely upon armed help. Such help will only make them weaker. If they have not the capacity for non-violent resistance, they should learn the art of defending themselves. It does not require a strong body; it requires a stout heart. The African Negroes have become, or were 25 years ago, so terror-stricken that they could not face a white lad—a pigmy compared to the giant-framed Negroes. White children were trained from their infancy not to fear the Negroes. The first lesson, therefore, for those who will learn how to defend themselves is to shed the fear of being hurt or being killed.[15]

Self-protection a duty

Self-defence can be violent or non-violent. I have always advised and insisted on non-violent defence. But I recognize that it has to be learnt like violent defence. It requires a different training from that which is required for violent defence. Therefore, if the capacity for non-violent self-defence is lacking, there need be no hesitation in using violent means.[16]

Every Indian, be he Hindu or any other, must learn the art of protecting himself. It is the condition of real democracy. The State has a duty. But no State can protect those who will not share with it the duty of protecting themselves.[17]

...I feel sure that no popularly elected Government can successfully cope with widespread *goondaism* as it is alleged to be in Noakhali. It is essentially a case of self-defence. Self-respect and honour cannot be protected by others. They are for each individual himself or herself to guard. Governments can at best punish offenders after the offence has been committed. They cannot assure prevention except in so far as punishment acts as a deterrent.[18]

Method of violent defence

I have said that for those who do not believe in non-violence armed defence is the only remedy. But if I am asked to advise how it can be done, I can only say, "I do not know."[19]

Rioters are mostly hooligans who do their nefarious deeds in the dark...Why should one be frightened of such people? One should rather brave death at their hands in the hope that the sacrifice will bring them to sanity. If one has not the requisite courage to face death, one must defend oneself by putting up a fight. The question may be asked as to how one should fight against those who stab you unawares from behind. It may not be possible to prevent such stabbing, but if the onlookers are not in collusion with the evil-doers and are not devoid of courage, they will catch hold of the culprit and hand him over to the police or to the community to which he belongs. Or they can bring him before the people's Panchayat. Only they may not take the law into their own hands.[20]

...This much is clear that, if the people are probably not ready for the exercise of non-violence of the brave, they must be ready for the use of force in self-defence. There should be no camouflage. Self-defence must be pure and simple. Then, too, it must never be cowardly or crude. It must, therefore, never be secret. Such is stabbing in the back and evading detection. I am conscious of the fact that we are a people unarmed and untrained in the use of arms. Opinions will differ as to whether it is good that we are in that position. There can be no denying the fact that no one needs training in the use of arms in self-defence. What is wanted for the purpose is strong arms and stronger will.[21]

If an individual or a group of people are unable or unwilling to follow this great law of life [death 'without retaliation, anger or malice, in self-defence or in defending

the honour of his womenfolk'], which is miscalled my lead, retaliation or resistance unto death is the second best, though a long way off from the first.[22]

Violence breeds violence

There are only two ways lying before the country: the course that the Punjab seems to have taken of returning blow for blow, and the other, of unadulterated non-violence. Some sort of peace may perhaps be established in the province by means of force. I shall hope, but it can never be said with confidence, that the evil will not spread throughout India, as it happened in the case of 1857. Similar things, as we know, had happened during the Sepoy War when it was quelled by means of superior arms. Outwardly, things quieted down but the hatred against an imposed rule went deep underground, with the result that we are even today reaping the harvest of what was then sown. The British Government took the place of the East India Company. They established schools and law courts and Indians took to these with enthusiasm; they even co-operated in the diffusion of Western culture; but, in spite of all this, they could never bear the insult or the degradation involved in political subjugation. Similarly, but in a worse manner, if the Punjab quietens down by reason of superior force used against the people of the Punjab, the seed of further quarrel and bitterness between brothers and sisters, that the Hindus and the Muslims are, will go still deeper. Violence, thus, can never be ended by counter-violence.[23]

Credit for violent defence

My Ahimsa forbids me from denying credit where it is due, even though the creditor is a believer in violence. Thus, though I did not accept Subhas Bose's belief in violence and his consequent action, I have not refrained from giving unstinted praise to his patriotism, resourcefulness and bravery.[24]

3 SELF-DEFENCE: THE NON-VIOLENT WAY

Active force

My creed of non-violence is an extremely active force. It has no room for cowardice or even weakness. There is hope for a violent man to be some day non-violent, but there is none for a coward. I have, therefore, said more than once in these pages that if we do not know how to defend ourselves, our women and our places of worship by the force of suffering, i.e., non-violence, we must, if we are men, be at least able to defend all these by fighting.[25]

Doing injury to another is obviously violence but harbouring injury to another and yet unwillingness from cowardice to defend oneself or one's neighbour is also violence and probably worse than the first.[26]

Satyagraha training

I believe that every man and woman should learn the art of self-defence in this age. This is done through arms in the West. Every adult man is conscripted for army training for a definite period. The training for Satyagraha is meant for all, irrespective of age or sex. The more important part of the training here is mental, not physical. There can be no compulsion in mental training. The surrounding atmosphere no doubt acts on the mind but that cannot justify compulsion.

It follows that shopkeepers, traders, mill-hands, labourers, farmers, clerks, in short, everyone ought to consider it his or her duty to get the necessary training in Satyagraha.[27]

Highest bravery

What I tell you I tell you for your own and the universal good. I have said that, if you cannot act non-violently, you should defend yourselves violently rather than be cowards. But the ability to die smiling at the hands of a brother without retaliation, physical or mental, is the highest bravery. In no case is it right to spoil for a fight. That is no self-defence. It is bad for you, bad for the country and utter disloyalty to your leaders. It is hindering you in your march towards Swaraj...If you behave in a disciplined manner, India will live. If you do not, then India will die and you will be unable to hold your heads high.[28]

True art of self-defence

Mankind has all along tried to justify violence and war in terms of unavoidable self-defence. It is a simple rule that the violence of the aggressor can only be defeated by superior violence of the defender. All over the world, men have thus been caught in a mad race for armaments, and no one yet knows at what point of time the world will be really safe enough for turning the sword into the plough. Mankind has not yet mastered the true art of self-defence.

But great teachers, who had practised what they preached, have successfully shown that true defence lies along the path of non-retaliation. It may sound paradoxical; but this is what I mean. Violence always thrives on counter-violence. The aggressor has always a purpose behind his attack; he wants something to be done, some object to be surrendered by the defender. Now, if the defender steels his heart and is determined not to surrender even one inch, and at the same time to resist the temptation of matching the violence of the aggressor by violence, the latter can be made to realize in a short while that it will not be paying to punish the other party and his will cannot be imposed in this way. This will involve suffering. It is this unalloyed self-suffering which is the truest form of self-defence which knows no surrender.

Someone may ask that, if through such non-resistance the defender is likely to lose his life, how can it be called self-defence? Jesus lost his life on the Cross and the Roman Pilate won. I do not agree. Jesus has won, as the world's history has abundantly shown. What does it matter if the body is dissolved in the process, so long as by the Christ's act of non-resistance, the forces of good are released in society?

This art of true self-defence by means of which man gains his life by losing it, has been mastered and exemplified in the history of individuals. The method has not been perfected for application by large masses of mankind. India's Satyagraha is a very imperfect experiment in this direction. Hence, during the Hindu-Muslim quarrel it proved a failure on the whole.[29]

4 USE OF THE MILITARY AND THE POLICE

Unmanly dependence

It is unmanly to ask or expect the Government to ensure the peace between rival parties or to defend our women against ourselves. And while we remain so unmanly, it is hopeless to expect Swaraj. In well-ordered societies, Governments merely undertake the police work.[30]

How I wish that both the Hindus and the Muslims would combine and dispense with the help of the police and the military for purposes of keeping them from mutual fight. I warn you that so long as you depend upon the help of the police and the military for maintaining law and order, real independence must remain mere idle talk.[31]

The alternative is that both must exhaust themselves; they must face police bullets. Some may be sent to jail and some mount the gallows before peace is restored. This is the wrong way. Fire put out in this fashion is bound to flare up again. This process does not reduce the poison.

Peace restored with the help of the police and its elder brother the military will strengthen the hold of the foreign Government and emasculate us still further.

There is a method about everything, even mutual fight. If we must fight, why should we seek the help of the police and the military? The Government should clearly say that the military, whilst it is in India, will only be used for maintaining cleanliness, cultivating unused land and the like. The police will be used to catch *bona fide* thieves. Neither will be used to put down communal riots.[32]

...The thirteen months' stay of the British power and British arms is really a hindrance rather than a help, because everybody looks for help to the great military machine they have brought into being. That happened in Bengal, in Bihar, in the Punjab, and in the North-West Frontier Province. The Hindus and the Muslims said in turn: 'Let us have the British troops.' It is a humiliating spectacle. I have often said before, but it does not suffer in value through repetition, because, every time I repeat it, it gains force—the British will have to take the risk of leaving India to chaos or anarchy. This is so because there has been no Home Rule; it has been imposed on the people. And, when you voluntarily remove that rule there might be no rule in the initial stage. It

might have come about if we had gained victory by the force of arms. The communal feuds you see here are, in my opinion, partly due to the presence of the British. If the British were not here; we would still go through the fire no doubt, but that fire would purify us.[33]

Reliance on British arms

If British arms are kept here for internal peace and order, your interim Government would be reduced to a farce. The Congress cannot afford to impose its will on warring elements in India through the use of British arms. Nor can the Congress be expected to bend itself and adopt what it considers a wrong course because of the brutal exhibition recently witnessed in Bengal. Such submission would itself lead to an encouragement and repetition of such tragedies. The vindictive spirit on either side would go deeper, biding for an opportunity to exhibit itself more fiercely and more disgracefully when occasion occurs. And all this will be chiefly due to the continued presence in India of a foreign power strong and proud of its arms. I say this neither as a Hindu nor as a Muslim. I write only as an Indian. In so far as I am aware, the Congress claims to know both the Hindu and the Muslim mind more than you or any Britisher can do. Unless, therefore, you can wholly trust the Congress Government which you have announced, you should reconsider your decision, as I have already suggested.[34] As it was, a third party had to intervene in order to still mutual savagery. Neither the Muslims nor the Hindus concerned have gained by the intervention. Supposing that the Calcutta virus extends to the whole of India and British gunpowder keeps the two from stabbing one another, the British power or its substitute will be in possession of India for a long time to come. The length will be measured by the period required by the parties [for] coming to sanity. It will come either by an exhausting mutual fight, independent of the foreign element or by one party eschewing violence in spite of heaviest odds. Successful mutual strife is obviously impossible in the present state of general ignorance of the use of modern weapons and their inaccessibility.

No use of military

The new Ministers must resolve never to use British troops, no matter what their hue is, not even the police trained by them. They are not our enemies. But they have been hitherto used not to help the people but to keep them under the foreign yoke. They should now, as they can, be used for constructive purposes.[36]

The task before the Ministers is early realization of communal unity. That cannot be done by a Government notification. The Ministers will have to live for it and die for it. If I had my way, I shall declare that hereafter the military will not be used for the preservation of internal peace. Personally, I would like to see even the use of the police banned for this purpose. People must find other means to prevent the communities from flying at each other's throat. If the worst comes to the worst, they must have the guts to fight it out among themselves without external aid. I venture to say that so long as they need the help of British arms for their security, their slavery will continue.[36]

They must generate their own strength and not rely on anyone else. If they insist on being provided with military and police help, the Ministers should resign rather than comply with a request that will strangle independence at its very inception. Instead, they and their leaders should be willing to go into the fray themselves and lay down their lives for the sake of Hindu and Muslim honour.[37]

If we want lasting peace, it must come from the people's hearts. I have been proclaiming from the house-tops that no one can protect us except our own stout heart. No one can ever dishonour the brave.[38]

Implications against independence

If Congressmen fail to protect Musalmans where the Congress is in power, then what is the use of a Congress Premier? Similarly, if in a League Province the League Premier cannot afford protection to the Hindus, then why is the League Premier there at all? If either of them has to take the aid of the military in order to protect the Muslim or Hindu minority in their respective provinces, then it only means that none of them actually exercises any control over the general population when a moment of crisis comes. If that is so, it only means that both of us are inviting the British to retain their sovereignty over India. This is a matter over which each one of us should ponder deeply.[39]

5 THE WAY OF NON-RETALIATION

The choice

The Hindus as also the Musalmans, whenever one of them goes mad, have two courses left open. Either to die valiantly without retaliation, that will at once arrest the progress of mischief; or to retaliate and live or die. For individuals both the courses will abide as long as the world lasts. All questionings arise because we have become helpless. We have forgotten the divine art of dying for our faiths without retaliation, and we have equally forgotten the art of using force in self-defence at the peril of our lives.[40]

Rules of fight

Where the Hindus are unequal to this soul-force, it is open to them to resort to force in self-defence. Where death without resistance or death after resistance is the only way, neither party should think of resorting to law courts or help from the Government. Even if one of the parties resorts to such aid, the other should refrain. If resort to law courts cannot be avoided, there ought to be at least no resort to false evidence.

It is the rule of honourable combat that, after having heartily given and taken blows, both the parties quiet down, and seek no reinforcement from outside. There should be no bitterness or feeling of revenge left behind.

A quarrel should in no case be carried from one street to another. The fair sex, the aged and the infirm, children and all non-combatants ought to be free from molestation. Fighting would be regarded as sportsman-like if these rules are observed.[41]

The secret stabbings of innocent persons and the speeches I read in the papers are hardly the thing leading to peace or an honourable settlement.[42]

It behoves man to act decently, irrespective of what the other party might or might not do. If one returns decency for decency, it is a bargain. Even thieves and dacoits do that. There is no merit in it. Humanity disdains to calculate profits and losses. It enjoins on one a unilateral obligation to put up decent behaviour.

If all the Hindus listened to my advice, or, in the alternative, the Musalmans listened to me, there would be peace in India which neither daggers nor lathis would be able

to shatter. The mischief-maker will soon be weary of the sorry business of stabbing, when there is no retaliation or counter provocation. An Unseen Power will arrest his uplifted arm and it will refuse to obey his wicked will. You may throw dust at the sun, it won't dim his lustre. All it needs is to hold one's soul in faith and patience. God is good and does not allow wickedness to proceed beyond a certain length.[43]

Dying without killing

If one side ceases to retaliate, the riots will not go on. What does it matter if even a few lakhs are killed in the right manner out of the 40 crores of India? If we can learn the lesson of dying without killing, India, which is celebrated in legend and history as *Karmabhoomi*—the land of duty—will become a virtual Eden—the image of the Kingdom of Heaven on earth.[44]

The Hindus and Musalmans should both cease to rely on the use of the knife and the stick for their protection and make suffering without retaliation their shield, and they will be safe.[45]

No revenge

Retaliation is a vicious circle. If you want retaliation you cannot have Independence. Supposing someone kills me, you will gain nothing by killing someone else in retaliation. And, if you only think over it, who can kill Gandhi except Gandhi himself? No one can destroy the soul. So let us dismiss all thought of revenge from our hearts. If we see this clearly we shall have taken a big stride towards Independence.[46]

Revenge is not the way of peace, it is not humanity. The Hindu scriptures teach forgiveness as the highest virtue. Forgiveness becomes a brave man. A learned Muslim friend came to see me yesterday. He told me that the teaching of the Koran is also similar. If a man kills one innocent person, he brings upon his head the sin, as it were, of murdering the entire humanity. Islam never approves of but condemns murder, arson, forcible conversions, abductions and the like...

It is contended that the Mahabharata advocates the way of retaliation. I do not agree with this interpretation. The lesson of the Mahabharata is that the victory of the sword is no victory. That great book teaches that victory of the Pandavas was an empty nothing.[47]

The noble way

To retaliate against the relatives of the co-religionists of the wrongdoer is a cowardly act. If you indulge in such acts, you should say goodbye to Independence.[48]

If you wish to take revenge you should learn the art from me: I also take revenge, but it is of a different type. I had read a Gujarati poem in my childhood which said: If to him who gives you a glass of water, you give two, there is no merit in it. Real merit lies in doing good to him who does you evil. This I consider noble revenge.[49]

Pause and think where you are drifting. I beg of the Hindus not to harbour anger in their hearts against the Muslims even if the latter want to destroy them. None should fear death. Death is inevitable for every human being. But if we died smiling, we will enter into a new life. We will create a new Hindustan.[50]

Muslims are your brothers. If anyone sinks to the level of the beast, it does not follow that all should do likewise. The Muslims cannot go on killing you. No one can live on killing. If a Muslim kills me, what will he gain so long as I remain without any hatred in my heart? Love alone can win over hatred.[51]

Non-violent resistance

I hope that even if we have not learnt the lesson of Ahimsa during the last 30 years, we have at any rate learnt not to live as slaves of anyone-not only of the British. If we have, what need of armies anywhere? This is the lesson I am trying to teach the Hindus in Noakhali and the Muslims in Bihar. If we have the personal courage, I will not mind if we resist oppression even violently. Naturally, I will always plead for non-violent resistance because the latter means that God is our sole protector. Violent resistance invariably means the aid of the sword which is at best a poor weapon of defence.[52]

The sufferers I would advise bravely to face the future and never to give way to panic. Such disturbances do happen in the lifetime of a people. Manliness demands there should be no weakness shown in facing them. Weakness aggravates the mischief, courage abates it.[53]

Lesson of religion

It is an unfortunate fact that India has been divided into two parts. If one part went mad and did ugly deeds, is the other part to follow suit? There is no gain in returning evil for evil. Religion teaches us to return good for evil. [54]

The uneven battle between the mighty Ravana and the exile Rama was won by the latter by strict adherence to Dharma. If both sides indulge in lawlessness, who can point the finger against the other? The question of degree, or who started it, cannot justify their behaviour.

You are brave men. You had stood up against the mighty British Empire. Why have you become weak today? The brave fear none but God.[55]

No imitation of wrong-doing

I must not be asked to recount the evil deeds of Pakistan. The recounting won't help either the Hindu or the Sikh sufferers. Pakistan has to bear the burden of its sins, which I know are terrible enough. It should be enough for everybody to know my opinion (in so far as it has any value) that the beginning was made by the Muslim League long before the 15th of August.

Nor am I able to say that they turned over a new leaf on the 15th of August last...What is of moment is that we of the Union copied the sins and thus became fellow sinners. Odds became even. Shall we now awake from the trance, repent and change or must we fall?[56]

'It was Pakistan that had started the mischief. The Hindus and the Sikhs had merely retaliated. Even if they stopped retaliating, Pakistan was not going to mend its ways. The property left behind by the Hindus and the Sikhs was lost by them for good.' I do not agree with this view.[57]

Anger at such events [one hundred and thirty innocent Hindus and Sikhs having been killed at the Parachinar refugee camp in Peshawar by raiders from tribal areas] will be understandable but nevertheless wrong. I have warned the congregation at the fair that, if there is any secret wish for retaliation, it will be a breach of the solemn pact entered into in their name. It is up to the Dominion Governments to take appropriate action in such matters, but so far as the public is concerned, they should remain unmoved.[58]

6 NON-VIOLENCE OF THE BRAVE

My Non-violence does not admit of running away from danger and leaving dear ones unprotected. Between violence and cowardly flight, I can only prefer violence to cowardice. I can no more preach non-violence to a coward than I can tempt a blind man to enjoy healthy scenes. Non-violence is the summit of bravery. And in my own experience, I have had no difficulty in demonstrating to men trained in the school of violence the superiority of non-violence. As a coward, which I was for years, I harboured violence. I began to prize non-violence only when I began to shed cowardice.

Death at one's post

Those Hindus who ran away from the post of duty when it was attended with danger did so, not because they were non-violent, or because they were afraid to strike, but because they were unwilling to die or even suffer any injury. A rabbit that runs away from the bull terrier is not particularly non-violent. The poor thing trembles at the sight of the terrier and runs for very life. Those Hindus who ran away to save their lives would have been truly non-violent and would have covered themselves with glory and added lustre to their faith and won the friendship of their Musalman assailants, if they had stood bare breast with smiles on their lips, and died at their post. They would have done less well though still well, if they had stood at their post and returned blow for blow.[59]

The braver way

Ahimsa is not the way of the timid or the cowardly. It is the way of the brave ready to face death. He who perishes sword in hand is no doubt brave, but he who faces death without raising his little finger and without flinching is braver.[60]

In the meantime those who want will fight, in spite of whatever I might say. Nor do they need any prompting from me. This I have said repeatedly: I do not want any cowardice in our midst. The heroism of Ahimsa cannot be developed from cowardice. Bravery is essential to both Himsa and Ahimsa. In fact, it is even more essential in the latter, for Ahimsa is nothing if it is not the acme of bravery.[61]

Out of strength, not weakness

I...ask you and myself whether our non-violence is of the weak instead of the strong as it should be. That it can work to a certain extent in the hands of the weak is true. It has so worked with us. But when it becomes a cloak for our weakness, it emasculates us. Far better than emasculation would be the bravery of those who use physical force. Far better than cowardice would be meeting one's death fighting.

We were perhaps all originally brutes, and I am prepared to believe we have become men by a slow process of evolution from the brute. We were thus born with brute strength, but we were born men in order to realize God who dwells in us. That indeed is the privilege of man, and it distinguishes him from the brute creation. But to realize God is to see Him in all that lives, i.e., to realize our oneness with all creation. This is impossible unless we voluntarily shun physical force and develop conscious non-violence that is latent in every one of us. This can only come out of strength. Have we the non-violence of the strong? It is open to discard it as an impossible ideal and choose instead the method of violence. But the choice has to be made.[62]

I hold that for the full play of non-violence, only one party need believe in it. Indeed, if both believe in it and live up to it, there is no appreciation or demonstration of it.

Armed peace

To live at peace with one another is the most natural thing to do. But neither party gains the merit that the exercise of non-violence carries with it. Unfortunately, at the present moment, those Hindus who do not know the use of violence, though they have it in their hearts, are sorry for their incapacity and would fain learn the trick—I won't call it the art—of violence, so as to be able to match what they describe as Muslim violence. And if peace is to be brought about by both parties being equally matched in the use of violence both offensive and defensive, I know that that peace will not come in my lifetime and, if it came, I should not care to be a witness of it. It will be an armed peace to be broken at any moment. Such has been the peace in Europe. Is not the present war enough to make one sick of such peace? [63]

As I have been repeatedly saying nowadays, our non-violence has not been of the strong. Weak people cannot develop it all of a sudden. But I have no other drug in my [medicine] chest. I can only prescribe what I have and what has never failed. I can

only, therefore, say: 'Try and try again until you succeed.' In the composition of the truly brave there should be no malice, no anger, no distrust, no fear of death or physical hurt. Non-violence is certainly not for those who lack these essential qualities. Wherever there are such persons, they should be able to cover the weak ones, provided, of course, that they would listen to their helpers.[64]

Art of dying

The art of dying follows as a corollary from the art of living. Death must come to all. A man may die of a lightning stroke or as a result of heart failure or failure of respiration. But that is not the death that a Satyagrahi can wish for or pray for himself. The art of dying for a Satyagrahai consists in facing death cheerfully in the performance of one's duty... It is not enough not to want to hurt or take the life of your enemy. You are no Satyagrahis if you remain silent or passive spectators while your enemy is being done to death. You must protect him even at the cost of your life. If thousands in India learnt that art, the face of India would be changed and no one would be able to point his finger of scorn at her non-violence as being a cloak for weakness.[65]

"हरिनो मारग छे शूरानो नहीं कायरनूं काम जोने" |

"The path of Truth is for the brave, never for the coward." The path of Truth is the path of non-violence.[66]

Inner strength

The chief of the elephants had gone for a drink to the river when he was caught hold of by an alligator. A furious struggle ensued, but in spite of his strength, the elephant was dragged into deeper waters. When he was on the point of being drowned, the elephant realized that his huge strength was of no avail, and he prayed to God for succour. God, the help of the helpless, came to his rescue and saved him from the jaws of death.

The moral is obvious. The strength of the strong without God's help has been often found to be useless. Therefore, I advise dependence not on outside sources but upon the inner strength which comes to all who sincerely seek it from God. This is the lesson which the people in Noakhali sorely need to learn.[67]

The only effective alternative to it [counter-violence] is the way of non-violence. Bihar has had a lesson of it in Champaran in 1917, but I can perhaps say at this distance of time that, although the farmers who were responsible for the movement were soon disciplined to stay their hands while non-co-operating with the English planters, their non-violence was the non-violence of the weak. Now that Indians are fighting violently as between brother and brother, such non-violence can be of no avail, only non-violence of the strong can prove really effective.[68]

Ahimsa on the test

How I wish the Hindus were influenced by my teaching of Ahimsa which is a force mightier than the force of arms however powerful. No teacher can be held responsible for a caricature of his teachings. Do we not know how geometrical propositions are caricatured by indifferent pupils? Are the teachers to be blamed? The utmost that can be said against me is that I am an incompetent teacher of Ahimsa. If such be the case, let us pray that my successor will be much more competent and successful.[69]

My groping in the dark refers to the fact that I did not know how to make the people see my view-point. I have no doubt that non-violence is as effective a weapon against communal strife as it has proved in our struggle against the British. The people had followed me then because they knew they could not face the might of British arms in any other way. It was the non-violence of the weak. That won't serve the purpose in communal strife. For that is required pure non-violence of the brave.[70]

I have admitted my mistake. I thought our struggle was based on non-violence, whereas in reality it was no more than passive resistance which essentially is a weapon of the weak. It leads naturally to armed resistance whenever possible...Intoxicated with my success in South Africa, I came to India. Here, too, the struggle bore fruit. But I now realize that it was not based on non-violence. If I had known so then, I would not have launched the struggle. But God wanted to take that work from me. So He blurred my vision. It is because our struggle is not non-violent that we today witness loot, arson and murder.[71]

We are daily paying the heavy price for the unconscious mistake we made, or better still, I made, in mistaking passive resistance for non-violent resistance. Had I not made the mistake, we would have been spared the humiliating spectacle of weak brother killing his weak brother thoughtlessly and inhumanly.[72]

Undying faith

"Hope for the future" I have never lost and never will, because it is embedded in my undying faith in non-violence. What has, however, clearly 'happened in my case is the discovery that in all probability there is a vital defect in my technique of the working of non-violence. There was real appreciation of non-violence in the thirty years' struggle against British Raj. Therefore, the peace the masses maintained during that struggle of a generation with exemplary patience had not come from within. The pent-up fury found an outlet when British Raj was gone. It naturally vented itself in communal violence which was never fully absent and which was kept under suppression by the British bayonet. This explanation seems to me to be all-sufficing and convincing. In it there is no room for failure of any hope...

His failure

Failure of my technique of non-violence causes no loss of faith in non-violence itself. On the contrary, that faith is, if possible, strengthened by the discovery of possible flaw in the technique.[73]

Whatever I have said does not refer in any way to the failure of Ahimsa, but it refers to my failure to recognize, until it was too late, that what I had mistaken for Ahimsa was not Ahimsa, but passive resistance of the weak, which can never be called Ahimsa even in the remotest sense.

I must not, therefore, flatter myself with the belief—nor allow friends ...to entertain the belief—that I have exhibited any heroic and demonstrable non-violence in myself. All I can claim is that I am sailing in that direction without a moment's stop. This confession should strengthen your belief in non-violence and spur you and friends like you to action along the path.[74]

In the course of a long letter which Reverend Dr. John Haynes Holmes has written to me before leaving the hospitable shores of India, he writes:

> Of course you have been sad, well nigh overborne, by the tragedies of recent months, but you must never feel that this involves any breakdown of your life work. Human nature cannot bear too much—it cracks under too great a strain—and the strain in this case was as terrific as it was sudden. But your teaching remained as true and your leadership as sound as ever. Single handed you saved the situation, and brought victory out of what

> seemed for the moment to be defeat. I count these last few months to be the crown and climax of your unparalleled career. You were never so great as in these dark hours.

I wonder if the claim can be proved. That much more than Dr. Holmes observed can be proved of Ahimsa, I have not the slightest doubt. My difficulty is fundamental. Have I attained the requisite qualifications for exhibiting the virtues of Ahimsa, even as Dr. Holmes has said? Knowing as I do the working of Ahimsa, however imperfectly, I see every reason for the utmost caution in advancing claims that cannot be proved beyond doubt.[75]

7 MARTYRDOM DURING RIOTS

Death for a cause

...Violence, whether secret or open, is the very reverse of Satyagraha. Absolute calmness and a firm resolve allied to a just cause always ensure victory. To die for a cause is the law of man, to kill is that of the beast.[76]

If the Hindus wish to convert the Musalman bully into a respecting friend, they have to learn to die in the face of the heaviest odds.[77]

Death is at any time blessed, but it is twice blessed for a warrior who dies for his cause, i.e., truth. Death is no fiend, he is the truest of friends. He delivers us from agony. He helps us against ourselves. He ever gives us new chances, new hopes. He is like sleep, a sweet restorer. Yet it is customary to mourn when a friend dies. The custom has no operation when the death is that of a martyr.[78]

Every brave man welcomes such a death whenever it comes to him. He greets it as a friend. But let no one, therefore, invite or hanker after such a death: let no one desire that some one else should be in the wrong and err against God and man, so that he might become a martyr. It is wrong to wish any one to go astray. Let us all be brave enough to die the death of a martyr, but let no one lust for martyrdom.[79]

I know that mine is today a voice in the wilderness and yet I claim that mine is the only practicable solution...It would be a present possibility if Hindus in their lakhs offered themselves to be cut to pieces without retaliation or anger in their hearts. Non-violence is today rightly laughed out of court as Utopian. Nevertheless, I maintain that it is the only way to keep Hinduism alive and India undivided. The history of the Congress non-violence for the last twenty-five years has taught us nothing, if it has not taught us that.[80]

20,000 able-bodied men prepared to die like brave men non-violently might today be regarded as a fairy tale. But it would be no fairy tale for every able-bodied man in a population of 20,000 to die like stalwart soldiers to a man in open fight. They will go down in history like the immortal five hundred of Leonidas who made Thermopylae.

Stranger! Tell Sparta, here her sons are laid,
Such was her law and we that law obeyed.

...Even if there is one Hindu in East Bengal, I want him to have the courage to go and live in the midst of the Musalmans and die if he must like a hero. He should refuse to live as a serf and a slave. He may not have the non-violent strength to die without fighting. But he can command their admiration if he has the courage not to submit to wrong and die fighting like a man.[81]

By learning to die bravely ['we create a sense of security and self-confidence']. Let us turn our wrath against ourselves.[82]

When it is a question of choice between killing oneself or the assailant, I have no doubt in my mind that the first should be the choice.[83]

Work will endure

If I am pure and mean what I say, my work is bound to survive my death. I believe that there must be perfect correspondence between private and public conduct. Similarly, if my associates are actuated purely by the spirit of service and are pure within and without and are not dominated by the glamour that surrounds me, they will work on with unabated zeal; their joint work will flourish with time. I have never subscribed to the superstition that any good work dies with the worker's death. On the contrary, all true and solid work makes the worker immortal by the survival of his work after his death.[84]

Amidst this mad upheaval there are men, like oasis in a desert, who risk the wrath of the violent mobs and save many Muslim lives and Muslim property. These people deserve congratulations, though they do not need any. If I do not go to them, it does not mean that I have not recognized their work. But I am in the nature of a doctor who goes not to the [one's that are] well but to the suffering.[85]

Go in the midst of the rioters and prevent them from indulging in madness or get killed in the attempt. But do not come back alive to report failure. The situation calls for sacrifice on the part of top rankers. So far the unknown, nameless rank and file alone have been the victims of the holocaust with the one exception of the late Ganesh Shankar Vidyarthi. That is not enough.[86]

Sufferings of the innocent

Have not persons belonging to the same faith, fought against one another exactly as the Hindus and the Muslims are doing now? What was to be expected of ordinary

human beings after uninterrupted preaching of the hymn of hate all these long years? If the correspondent will justify his nationalism, he must not deny himself at the crucial moment. We must avoid imitation of Judas Iscariot. Hence, I have no hesitation in advising the correspondent to return to his home in Jullunder even if he is to be cut to pieces by his erstwhile friends. Such martyrs will be saviours of Hindu-Muslim unity. If he proves as good as his word, I prophesy that his parents will receive him with open arms. Is it not the lot of us mortals that the innocent suffer for the guilty? It is as well that they do. The world is the richer and better for the sufferings of the innocent. I need not be an "apostle of liberty and equality" to, reiterate this plain truth.[87]

8 PEACE BRIGADES

Pledge

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

Do you think this is an empty dream? Do you think we cannot quell the riots even with such a non-violent army? If you really think so, if that is the conclusion that you arrived at after calm and dispassionate thinking, you must also conclude that Swaraj cannot be attained by means of non-violence.[88]

Qualifications

Let us, therefore, see what qualifications a member of the contemplated Peace Brigade should posses.

Some time ago I suggested the formation of a Peace Brigade whose members would risk their lives in dealing with riots, especially communal. The idea was that this Brigade should substitute the police and even the military. This reads ambitious. The achievement may prove impossible. Yet, if the Congress is to succeed in its non-violent struggle, it must develop the power to deal peacefully with such situations. Communal riots are engineered by politically minded men. Many of those who take part in them are under the influence of the latter. Surely it should not be beyond the wit of Congressmen to devise a method or methods of avoiding ugly communal situations by peaceful means. I say this irrespective of whether there is or there is not a communal pact.

(1) He or she must have a living faith in non-violence. This is impossible without a living faith in God. A non-violent man do nothing save by the power and grace of

God. Without it he won't have the courage to die without anger, without fear and without retaliation. Such courage comes from the belief that God sits in the hearts of all and that there should be no fear in the presence of God. The knowledge of the omnipresence of God also means respect for the lives of even those who may be called opponents or *goondas*. This contemplated intervention is a process of stilling the fury of man when the brute in him gets the mastery over him.

(2) This messenger of peace must have equal regard for all the principal religions of the earth. Thus, if he is a Hindu, he will respect the other faiths current in India. He must therefore possess a knowledge of the general principles of the different faiths professed in the country.

(3) Generally speaking, this work of peace can only be done by local men in their own localities.

(4) The work can be done singly or in groups. Therefore, no one need wait for companions. Nevertheless, one would naturally seek companions in one's own locality and form a local brigade.

(5) This messenger of peace will cultivate through personal service contacts with the people in his locality or chosen circle, so that when he appears to deal with ugly situations, he does not descend upon the members of a riotous assembly as an utter stranger liable to be looked upon as a suspect or an unwelcome visitor.

(6) Needless to say, a peace-bringer must have a character beyond reproach and must be known for his strict impartiality.

(7) Generally, there are previous warnings of coming storms. If these are known, the Peace Brigade will not wait till the conflagration breaks out but will try to handle the situation in anticipation.

(8) Whilst, if the movement spreads, it might be well if there are some wholetime workers, it is not absolutely necessary that there should be. The idea is to have as many good and true men and women as possible. These can be had only if the volunteers are drawn from those who are engaged in various walks of life, but have leisure enough to cultivate friendly relations with the people living in their

circle and otherwise possess the qualifications required of a member of the Peace Brigade.

(9) There should be a distinctive dress worn by the members of the contemplated Brigade so that, in course of time, they will be recognized without the slightest difficulty.

These are but general suggestions. Each centre can work out its own constitution on the basis here suggested.[89]

Great possibilities

To quell riots non-violently, there must be true Ahimsa in one's heart, and Ahimsa that takes even the erring hooligan in its warm embrace. Such an attitude cannot be adopted. It can only come as a prolonged and patient effort which must be made during peaceful times.

The would-be member of a Peace Brigade should come into close touch and cultivate acquaintance with the so-called *goonda* element in his vicinity. He should know all and be known to all and win the hearts of all by his living and selfless service. No section should be regarded as too contemptible or mean to mix with.[90]

Lest false hopes may be raised, I must warn workers against entertaining the hope that I can play any active part in the formation of a Peace Brigade. I have not the health, energy or time for it. I find it hard enough to cope with the tasks I dare not shirk. I can only guide and make suggestions through correspondence or these columns. Therefore, let those who appreciate the idea and feel they have the ability, take the initiative themselves. I know that the proposed Brigade has great possibilities and that the idea behind it is quite capable of being worked out in practice.[91]

9 DUTY OF A SATYAGRAHI

Civil Resistance

No civil resister will intentionally become a cause of communal quarrels.

In the event of any such outbreak, he will not take sides, but he will assist only that party which is demonstrably in the right. Being a Hindu he will be generous towards Musalmans and others, and will sacrifice himself in the attempt to save non-Hindus from a Hindu attack. And if the attack is from the other side, he will not participate in any retaliation but will give his life in protecting Hindus.

He will, to the best of his ability, avoid every occasion that may give rise to communal quarrels.

If there is a procession of Satyagrahis, they will do nothing that would wound the religious susceptibilities of any community, and they will not take part in any other processions that are likely to wound such susceptibilities.[92]

Satyagraha brigades

A friend has gently posed the question as to what a Satyagrahi should do to prevent looting by *goondas*. If he had understood the secret of Satyagraha, he would not have put it.

To lay down one's life, even alone, for what one considers to be right is the very core of Satyagraha. More no man can do. If a man is armed with a sword, he might lop off a few heads but ultimately he must surrender to superior force or else die fighting. The sword of the Satyagrahi is love and the unshakable firmness that comes from it. He will regard as brothers the hundreds of *goondas* that confront him and, instead of trying to kill them, he will choose to die at their hands and thereby live. This is straight and simple. But how can a solitary Satyagrahi succeed in the midst of a huge population? Hundreds of hooligans were let loose on the city of Bombay for arson and loot. A solitary Satyagrahi will be like a drop in the ocean. Thus argues the correspondent.

My reply is that a Satyagrahi may never run away from danger, irrespective of whether he is alone or in the company of many. He will have fully performed his duty if he dies fighting. The same holds good in armed warfare. It applies with greater force in Satyagraha. Moreover, the sacrifice of one will evoke the sacrifice of many and may

possibly produce big results. There is always this possibility. But one must scrupulously avoid the temptation of a desire for results...

Satyagraha Brigades can be organized in every village and in every block of buildings in the cities. Each Brigade should be composed of those persons who are well known to the organizers. In this respect Satyagraha differs from armed defence. For the latter the State impresses the service of everybody. For a Satyagraha Brigade only those are eligible who believe in Ahimsa and Satya. Therefore, an intimate knowledge of the persons enlisted is necessary for the organizers.[93]

X. Partition and Pakistan

1 THE RELIGIOUS BASIS OF PARTITION

What about the religious and the moral [aspects of the partition proposal] which are greater than the political? For, at the bottom of the cry for partition is the belief that Islam is an exclusive brotherhood, and anti-Hindu. Whether it is against other religions it is not stated…

Evolution of Islam

Time was when Hindus thought that Muslims were the natural enemies of Hindus. But, as is the case with Hinduism, ultimately it comes to terms with the enemy and makes friends with it. The process had not been completed. As if nemesis had overtaken Hinduism, the Muslim League started the same game and taught that there could be no blending of the two cultures. In this connection, I have just read a booklet by Shri Atulanand Chakrabarti which shows that, ever since the contact of Islam with Hinduism, there has been an attempt on the part of the best minds of both to see the good points of each other, and to emphasize inherent similarities rather than seeming dissimilarities. The author has shown Islamic history in a favourable light. If he has stated the truth and nothing but the truth, it is a revealing booklet which all Hindus and Muslims may read with profit. He has secured a very favourable and reasoned preface from Sir Shafaat Ahmed Khan and several other Muslim testimonials. If the evidence collected there reflects the true evolution of Islam in India, then the partition propaganda is anti-Islamic.

Not anti-Hinduism

Religion binds man to God and man to man. Does Islam bind Muslim only to Muslim and antagonize the Hindu? Was the message of the Prophet peace only for and between Muslims and war against Hindus or non-Muslims? Are eight crores of Muslims to be fed with this which I can only describe as poison? Those who are instilling this poison into the Muslim mind are rendering the greatest disservice to Islam. I know that it is not Islam. I have lived with and among Muslims not for one day but closely and almost uninterruptedly for twenty years. Not one Muslim taught me that Islam was an anti-Hindu religion.[1]

I wonder and am hurt when the Quaid-i-Azam and his disciples call Hindus their enemies. I am not a Muslim, but I claim that Islam does not teach enmity to any man. If I am, as I believe, a true Hindu I am equally a good Christian and a good Sikh and a good Jain. No religion teaches man to kill fellow man because he holds different opinions or is of another religion, and yet this is what is being done. No one can look upon another as his enemy unless he first becomes his own enemy...[2]

For peace

Does the Muslim League imagine they are going to keep Islam alive through the sword? If so, they are much mistaken. The very word Islam means peace. And I maintain that no religion worthy of the name can exist except on terms of peace.[3]

I would have no hesitation in conceding the demand of Pakistan if I could be convinced of its righteousness or that it is good for Islam. But I am firmly convinced that the Pakistan demand as put forth by the Muslim League is un-Islamic and I have not hesitated to call it sinful.

Islam stands for the unity and brotherhood of mankind, not for disrupting the oneness of the human family. Therefore, those who want to divide India into possibly warring groups are enemies alike of India and Islam. They may cut me to pieces but they cannot make me subscribe to something which I consider to be wrong.[4]

2 THE 'TWO-NATION' THEORY

Way of strife

Why is India not one nation? Was it not one during, say, the Moghul period? Is India composed of two nations? If it is, why only two? Are not Christians a third, Parsis a fourth, and so on? Are the Muslims of China a nation separate from the other Chinese? Are the Muslims of England a different nation from the other English? How are the Muslims of the Punjab different from the Hindus and the Sikhs? Are they not all Punjabis, drinking the same water, breathing the same air and deriving sustenance from the same soil? What is there to prevent them from following their respective religious practices? Are Muslims all the world over a separate nation? Or are the Muslims of India only to be a separate nation distinct from the others? Is India be vivisected into two parts, one Muslim and the other non-Muslim? And what is to happen to the handful of Muslims living in the numerous villages where the population is predominantly Hindu, and, conversely, to the Hindus where, as in the Frontier Province or Sind, they are a handful? The way suggested is the way of strife. Live and let live or mutual forbearance and toleration is the law of life. That is the lesson I have learnt from the Koran, the Bible, the Zend Avesta and the Gita.[5]

Religion not basis of nationhood

There may be arguable grounds for maintaining that Muslims in India are a separate nation. But I have never heard it said that there are as many nations as there are religions on earth. If there are, it would follow that a man changes his nationality when he changes his faith. According to my correspondent, English, Egyptians, Americans, Japanese, etc., are not nations, but Muslims, Parsis, Sikhs, Hindus, Christians, Jews, Buddhists are different nations, no matter where born. I am afraid my correspondent occupies very weak ground in maintaining that nations are or should be divided according to their religions. In his zeal to maintain an untenable position, he has overproved his case.

I must deny that the Muslim dynasties divided India into two nations. Akbar's example is irrelevant. He aimed at a fusion of religions. It was a dream not to be realized. But the other Muslim emperors and kings surely regarded India as one indivisible whole. That is how I learnt history as a boy.[6]

Quaid-i-Azam Jinnah's reply to me, as published in the Press, however, dashes to the ground all hope of unity if he represents the Muslim mind. His repudiation of the natural meaning I put upon his action in making common cause with the different political groups has created a unique situation. His picture of India as a continent containing nations counted according to their religions, if it is realized, would undo the effort the Congress has been making for over half a century. But I hope that Quaid-i-Azam Jinnah's opinion is a temporary phase in the history of the Muslim League. Muslims of the different provinces can never cut themselves away from their Hindu or Christian brethren. Both Muslims and Christians are converts from Hinduism or are descendants of converts. They do not cease to belong to their provinces because of change of faith. Englishmen who become converts to Islam do not change their nationality. I hope Quaid-i-Azam Jinnah does not represent the considered opinion even of his colleagues.[7]

If the vast majority of Indian Muslims feel that they are not one nation with their Hindu and other brethren, who will be able to resist them? But, surely it is permissible, to dispute the authority of the 50,000 Muslims who listened to Quaid-i-Azam to represent the feelings of eight crores of Indian Muslims.[8]

Theory an untruth

The 'two-nation' theory is an untruth. The vast majority of Muslims of India are converts to Islam or are descendants of converts. They did not become a separate nation as soon as they became converts. A Bengali Muslim speaks the same tongue that a Bengali Hindu does, eats the same food, has the same amusements as his Hindu neighbour. They dress alike. I have often found it difficult to distinguish by outward sign between a Bengali Hindu and a Bengali Muslim. The same phenomenon is observable more or less in the South among the poor, who constitute the masses of India. When I first met the late Sir Ali Imam, I did not know that he was not a Hindu. His speech, his dress, his manners, his food were the same as of the majority of the Hindus in whose midst I found him. His name alone betrayed him. Not even that with Quaid-i-Azam Jinnah. For, his name could be that of any Hindu. When I first met him, I did not know that he was a Muslim. I came to know his religion when I had his full name given to me. His Indian nationality was written in his face and manner. The reader will be surprised to know that for days, if not months, I used to think of the

late Vithalbhai Patel as a Muslim as he used to sport a beard and a Turkish cap. The Hindu law of inheritance governs many Muslim groups. Sir Mahomad Iqbal used to speak with pride of his Brahmanical descent. Iqbal and Kitchlew are names common to Hindus and Muslims. The Hindus and Muslims of India are not two nations. Those whom God has made one, man will never be able to divide.

And is Islam such an exclusive religion as Quaid-i-Azam would have it? Is there nothing in common between Islam and Hinduism or any other religion? Or, is Islam merely an enemy of Hinduism? Were the Ali Brothers and their associates wrong when they hugged Hindus as blood-brothers and saw so much in common between the two? I am not now thinking of individual Hindus who may have disillusioned the Muslim friends.

Quaid-i-Azam's thesis

Quaid-i-Azam has, however, raised a fundamental issue. This is his thesis:

> It is extremely difficult to appreciate why our Hindu friends fail to understand the real nature of Islam and Hinduism. They are not religions in the strict sense of the word, but are, in fact, different and distinct social orders, and it is a dream that the Hindus and the Muslims can ever evolve a common nationality. This misconception of one Indian nation has gone far beyond the limits and is the cause of most of our troubles and will lead India to destruction if we fail to revise our notions in time.
>
> The Hindus and Muslims have two different religious philosophies, social customs, literatures. They neither intermarry, nor interdine together, and indeed, they belong to two different civilizations which are based mainly on conflicting ideas and conceptions. Their aspects on life and of life are different. It is quite clear that the Hindus and Musalmans derive their inspiration from different sources of history. They have different epics, their heroes are different and they have different episodes. Very often the hero of one is a foe of the other and, likewise, their victories and defeats overlap. To yoke together two such nations under a single State, one as a numerical minority and the other as majority, must lead to growing discontent and final destruction of any fabric that may be so built up for the government of such a State.

He does not say some Hindus are bad; he says Hindus as such have nothing in common with Muslims. I make bold to say that he and those who think like him are rendering no service to Islam; they are misinterpreting the message inherent in the very word Islam. I say this because I feel deeply hurt over what is now going on in the name of the Muslim League.

I should be failing in my duty if I did not warn the Muslims of India against the untruth that is being propagated amongst them. This warning is a duty because I have faithfully served them in their hour of need and because Hindu-Muslim unity has been and is my life's mission.[9]

Settlement of issue

I refuse ... to believe that the eight crores of Muslims will say that they have nothing in common with their Hindu and other brethren. Their mind can only be known by a referendum duly made to them on that clear issue. The contemplated Constituent Assembly can easily decide the question. Naturally, on an issue, such as this there can be no arbitration. It is purely and simply a matter of self-determination. I know of no other conclusive method of ascertaining the mind, of the eight crores of Muslims. But the contemplated Constituent Assembly will have the framing of a constitution as its main function. It cannot do this until the communal question is settled.[10]

It makes no difference to me that some Muslims regard themselves as a separate nation. It is enough for me that I do not consider them as such. They are sons of the soil. Muslims considered separately have eight crores of unarmed Muslims scattered over India to look to.[11]

Claim pressed: 1946

Now we have fallen upon evil times. The hearts of Hindus and Musalmans are sundered. The air is poisoned with communal bitterness and rancour. A section of the Musalmans have begun to claim that they are a separate nation. Into the logic of this claim I shall not go at present. I confess that it baffles my understanding.[12]

I would have you remember that a Musalman does not become a non-Indian by changing his religion. It is a most fantastic claim. My son became a Muslim for a little time for purely sordid reasons. Did he lose his nationality? I am perhaps a better Musalman than many a Hindu convert to Islam. This whole idea is wrong *au fond*.[13]

The moment you begin to think in terms of Hindu and Muslim Raj, you fall into an error. That is a dangerous doctrine.[14]

Does the readjustment of the geography of India mean two nations? I admit that the division having been agreed upon, unity becomes somewhat difficult. But assuming that the Muslims of India look upon themselves as a nation distinct from the rest, they cannot become so if the non-Muslims do not respond. The Muslim majority areas may call themselves Pakistan but the rest and the largest part of India need not call itself Hindustan. In contradistinction to Pakistan it will mean the abode of the Hindus. Do the Hindus feel so? Have the Parsis, the Christians and the Jews born in India, and the Anglo-Indians who do not happen to have the white skin, any other home than India? I will omit the Muslims for the time being. I suppose such is the reason why Panditji refuses to call the non-Pakistan areas as Hindustan and loves to call them by the proud name of the Union of Indian Republics, from which some Muslim majority areas have seceded. History has shown that possession of proud names does not make the possessors great. Men and groups are known, not by what they call themselves, but by their deeds.[15]

I have always held that there is no distinction between the two [Hindus and Muslims]. Even though their observances differ, these do not separate them. They undoubtedly profess different religions, but they, like others, come from the same root. Nevertheless, I detect certain flaws in her [Raihanabehn Tyabji's] arguments.

We are not two nations. Those who believe the Hindus and the Muslims to be two nations harm both the communities and India. It should not matter that the Quaid-i-Azam believes the Hindus and the Muslims of India to be two nations or that there are Hindus too who entertain the same belief. Surely, it does not follow that because the whole world is in error, we, who believe otherwise, should follow it. This should never happen.[16]

3 THE DEMAND FOR PAKISTAN

British Refusal to make the required declaration of Britain's war aims about India has perhaps come as a blessing in disguise. It removes the Congress out of the way to enable the Muslim League to make its choice, unfettered by the Congress administration in eight provinces, as to whether it will keep the British yoke by vivisecting India or whether it will fight for the independence of in undivided India. I hope that the League does not want to vivisect India.[17]

But I do not believe that Muslims, when it comes to a matter of actual decision, will ever want vivisection. Their God sense will prevent them. Their self-interest will deter them. Their religion will forbid the obvious suicide which the partition would mean.[18]

His opposition

As a man of non-violence, I cannot forcibly resist the proposed partition if the Muslims of India really insist upon it. But I can never be a willing party to the vivisection. I would employ every non-violent means to prevent it. For, it means the undoing of centuries of work done by numberless Hindus and Muslims to live together as one nation. Partition means a patent untruth. My whole soul rebels against the idea that Hinduism and Islam represent two antagonistic cultures and doctrines. To assent to such a doctrine is for me denial of God. For, I believe with my whole soul that the God of the Koran is also the God of the Gita, and that we are all, no matter by what name designated, children of the same God. I must rebel against the idea that millions of Indians who were Hindus the other day changed their nationality on adopting Islam as their religion. But that is my belief. I cannot thrust it down the throats of the Muslims who think that they are a different nation.[19]

My life is made up of compromises, but they have been compromises that have brought me nearer the goal. Pakistan cannot be worse than foreign domination. I have lived under the latter though not willingly. If God so desires it, I may have to become a helpless witness to the undoing of my dream. But I do not believe that the Muslims really want to dismember India.[20]

What can be done under the threat of Pakistan? If it is not a threat but a desirable goal, why should it be prevented? If it is undesirable and meant only for the Muslims

to get more under its shadow, any solution would be an unjust solution. It would be worse than no solution. Therefore, I am entirely for waiting till the menace is gone.[21]

New phase

The partition proposal has altered the face of the Hindu-Muslim problem. I have called it an untruth. There can be no compromise with it. At the same time I have said that, if the eight crores of Muslims desire it, no power on earth can prevent it, notwithstanding opposition violent or non-violent. It cannot come by honourable agreement. That is the political aspect of it.[22]

Let them declare that they want to have their political salvation apart from that of the Hindus. India is a poor country full of Hindus and Musalmans and others staying in every corner of it. To divide it into two is worse than anarchy. It is vivisection which cannot be tolerated—not because I am a Hindu, for I am speaking from this platform as a representative of Hindus, Muslims, Parsis and all else. But I will say to them, "Vivisect me before you vivisect India. You shall not do what even the Moghuls, who ruled over India for over two centuries, did not do."[23]

The solution

How to get out of the tangle is the question. I want just now to confine myself to the four Muslim majority provinces. In them, there is natural Pakistan in the sense that the permanent majority can rule the minority. I hold it to be utterly wrong thus to divide man from man by reason of religion which is liable to change. What conflict of interest can there be between Hindus and Muslims in the matter of revenue, sanitation, police, justice, or the use of public conveniences? The difference can only be in religious usage and observances, with which a secular State has no concern.[24]

League stand

It should be enough to state the proposition that nothing can prevent the Muslim League from having it if the Muslims really want it. They will take it by the vote or the sword, unless they will submit to arbitration. But all this can only happen when the British power is entirely withdrawn and the Japanese menace has abated. Till then there is neither Pakistan nor Hindustan nor any other 'stan'. It is today Englistan and may be tomorrow Japanistan, if we do not take care. If all who consider India to be their home now and forever will pull their full weight to deliver it from the present

and the impending peril, and when both the perils are finally removed, it will be time to talk of Pakistan and other 'stans' and to come to an amicable decision or fight. No third party will or should decide our fate. It should be reason or the sword.[25]

Today, we do not even know that the goal of the Congress and the League is one. And you cannot bribe the League to co-operate for independence. Either the League believes that India is as much the home of Muslims as of non-Muslims, or it does not. If it does, it must first free the home from bondage before partitioning it. Today, there is nothing to partition. After ridding the home of the foreign occupant, it can demand partition if it wishes and get it by negotiation or force. However, if it does not believe in India being the home of the Muslims, there is no question of negotiations for freeing India from bondage.

Rajaji's formula

Rajaji's plan is, in my opinion, wholly unnatural. He wants to thrust himself on the British power which does not want him, for, as the possessor by right of conquest, it gets all it wants. In order to thrust himself on the British, he gives the League the right of self-determination which every single individual has, whether the others recognize it or not. Rajaji does not like partition and hugs the belief that his superfluous recognition of the inherent right will enable him to avoid partition.

...We know and love each other enough to let time correct the error, whether it lies on my side or his. Meanwhile, a frank and bold admission of differences and their exact nature makes for healthy education of public opinion. What is needed is avoidance of anger and intolerance, the twin enemies of correct understanding.[26]

Meaning of Pakistan

If I felt convinced of the rightness of the demand, I should certainly work for it side by side with the League. But I do not. I would like to be convinced. Nobody has yet told me all its implications. Those that are described in the anti-Pakistan Press are too terrible to contemplate. But I cannot take them from the opposition. Only the protagonists know what they want and mean. I plead for such an exposition. Surely, Pakistanis want to convert the opposition, not to force them. Has an attempt been ever made to meet the opposition in a friendly manner and to convert them? I am sure the Congress is willing to be converted, let alone me.[27]

Jinnah's exposition

"Pakistan" according to him [Jinnah] "in a nutshell, is a demand for carving out of India a portion to be wholly treated as an independent and sovereign State". This sovereign State can conceivably go to war against the one of which it was but yesterday a part. It can also equally conceivably make treaties with other States. All this can certainly be had, but surely not by the willing consent of the rest.

But it seems he does not want it by consent. For he says, "Pakistan is an article of faith with Muslim India and we depend upon nobody except ourselves for the achievement of our goal." How is one to offer one's service in these circumstances?

But later he gives me hope, for he says: "Show your sincerity and frankness for an honourable settlement." In order to show both, I wrote the article to which the Quaid-i-Azam has objected. How else is one to show sincerity and frankness except through one's action and speech or pen?

Let me state my limitations. I cannot speak as a mere Hindu, for my Hinduism includes all religions. I can speak only as an Indian. If Pakistan as defined above is an article of faith with him, indivisible India is equally an article of faith with me. Hence there is a stalemate.

But today there is neither Pakistan nor Hindustan. It is Englistan. So I say to all India, 'Let us first convert it into the original Hindustan and then adjust all rival claims.' This is surely clear. After the restoration of India to the nation, there will be no Central Government. The representatives will have to construct it. It may be one Hindustan or many Pakistans.

If the Quaid-i-Azam really wants a settlement, I am more than willing and so is the Congress. He will forgive me for suggesting that his reply leaves one the impression that he does not want a settlement. If he wants one, why not accept the Congress President's offer that Congress and League representatives should put their heads together and never part until they have reached a settlement? Is there any flaw or want of sincerity in the offer? [28]

Can you describe Pakistan to me? What reply can be given to an unknown premise? I have tried to understand what it is and have failed. And if the Punjab and Bengal today are hall-marks of Pakistan, then it can never exist.[29]

Is Pakistan, according to Jinnah Saheb, a State, where every child will enjoy the fullest security, where there will be no caste and no distinctions of high and low, where there will be justice for all? No one can have anything against such a Pakistan. I myself will tour with Quaid-i-Azam Jinnah all over and explain to the people that they can all live happily in that Pakistan. But the happenings in N.W.F.P., the Punjab and Bengal do not encourage such a belief.[30]

I suggest that the Quaid-i-Azam should lay all his cards on the table so that the world can see what he means by Muslim majority rule, otherwise called Pakistan.[31]

Put Pakistan on the screen

Now that the Quaid-i-Azam has got what he wanted, it is up to him to give the world the shape of Pakistan and make it attractive in word and action. Is it not up to him to invite all non-Muslims and show them that they will be as happy as the Muslims of Pakistan? What about the Frontier Province? It is a Congress Province. If it is to be of Pakistan, the Quaid-i-Azam has to convince the Pathans that they will be just as well off in Pakistan as in the Union of the Provinces of India. Referendum is a dangerous method at this time. I, therefore, suggest the method of attracting the Pathan through reason and love.

What should happen is that the Union of India and Pakistan should vie with each other in well-doing. If Pakistan does better, the whole of India will be Pakistan in which there will be neither majority nor minority and all will be equal. If I were the President of the Muslim League, I would put Pakistan on the screen and make it attractive by its matchless beauty. In this case, I will be the first one to admit my mistake and commend Pakistan to everybody. Will the Quaid-i-Azam do this?[32]

Character of Pakistan

I have no objection to the setting up of a separate Muslim State. In fact, Bengal is so. But the question is: what is going to be the character of such a separate Muslim State. That has not been made clear so far, and if a Muslim State implies freedom to make hostile treaties with foreign powers to the detriment of the country as a whole, then, that cannot be a matter for agreement.

I think that no one can be asked to sign an agreement granting liberty to others to launch hostilities against himself.[33]

Division inevitable?

Personally, I have always said 'No', and I say 'No' even now to both these questions [whether the communal division of India is inevitable and whether such division will solve the communal problem].[34]

The conversations were carried on in a friendly spirit even though there could never be agreement between us [Jinnah and me] on the question of the division of India. I cannot bear the thought of it and so long as I am convinced that it is wrong, I cannot possibly put my signature to the scheme. I hold that it is not only bad for the Hindus, but equally so for the Muslims.

I do not think in terms of the good of any particular community where India is concerned. I try to be the representative and servant of all alike.[35]

[I am sorry] at what I consider is a mistaken policy of the Muslim League. They fear Hindu domination, they said, and desire to rule in what they are mistaken in calling their own homelands. As a matter of fact, however, India is the homeland of all who are born and bred in India. Will the Muslim homeland live in isolation? Is not the Punjab as much the homeland of the Hindus, the Sikhs, the Christians, the Jews and the Parsis who are of the Punjab?

I cannot blame the Viceroy for what has happened. It is the act of the Congress and the League. The Viceroy has openly said that he wants a United India, but he is powerless in the face of Congress, acceptance, however reluctantly, of the Muslim position.[36]

I cannot understand why we cannot remain united for the object of facing foreign aggression. The present mode of division may even lead to internal warfare between the two armies who might even look upon themselves as rivals. That will be a tragedy too deep for tears.[37]

4 THE SETTING-UP OF PAKISTAN

Use of farce

The proposal to vivisect India is a contribution to imperialistic growth. For, vivisection can only be made by the aid of the British bayonet or through a deadly civil war. I hope the Congress will be party to neither game.[38]

It has hurt me to hear some of the recent pronouncements of the Quaid-i-Azam and his lieutenants. They go on saying that they will take what they want by force. I wonder where this is going to lead the ship of State.[39]

If the Hindus and the Sikhs are non-violent, the world will, condemn the action of the Muslims in trying to get Pakistan by force. It will be a wonderful lesson for the whole world.[40]

The Muslim League leaders talk of forcing the Congress and the Hindus and even the British to yield to their demands. This surely is not the right way. I recall with pride the days of the Khilafat...I was addressing a meeting of Hindus and said to them, "If you want to save the cow, you must save the Khilafat, die for it if need be." This brought tears of joy to the eyes of the Ali Brothers. What a sad change is there today! I long for those days when Muslims and Hindus never did anything without consulting each other. What can I do to bring that state of affairs back again, is the question that is worrying me all the time. I make bold to say that for any Hindu or Musalman to regard the other community as 'enemy' is not only disloyal but stupid too.[41]

Not by force

In Khilafat days no one talked of dividing India. Now you do so. But partitioning, even if it is desirable, cannot be so achieved. It cannot be retained except by the goodwill of the people concerned. The Bengal Ministers have assured me that the Muslims do not believe in getting Pakistan through force.[42]

If India is destined to be partitioned, I cannot prevent it. But I wish to tell you that Pakistan cannot be established by force [43]

There is no question of force here and if Pakistan is going to be established by sterling qualities of character, everybody will welcome such a State, no matter by what name it is called.[44]

The violence that is being practised in order to seize Pakistan by force is bound to defeat its purpose, if Indians are worth their salt...

I will make bold to say that seizure of Pakistan by force is an empty dream.[45]

In a true Pakistan—holy land—there ought to be no fighting. Everything must be done by appealing to reason and not through force. I am speaking to the Punjab from here. I am no stranger to this province or to its people [46]

It is the Muslim League that has thrown out the gauntlet. I agree that the Muslim League has been wrong to have raised the slogan of '*larke lenge Pakistan*' [we will fight and take Pakistan]. I have never believed that such a thing can happen. In fact, they cannot have succeeded in partitioning the country through force. If the Congress and the British had not agreed, there will be no Pakistan today. Nobody can now go back upon it. The Muslims of Pakistan are entitled to it.

The Muslims are reported to have said *hanske liya Pakistan, larke lenge Hindustan*. [Smiling we took Pakistan, fighting shall we take Hindustan.] If I have my way, I will never let them have it by force of arms.[47]

Non-resistance to partition

If a man abuses me, it will never do for me to return the abuse. An evil returned by another evil only succeeds in multiplying it, instead of leading to its reduction. It is a universal law that violence can never be quenched by superior violence, but can only be quenched by non-violence or non-resistance.

But the true meaning of non-resistance has often been misunderstood or even distorted. It never implies that a non-violent man should bend before the violence of an aggressor. While not returning the latter's violence by violence, he should refuse to submit to the latter's illegitimate demand even to the point of death. That is the true meaning of non-resistance.

If, for instance, someone asked me under threat of violence to admit a claim, say, like that of Pakistan, I should not immediately rush to return the violence thus offered. In all humility I should ask the aggressor what is really meant by the demand, and if I am really satisfied that it is something worth striving for, then I shall have no hesitation in proclaiming from the house-tops that the demand is just and it has to be admitted by everyone concerned. But if the demand is backed by force, then the

only course open to the non-violent man is to offer non-resistance against it as long as he is not convinced of its justice. He is not to return violence by violence but neutralize it by withholding one's hand and, at the same time, refusing to submit to the demand. This is the only civilized way of going on in the world.[48]

I appeal to the Hindus and the Sikhs of the Punjab to resolve to be killed but not kill. They should resist Pakistan being forced on them with all the incomparable strength of Satyagraha.[49]

It is not the British who have partitioned the country. It has been done with the consent of the Congress howsoever reluctantly. There is only one way to avoid the calamity and that is by the non-violence of the brave. But how can the people develop it overnight? [50]

Partition after freedom

Azadi and Pakistan require the exclusion of all foreign powers. Until and unless India is free, there cannot be any other question. Freedom as envisaged by me, is freedom not merely from British rule but from every foreign rule.[51]

Whatever may be said to the contrary, it would be a blunder of first magnitude for the British to be party in any way whatsoever to the division of India. If it has to come, let it come after the British withdrawal, as a result of understanding between the parties or [of] an armed conflict which, according to Quaid-i-Azam Jinnah, is taboo. Protection of minorities can be guaranteed by establishing a court of arbitration in the event of difference of opinion among contending parties.[52]

"Joint appeal"

In my opinion, the honour, both of the Viceroy who was instrumental in bringing about the joint appeal and of Quaid-i-Azam Jinnah, was involved in the failure of the appeal. I hold that it is not open to Jinnah Saheb to plead that his followers do not listen to his (Jinnah Saheb's) appeal. This will be cutting the whole ground from under his feet because he is the undisputed President of the All-India Muslim League which claims to represent the vast bulk of the Muslim population of India. Where is the authority of the League if the Muslims resort to violence for gaining the political aim which is summed up in the word Pakistan? Is the British Government to yield to the force of arms rather than the force of reason?

I had expressed my doubts as to the wisdom of issuing the joint appeal unless it was certain that it meant for both the signatories all that the words thereof conveyed.[53]

My own view regarding the division of India has not undergone any change. I stand for a United India as firmly as ever and at I said more than once to friends, "The ultimate decision of division or partition of provinces and all such matters are for the people to settle among themselves after the British have withdrawn their power." This looking towards the British power for everything is a hopeless and a disintegrating factor in our lives.[54]

The Government of free Indians formed under the constitution worked out by the Constituent Assembly can do anything afterwards—keep India one or divide it into two or more parts.[55]

...If I have my will, there never will be Pakistan before peace, and certainly not through British intervention. After the joint statement I have just referred to, Quaid-i-Azam Jinnah has left no way open to himself but the way of conviction through cold reason for the attainment of Pakistan. Let him first establish peace with or without my association and afterwards convene a meeting at his house or anywhere else of Indian leaders of all classes and communities and plead with them the cause of Pakistan and wait till he has carried conviction to them.[56]

If Pakistan of Jinnah Saheb's conception is a reasonable proposition, he should have no difficulty in convincing India. Let him not appeal to the British power or its representative, Viscount Mountbatten. The latter's function is only to quit India at the latest by the end of June next year, leaving India at peace if possible, but quit in any case, peace or no peace. Imposed peace will be the peace of the grave of which all India and the British should be ashamed. Let it not be said that I am too late on the scene. I am not. It is never too late to mend, never too late to replace the force of the sword with that of reason. Can the British dare to impose Pakistan on an India temporarily gone mad? [57]

His position

I cannot plead guilty to the taunt ['that I who had proclaimed that the vivisection of India would mean a vivisection of myself, have weakened']. When I made the statement I was voicing public opinion. But, when public opinion is against me, am I

to coerce it? The writer has also argued that I had often held that there is to be no compromise with untruth or evil. The assertion is correct. But the application must also be correct. I make bold to say that, if only non-Muslim India is with me, I can show the way to undo the proposed partition. But I freely admit that I have become, or am rather considered, a back number. We have forgotten the lesson we have learnt for the past thirty years. We have forgotten that untruth is to be conquered by truth and violence by non-violence, impatience by patience and heat by cold. We have begun to fear our own shadows. Many have invited me to head the opposition. But there is nothing in common between them and me except the opposition. The basis of my opposition seems to be wholly different from that of the inviters. Can love and hate combine?

The division of India ...is now a certainty so far as man can see. I ask you not to grieve over it. I have never believed in Quaid-i-Azam Jinnah's two-nation theory and never will. Change of religion can never change nationality. I am as much of Pakistan as of Hindustan. If you act in like manner, Jinnah Saheb will not be able to prove his theory in spite of the geographical division of India.[58]

Friendly partition

A note appeared in the press that the Muslim League and the Congress members of the Partition Committee have agreed before the Viceroy that the partition will be effected in a brotherly spirit. It is a good thing that H. E. the Viceroy has been able to achieve. But I know that sweet words butter no parsnips. I shall dance with joy when I find a series of acts following the words. The world is tired of eloquent speeches and writings. Both the things are overdone. Hunger is appeased by even a dry crust of bread without butter, but never by honeyed promises.[59]

A friend from Noakhali has written to me that, if I do not return there by the 15th of August, I may have to repent. 15th August is the dead-line for the division of India and the transfer of power from British to Indian hands. As a matter of fact, the division is a settled plan already. But God can upset the plans of men. An earthquake can destroy the whole of India before the appointed day. A foreign invasion may upset man's pretty and petty plans. But, humanly speaking, Pakistan will be a legally established fact on the 15th of August.[60]

British mistake

You threw out a hint that Quaid-i-Azam might not be able even to let you quit even by 15th August, especially if the Congress members did not adopt a helpful attitude. This was for me a startling statement. I pointed the initial mistake of the British being party to splitting India into two. It is not possible to undo the mistake. But I hold that it is quite possible and necessary not to put a premium upon the mistake. This does not in any way impinge upon the very admirable doctrine of fairplay. Fairplay demands that I do not help the mistaken party to fancy that the mistake was no mistake but a belated and only a partial discharge of an obligation.

You startled me again by telling me that, if the partition had not been made during British occupation, the Hindus being the major party would have never allowed partition and held the Muslims by force under subjection. I told you that this was a grave mistake. The question of numbers was wholly untenable in this connection. I cited the classic example of less than one hundred thousand British soldiers holding India under utter subjection. You saw no analogy between the two instances. I suggested the difference was only one of degree.[61]

Great Britain's unique action will be judged by results. Dismemberment of India constitutes an unconscious invitation to the two parts to fight among themselves. The free grant of independence to the two parts as sister Dominions seems to taint the gift. It is useless to say that either Dominion is free to secede from the British family of nations. It is easier said than done.[62]

5 PARTITION OF BENGAL AND THE PUNJAB

Without going into the merits of the question, I will say that the best way of silencing the cry for the partition of Bengal will be to reason with the Hindus, to demonstrate to them from now that he [the Chief Minister of Bengal] wishes them to do nothing compulsorily, and to prove by his strictly fair conduct that in Pakistan there is no fear to be entertained by the Hindus about the strictest impartiality and justice, that no Muslim is to be favoured because he is Muslim and that merit is the sole consideration in selecting men and women for service in the Government.[63]

Partition wrong

I feel that partition of the Punjab and Bengal is wrong in every case and a needless irritant for the League. This as well as all innovation can come after the British withdrawal, not before, except always for mutual agreement. Whilst the British power is functioning in India, it muse be held principally responsible for the preservation of peace in the country. That machine seems to be cracking under the existing strain which is caused by the raising of various hopes that cannot or must not be fulfilled. These have no place during the remaining thirteen months. This period can be most profitably shortened if the minds of all were focussed on the sole task of withdrawal. You and you alone can do it, to the exclusion of all other activity, so far as the British occupation is concerned...

Non-partition of the Punjab and Bengal does not mean that the minorities in these Provinces are to be neglected. In both the Provinces they are large and powerful enough to arrest and demand attention. If the popular Governments cannot placate them, the Governors should, during the interregnum, actively interfere.[64]

United Bengal

I recognize the force of ['the rising tide of Hindu opinion' in favour of Pakistan]. I myself am not in a position to pronounce an opinion. But I can say without fear of contradiction that if there is partition, the Muslim majority will be responsible for it and, what is more, the Muslim Government that is in power. If I were the Prime Minister of Bengal, I shall plead with my Hindu brethren to forget the past. I shall say to them that I am as much a Bengali as they are. Differences in religion cannot part the two. We and they speak the same language, have inherited the same culture. All

that is Bengal's is common to both, of which both should be equally proud. Bengal is Bengal. It is neither the Punjab, nor Bombay, nor anything else. If the Prime Minister can possibly take up that attitude, I shall undertake to go with him from place to place and reason with Hindu audiences, and I make bold to say that there will not be a Hindu opponent left of the unity of Bengal, the unity for which the Hindus and the Muslims had fought together so valiantly and undone "the settled fact" of so powerful a Viceroy as Lord Curzon. If I were Janab Suhrawardy, I would invite the Hindus to partition my body before they think of partitioning Bengal. If I had that sturdy love for Bengal and the Bengalis, whether Hindus or Muslims, that love will melt the stoniest Hindu heart, as it is their fear and suspicion that have seized the Hindu mind.[65]

If Pakistan is wrong, partition of Bengal and the Punjab will not make it right. Two wrongs will not make one right.[66]

Mutual settlement

If what I have said is well understood, it follows that nothing can happen without the joint wish of both the Hindus and the Muslims. If a third party is not to decide their fate, it can be only decided by their joint will. Then there is no question as yet of a divided India. If the distant event unfortunately does come to pass, the joint and free will of Hindu and Muslim Bengalis will decide which part to join.

This question ['can we not wait to settle matters between ourselves *after* power is really transferred to the Indian people?'] really does not arise. For when the whole of Bengal has one united mind, it is irrelevant whether it is expressed then or after the British power has actually withdrawn.[67]

I have already told you over and over again that to yield even an inch to force is wholly wrong. The Working Committee holds that they have not yielded to the force of arms but they had to yield to the force of circumstances. The vast majority of Congressmen do not want unwilling partners. Their motto is non-violence and, therefore, no coercion. Hence, after careful weighing of the pros and cons of the vital issues at stake, they have reluctantly agreed to the secession from the Union that is being framed of those parts which have boycotted the Constituent Assembly.[68]

Unity—with honour

Some people have told me that the move for a united, sovereign Bengal is a sinister one. The Hindus are fed up and want to separate West from East Bengal. The Bengal Muslim League has also rejected the unity plan, but some people are still persisting with it and it is said to be due to the fact that I am behind the move. I want to make clear that I can never support any questionable practice. I am even told that money is being spent like water to buy votes in favour of a united Bengal. I appreciate unity, but not at the cost of honour and justice.[69]

I willingly plead guilty to the charge of wanting a united Bengal. I will not mind standing alone in defence of such unity, if it can be preserved with dignity, honesty and willingness on both sides. For me it is no political game or bargain. What I want is a heart-unity. And although the provincial League has turned down the proposition, I make bold to say that it is possible for the Muslims of Bengal to give an assurance accompanied by tangible action that the Hindus have nothing to fear from the Muslim majority and there will be no partition. Unfortunately, the omens appear to be the contrary.[70]

6 FRONTIER PROVINCE

Referendum: recommendations to Viceroy

Referendum at this stage in the Frontier (or any Province for that matter) is a dangerous thing in itself. You have to deal with the material that faces you. In any case, nothing should or can be done over Dr. Khan Saheb's head as Premier. Note that this ... is relevant only if division is at all to be countenanced.[71]

1. As to the referendum in the Frontier Province, I must confess that my idea does not commend itself to Pandit Nehru and his colleagues. As I told you, if my proposal did not commend itself to them, I would not have the heart to go any further with it.
2. This, however, does not in any way affect my proposal that, before proceeding with the referendum, you should invite Quaid-i-Azam Jinnah to proceed to the Frontier Province and to woo the Ministers including Badshah Khan and his Khudai Khidmatgars who have made the Province what it is—better or worse. Before he goes, no doubt, he should be assured of a courteous hearing from them.
3. Whether he favours the idea or not, Quaid-i-Azam should be asked to give a fair picture of the Pakistan scheme before the simple Pathan mind is asked to make its choice of Hindustan or Pakistan. I fancy that the Pathan knows his position in Hindustan. If he does not, the Congress or the Constituent Assembly now at work should be called upon to complete the picture. It will be unfair, I apprehend, to choose between Hindustan or Pakistan without knowing what each is. He should at least know where his entity will be fully protected.
4. There is yet no peace in the Frontier Province. Can there be a true referendum when strife has not completely abated? Minds are too heated to think coherently. Neither the Congress nor the League can disown liability for disturbances by their followers. If peace does not reign in the land, the whole superstructure will come to pieces and you will, in spite of division, leave behind legacy of which you will not be proud.
5. The sooner you have a homogeneous ministry the better. In no case can the League nominees work independently of the whole Cabinet. It is a vicious thing that there is no joint responsibility for every act of individual members.

6. The only way to keep the wonderful time-table made by you is to anticipate the future and ask your special staff to work out all the items presented by you, without reference to the Cabinet and then, when the time comes, the report should be presented to the respective parties for acceptance, amendment or rejection.

...I suggest that the attempt to please all parties is a fruitless and thankless task. In the course of our conversation, I suggested that equal praise bestowed on both the parties was not meant. No praise would have been the right thing. 'Duty will be merit when debt becomes a donation.' It is not too late to mend…[72]

There is a talk of referendum in N.W.F.P. I will suggest to Jinnah Saheb that he should meet the Frontier Ministers and Badshah Khan as also his Khudai Khidmatgars and tell them why they should be in Pakistan. If the terms are attractive, I shall have no hesitation in advising my Frontier friends to be part of Pakistan and thus avoid conflict between Pathan and Pathan and keep their Pathanistan intact in a federation of the majority Muslim States. Surely, it is not proper to divide the Pathans by a referendum into two parties.[73]

...There should be no demonstration against League Muslims, ...it should be enough that in the present state of tension and misrepresentation Khudai Khidmatgars should not vote at all one way or the other,...they were entitled so far as internal affairs were concerned to claim complete autonomy without any interference from Pakistan or the Union and... they could come to a decision as to the choice between the Union or Pakistan when the constitutions of the two were promulgated and when the Frontier Province had fashioned its own autonomous constitution. Above all, every occasion for clash with the Muslim League members was to be avoided. Real Pathan bravery was now on its trial. It was to be shown by cheerfully meeting blows or even meeting death at the hands of the opponents without the slightest sort of retaliation. Boycott would certainly result in a legal victory for Pakistanis but it would be a moral defeat if, without the slightest fear of violence from your side, the bulk of the Pathans refrained in a dignified manner from participating in the referendum. There should be no fuss, no procession, no disobedience of any orders from authority.[74]

7 PAKISTAN ESTABLISHED

Independence Bill

I do not propose to examine in detail the twenty sections of the elaborate Bill. I am ill-disposed with many critics to read a sinister meaning in it. The fact that there are two Indias instead of one is bad enough in itself. Both have the same status. Quaid-i-Azam Jinnah and the Muslim League are entitled to claim full credit for bringing about a state of things which seemed to be impossible only as it were yesterday. They have undone the solemn declaration of the Cabinet Mission. They have succeeded in compelling consent from the Congress and the Sikhs to the division. The thing that is in itself bad does not become good because the parties concerned have accepted it, no matter that the causes dictating acceptance are different in each case. It is hardly any comfort that the Quaid-i-Azam does not get all that he wants. The difference is not at all in kind. He wants a sovereign State. That he has in the fullest measure. Pakistan has the same status as India.

As I read and re-read the Bill, I see that the three parties have subjected themselves consciously or unconsciously to public judgment in terms of the Bill. It is true that the British are divesting themselves of all power. But they have become party to the division and have I two new members in the family of the Commonwealth possessing conflicting ideals and interests. So long as they two have any connection with Great Britain, the latter will be judged by the action, following the Bill rather than by its language, however generous and just it may read. I admit that it will be a superhuman task to reconcile conflicting interests and treat them equally. What will happen if one declares complete independence when the Constitution Act is passed by its Constituent Assembly?...

Challenge to Pakistan

The Quaid-i-Azam and the Muslim League have by their act of secession and severance invited the world to judge them by their behaviour towards the Muslims as also towards the non-Muslims. Surely there are many sects, chief among whom are the Sunnis and the Shias, politically, the Nationalists and the Leaguers, the Baluchis, the Sindhis, the Pathans, the Punjabis, the Bengalis, the Muslims of the Indian Union. I am daily besieged by the large Hindu and Sikh minorities and not as often by Christians and Parsis. I am asked whether there is ground for the fear that there will be an

attempt to estrange the Scheduled Classes from their Hindu brethren. Is Pakistan a means of converting non-Muslims to a special brand of Islam? True religion is a universal belief in the one and only God. The world is fast growing out of dogmas and creeds which have so sickened it that it has become confused and has begun to deny the very existence of the Maker. Happily, that stage of negation is quickly passing and enlightened faith in the Supreme Maker of the Universe is taking its place. Is the Islam of Pakistan going to be in the vanguard of that movement for restoration of universal faith? Or is it to pass through darkness and denial of God in the name of God? I hope that the doubts I have mentioned will be quickly dissolved...

Pakistan achieved

It is possible to turn Pakistan which, I have declared an evil into unadulterated good, if all the forebodings are dispelled and enmities are turned into friendship and mutual distrust gives place to trust.[75]

As a friend and well-wisher, I must say to all those who reside in Pakistan and mould its fortune that they will fail to make Pakistan permanent if their conscience is not quickened and if they do not admit the wrongs for which Pakistan is responsible.[76]

Undoing Pakistan?

The partition of India is there and I cannot but be unhappy about it. If, however, what I say depresses you, the fault is not mine. I have told you that it is no use crying over spilt milk. I have been a rebel and a fighter all my life and have found great happiness therein. But I have never been defeated in spirit. I cannot weep nor can I make others do so. I had gone to Noakhali to wipe their tears and tell them not to mourn over the loss of life and property. A Satyagrahi knows no defeat. Even if your leaders have made a mistake, there is no consciousness about it. They believe that what they have done is for the good of the country. If they are happy, the audience too felt likewise. It is no part of my duty to seek to deprive them of their happiness.[77]

On the basis of this immortal *shloka** ['This is mine and that is someone else's is the calculation of narrow minds.'], you and I cannot discriminate between Hindustan and Pakistan. What even if you and I happen to be the only ones having such a belief? If we are true, others are bound to follow us.

The Congress has always kept a broad vision. Today it is needed more than ever before. It is permissible to say that India has accepted partition at the point of the bayonet. This settled fact cannot be unsettled in the same way. The two can be one only when there is heart unity.[78]

At the same time that India has become independent of foreign rule, by common consent it has been cut into twain so as to induce the untenable belief that one part is popularly described as Hindu India and the other part as Muslim India. Like all superstitions, this of Hindu and Muslim India will die hard. The fact is that the Indian Union and Pakistan belong equally to all who call themselves, and are, sons of the soil, irrespective of their creed or colour.[79]

To undo Pakistan by force will be to undo Swaraj.[80]

It was our misfortune that the country was divided into two parts. The division was avowedly by reason of religious cleavage. Behind it might be economic and other causes. They could not have brought out the cleavage. The poison that fills the air arose also from the same communal cause. Irreligion masquerades as religion. It sounds nice to say that it would have been better if there had been no communal question. But how can the fact be undone? [81]

*. अयं निजः परो वेति गणना लघुचेतसाम्
उदारचरितानां तु वसुधैव कुटुंबकम्।

8 THE BOUNDARY COMMISSION

The real day of rejoicing will be when the Hindus and the Muslims will live as brothers, even though in the two Dominions. I am distressed to hear that the Punjab Muslim League are holding out threats of violence if the decision of the Boundary Commission goes against their wishes. Some Sikhs have said likewise. I deplore this attitude. It is inconsistent with the honour of the parties who have agreed to arbitration. Having agreed they must conform to the decision.[82]

I now come to the award of the Umpire in the Boundary Commission. The Umpire was chosen by all the parties to the dispute. It will be unjust and unworthy to impute motives to the Umpire. He was specially invited by the parties to the thankless task. The parties and the public they represented were loyally to abide by the award. No award that I know—and I had to do with many arbitrations—completely satisfied the parties. But having made the choice we are bound to carry out the terms of the award. No doubt the best way is for the parties to adjust differences themselves. This royal road is open to them any time as Khwaja Saheb Nazimuddin and Dr. Ghosh, the two Premiers, have wisely pointed out.

I know that the Muslims of Murshidabad and Malda are severely disappointed as the Hindus in Khulna or Gopalganj and the Buddhists in the Chittagong Hill tracts. The latter have gone to East Bengal. I would say to all these parties that it is not only foolish but unbecoming to quarrel over the award.[83]

Thus, neither the Bengalis nor the Biharis can assert themselves at the point of the sword, nor can the Boundary Commission award similarly be changed.[84]

"Those who advocate the policy of undivided Bengal shall be punishable with death is the gazetted Order of the East Bengal Government", writes a correspondent. I should like to see the text of the Order before I can believe it. I feel sure that even if there is any Order to some such effect, the exact wording would bear a different meaning. I can understand the criminality of such action. There are very few Hindus and certainly not many Muslims who believe in the advisability or justice of the step. But only a madman would advocate any forcible measure to upset the settled fact. The partition can be undone only by the willing consent of both the parties. But even that consent will be impossible, if no one is allowed to convert public opinion to the side of unity.[85]

9 THE REFUGEE PROBLEM

Migration

I have suggested *hijrat*. I repeat the suggestion. It is not unpractical. People do not know its value. High and mighty have been known to have resorted to it before now. Planned *hijrat* requires courage and forethought. The second book of the Old Testament is known as Exodus. It is an account of the planned flight of the Israelites. In exile they prepared for a military career. In modern times we have the example of the flight of the Doukhobors from Russia owing to persecution. Theirs was no military career. On the contrary they were non-violent. There is, therefore, nothing wrong, dishonourable or cowardly in self-imposed exile. India is a vast country. Though poor, it is well able to admit of inter-migration, especially of those who are capable, hard-working and honest.

...Apart from political pacts, local heads among Hindus and Muslims may meet with mutual profit. It can do nobody or [no] party any good to promote mutual slaughter and consequent increase in the existing ill-will. But if no honourable local settlement is arrived at, and if the local residents do not feel able to defend themselves and their families and possessions non-violently or violently, I have no doubt that they should vacate the place in which they live in perpetual fear of their lives and the honour of their womenfolk.[86]

My advice to migrate is for all who feel oppressed and cannot live without loss of self-respect in a particular place. If the Muslims, where they are in a minority, are really oppressed and they sought my advice, I should give them the same advice that I have given to the Sind Hindus. But as a general rule, they are capable of holding their own even when they are in a minority. I have already told the Sindhis that, if they have the bravery to defend themselves even though they are a handful, they should not leave the places where they are settled. My advice is meant for those who, though they are conscious of self-respect, lack the strength that comes from non-violence or the capacity to return blow for blow.

The question what the refugees should do after migration is surely secondary. A few thousand of them can be easily absorbed in a vast country like India. Sindhis are enterprising. They are scattered all over the world. I hardly think any public appeal will be necessary. Let them know that there are refugees from Limbdi who are bravely

and silently bearing their exile. A keen sense of honour turns every privation into a joy. But perhaps migration will be unnecessary. I see signs of Muslim leaders realizing their responsibility and making arrangements to create among the Hindus concerned a sense of security. If this happens, it would be as it should be.[87]

Exodus of minorities

I do not wish to encourage people to flee from their homes in East Bengal... If the mass flight of the refugees has been deliberately planned to discredit the Muslim League Ministry, it will recoil on the heads of those who have done so. To me it seems hardly credible. I suggest that the right course will be to make a clean breast of the matter.[88]

I told the Hindus of Noakhali that, if they were afraid, they could go anywhere if they got compensation. And why should the Government not pay compensation when they got the properties? Similarly, I will tell you to go anywhere provided you get adequate compensation. But I must tell you that it is not my heart's desire. Leaving your homestead in such a manner is nothing but cowardice. If the Government is not prepared to pay compensation, I should say it is unworthy of them and the Government cannot refuse it. Moreover, if the Ministers who have been returned by the Hindu votes say that the Hindus here have gone beyond control, it is better for them to consume themselves in the flames of the Hindu rage rather than continue in office. The Government has to do justice and cannot afford injustice in any manner.[89]

I will now deal with the question of the refugees. Among them they are nearly 9,000. The Hindus and the Sikhs who discussed the question with me say that they are afraid of the approach of August 15. I confess that I do not in any way whatsoever share the fear. Nor can I appreciate it. The Muslims have got their Pakistan. They can now have no quarrel with the Hindus and the Sikhs of the Punjab Jinnah Saheb and other Muslim Leaguers have given assurances that the non-Muslims are as safe in Pakistan as the Muslims. I invite you to accept the assurance. Supposing that the assurance proves untrue and the worst fears of the refugees prove true, it will be the beginning of the ruin of Islam. I refuse to believe that Muslim leaders will be guilty of such a suicidal act. I ask the refugees, men and women, to dispel all fear.[90]

Is it not to our shame as a nation that there should be any refugee problem at all? Quaid-i-Azam Jinnah, Liaquat Saheb and other Pakistan leaders have proclaimed, in

common with Pandit Nehru and Sardar Patel that the minorities will be treated in the respective Dominions with the same consideration as the majorities. Is this said by each to tickle the world with sweet words or is it meant to show the world that we mean what we have said and that we will die in the attempt to redeem the word? If so, I ask why are the Hindus and Sikhs and the proud Amils and Bhaibunds driven to leave Pakistan which is their home? What has happened in Quetta, Nawabshah and Karachi? The tales that one hears and reads from Western Pakistan are heart-breaking. It will not do for either party to plead helplessness and say that it is all the work of *goondas*.

Each Dominion is bound to take full responsibility for the acts of those who are living in either Dominion...No longer do they work willy-nilly under the crushing weight of imperialism. But it can never mean that there is now to be no rule of law, if they are to face the world squarely in the face. Are the Union Ministers to declare their bankruptcy and shamelessly own to the world that the people of Delhi or the refugees will not cheerfully and voluntarily obey the rule of law? I should like the Ministers to break in the attempt to wean the people from their madness rather than bend.[91]

My thoughts turn to the cause of the dislocation on a scale which arrests the progress of the nation. Why are so many Hindus and Sikhs coming away from the Western, Pakistan provinces? Is it a crime to be a Hindu or a Sikh? Or are they coming away out of sheer cussedness? Or is it a punishment for what their confreres have done in the East? [92]

During the night, as I heard what should have been the soothing sound of gentle life-giving rain, my mind went out to the thousands of refugees lying about in the open camps in Delhi. I was sleeping snugly in a verandah protecting me on all sides. But for the cruel hand of man against his brother, these thousands of men, women and children would not be shelterless and, in many cases, foodless. In some places they could not but be in knee-deep water. Was it all inevitable? The answer from within was an emphatic 'No'. Was this the first fruit of freedom, just a month-old baby? These thoughts have haunted me throughout these last twenty hours. My silence has been a blessing. It has made me enquire within. [93]

I have heard that convoys of Hindus and Sikhs are pouring in from West Punjab into the East—57 miles in length. It makes my brain reel to think how this can be. Such a

happening is unparalleled in the history of the world and it ...should make all of us hang our heads in shame. This is no time to ask who has done more wrong and who less. It is time to put a stop to this madness.[94]

The Hindus and the Sikhs in Pakistan are in a terrible plight. Evacuation is a difficult process. Many must die on the way.

Those fleeing from one Dominion may imagine that the conditions on the other side will be much better. But they are mistaken. With all the will in the world, the authorities will not be able to cope with so many refugees. They cannot reproduce the original condition. The only advice that I can give to the people is to stick to their places and look to none but God for their protection. They will die courageously, if they must, in their own homes. Naturally, it will be the duty of the other Government to ask for the safety of the minorities.[95]

No panic-evacuation

I am told that there are still left over 18,000 Hindus and Sikhs in Rawalpindi and 30,000 in the Wah Camp. I shall repeat my advice that they should all be prepared to die to a man rather than leave their homes.[96]

I can but repeat what I have said often enough. It is unbecoming for brave men and women to be bullied out of their homes. They should stay there and face death rather than dishonour or loss of self-respect. They should fear none but God. They should defend their religion, their honour and their citizens' rights with their lives. If they do not have that courage, it is far better for them to go away. If they decide to leave East Bengal, it is the duty of the upper-class Hindus such as doctors, lawyers, merchants etc. to see that the poor scheduled castes and others went first. They should be the last and not the first to leave.[97]

I admit that there is much truth in the criticism [that it is 'too much to expect the remnants of the poor Muslims, who had seen others slaughtered before their eyes and yet others going away to Pakistan, to remain in their homes in spite of the disabilities'], but I have no other advice to offer them. I think that leaving their hearth and home is likely to result in greater distress. I, therefore, sincerely believe that, if the remnant honestly and heroically remain in their homes in spite of the sufferings, they are bound to melt the hard hearts of their Hindu neighbours. Then there will be

certain deliverance for others in both the parts of India. For, unexampled bravery born of non-violence coupled with strict honesty, shown by a fair number of Muslims is sure to infect the whole of India.[98]

I can only think non-violently. If they gave proper compensation, I would probably advise acceptance. I cannot think out now and here the pros and cons. If, on the other hand, they resorted to confiscation, I would advise people to stand their ground and refuse to leave their homesteads even on pain of death. This I would say of all provinces, whether Muslim majority or Hindu majority [provinces]...

Those who belong to the land for ages cannot be removed from their homesteads for the simple reason that they find themselves in a minority. This is no religion, Hindu, Muslim, Christian or any other. It is intolerance.[99]

Compulsory evacuation

Complaints are being repeatedly made that Muslims are being forced to leave their ancestral home in the Union and migrate to Pakistan. Thus, it is said that in a variety of ways they are being made to vacate their houses and live in camps to await dispatch by train or even on foot. I am quite sure that such is not the policy of the Cabinet. When I tell the complainants about this, they laugh at it and tell me in reply that either my information is incorrect or the Services do not carry out the policy. I know that my information is quite correct...

What is the duty of the affected citizens of the Union? It is clear that there is no law that can compel a citizen to leave his place of residence. The authority will have to arm itself with special powers to issue orders such as are alleged to have been given. So far as I am aware, there are no written orders issued to anyone. In the present case thousands are involved in the alleged verbal orders. There is no helping those who will be frightened into submission to any order given by a person in uniform. My emphatic advice to all such persons is that they should ask for written orders whose validity in case of doubt should be tested in a court of justice, if appeal to the final executive fails to give satisfaction.[100]

Security of minorities

It is the duty of the people to see that the minorities live without any fear of the majority. If the Muslims from the Union want to go to Pakistan, they should be allowed

to do so. But due protection should be afforded to such Muslims as want to stay in the Indian Union. I am against the use of force under any circumstances.[101]

[A telegram] said that 15,000 Sikhs scattered about in Sindh are in danger of extermination. Their life, religion and culture are in danger. Arrangements should be made for their speedy evacuation. I can never tolerate the extermination of the Sikhs and will do for them all that is possible for one maxi to do. Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru's Government is also fully alive to their responsibility. I call upon the Sindh Government and the Pakistan Government to reassure the Sikh residents there that they will protect them with their own lives. If they cannot guarantee their protection, they should gather them in one place and make arrangements for their speedy and safe evacuation. The Sikhs are a brave community. They should know that everyone's honour and religion are safe only in one's own hands. No one else can rob one of these.[102]

Exchange of population

The question of the exchange of population is unthinkable and impracticable. This question never crossed my mind. In every Province everyone is an Indian, be he a Hindu, a Muslim or of any other faith. It would not be otherwise even if Pakistan came in full. For me exchange of population will spell bankruptcy of Indian wisdom or statesmanship or both. The logical consequence of any such step is too dreadful to contemplate. Is it not that India should be artificially divided into so many religious zones? ...

I see nothing to warrant...a [migration] policy. It is one of despair and, therefore, to be adopted in rare cases as a last resort.[103]

I wish we can unitedly make up our minds that transfer of population is a fatal snare. It means nothing but greater misery. The solution lies in both living in peace and friendship in their own original homes. It will be madness to make the present estrangement into permanent enmity. It is the bounden duty of each Dominion to guarantee full protection to its minorities. Let the two thrash the question out among themselves or, if need be, fight it out and make of themselves the laughing stock of the world.[104]

For me, transfer of millions of Hindus, Sikhs and Muslims is unthinkable. It is wrong. The wrong of Pakistan will be undone by the right of a resolute non-transfer of population. I hope I shall have the courage to stand by it, even though mine may be the solitary voice in its favour.[105]

Death in the process of exchange of population does no good to anyone. Exchange raises tremendous problems of relief and rehabilitation.[106]

I have, too, some Muslim friends coming to me who deplore with me that vast and criminal exchange of populations is going on. These friends tell me that the Muslim refugees in Pakistan suffer no less than the Sikhs and the Hindus in the Union. No government can cope with such a large mass of human beings uprooted from their homes and thrown on its shoulders. It is like an overwhelming onrush of waters. Cannot this mad rush be stopped, the friends asked. I have no doubt that it can be, if the suspicion and the flinging of charges (I think, baseless) is altogether and sincerely stopped. I invite you to pray with me that God will bring sanity to the unhappy land.[107]

I can never bring myself to accept the proposition of a permanent exchange of population. Even if the refugees are well settled, they will hark back to their old homes. Therefore, I cannot envisage real peace without the parties returning to their homes.[108]

Return of the refugees

That ['in order to restore confidence, Hindu leaders should reinforce the appeals of the Muslims to the refugees to go back to their villages'] is not the right way to dispel the apprehension and distrust of the Hindus which is well-grounded. I will not be able to advise them to return to their homes unless there is at least one good Hindu and one good Musalman for each village who will stand guarantee for their safety and security and who will be prepared to immolate himself before a hair of their head is touched. It is for the Muslim League leaders, who are also members of the Government, to say whether such men will be forthcoming. There is no other way to restore confidence after all that has happened.[109]

I shall not ask them to go back under police or military protection. They have run away out of the fear of the Muslims. Therefore, it is the Muslims who have to come

forward and reassure them that they will regard them as their own mothers, daughters and sisters and protect them with their lives.[110]

You know, the Ministers and the Parliamentary Secretaries, who have come to Noakhali, have been proclaiming that, for the sake of their honour and the influence of Islam, they are anxious that the refugees should return to their villages and feel perfectly safe and serene in the midst of the majority of Muslims living there. I have no hesitation in trusting their pledged word and asking the people to do likewise. Those who trust are never the losers, deceivers ever are.[111]

My companions have been left behind at Kazirkhil, and each of them is likewise to choose one village for himself. My idea is that every Hindu worker thus sent should be accompanied by a single Musalman worker, and both of them together should mix with the local people and gradually create the necessary atmosphere when the refugees from here will be able to shed their fear and to come back and live in peace and friendship once more.[112]

Loss in riots

One problem which has been recently exercising me is in connection with the families of those who have lost their all in the course of the disturbances. There are many families which have lost their earning members. The survivors have to be looked after, while the children have to be educated and given adequate protection. That undoubtedly is the duty of the Government. Both of us, if we want heart-peace, should look at the question from a broader standpoint.[113]

It is perfectly correct that a non-violent man will not move out of his place. For such a one there will be no question of compensation. He will simply die at his post and prove that his presence is not a danger to the State or the community. I know that the Hindus of Noakhali make no such pretension. They are simple folk who love the world and want to live in the world in peace and safety. Such persons will consult their honour if the Government honourably offers them compensation in order to see the majority living in peace. If the mere presence of the Hindus irritate, the Muslims who are the majority, I shall consider it to be the duty of the Government to offer compensation, as it will be of the Government in a Hindu majority province to offer compensation to the Muslims if their presence irritates the majority community. [114]

Restoration to homes

The people of Delhi will make it difficult to demand justice from the Pakistan Government. Those who seek justice must do justice, must have clean hands. Let the Hindus and the Sikhs take the right step and invite the Muslims who have been driven out of their homes to return. If they can take this courageous step, worthy from every point of view, they immediately reduce the refugee problem to its simplest terms. They will command recognition from Pakistan, nay, from the whole world. They will save Delhi and India from disgrace and ruin.[116]

The Hindus and Sikhs of Pakistan and the Muslims of East Punjab have to be reinstalled in their own homes. In Pakistan and the Union they should produce conditions that not even a little girl, whatever her religion, should feel insecure.[116]

Those who invoke God's assistance can turn even misfortune to good account. There are some among the refugees who are embittered by their sufferings. They are angry. But anger does not help. They are well-to-do people. They have lost their all. So long as they do not return to their homes with honour and dignity and assurance of safety, they have to do the best they can in the camp life. Contemplated return is, therefore, a long-range programme.[117]

I cannot be satisfied until every Hindu and [every] Sikh returns to his home in safety and honour, and the Muslims do likewise.[118]

My ambition is that the evacuees on either side should return to their homes in honour and safety. I, for one, shall not like to live to witness the perpetuation of the present unnatural condition.[119]

There can be no rest for this unhappy land unless every Hindu and [every] Sikh returns with honour and in safety to the West Punjab and every Muslim refugee to the Union, barring, of course, those who do not choose to do so for reasons of their own. The sin of mass exchange of population must be washed out if we are to live as peaceful and helpful neighbours.[120]

XI. India-Pakistan Relations

1 TREATMENT OF MINORITIES

Friendship despite partition

I am told that the Hindus in Eastern Bengal fear that, now that the province is divided into two, the Hindus of Western Bengal will forget them and that the Hindus of East Bengal will be weakened. I can never understand such fears. All are Indians first and last, wherever they live and to whatever creed or province they belong. Religion is entirely a personal matter. Each one can approach his Creator as he likes. But the poison of separatism has gone deep into the soil. When I was in Noakhali, I was just as much at home there as elsewhere. And are the Muslims of East Bengal and the Hindus of Bihar, for example, always going to behave as madmen? I am never going to subscribe to such a fear. I want to reiterate that, while I do not like division, it is at the moment a *fait accompli* and you have to face up to it. But it is always possible by correct conduct to lessen an evil and, eventually, even to bring good out of evil. In spite of the division, the people of Eastern and Western Bengal are going to be Bengalis and speak the same language. The Hindus of Western Bengal must live as friends with the Muslims there. If they do, the Muslims of Eastern Bengal will certainly reciprocate the friendship with their Hindu brothers. None must look upon the other as his enemy. Only such action can drive out fear. Western Bengal is better able to help the Hindus in East Bengal because the Government of West Bengal is in their hands.[1]

Protection of minorities

I cannot understand a Pakistan where no non-Muslim can live in peace and security, nor a Hindustan where the Muslims are unsafe.[2]

We should trust his [Jinnah Saheb's] word and believe that no harm will come to the non-Muslims in that part of India, as none will befall the Muslims in the Indian Union. Now we have two States in India. Therefore, I think that each will have to be responsible to the other for the due protection of the minorities.[3]

No one has asked me to agree [that the minorities should quit their respective Dominions]. But I should oppose any such movement. There is no occasion to distrust the majority in either Dominion. And in any case, now that there are two sovereign States in India, each has to ensure the proper treatment of the minorities in the other.

Let us hope that such a contingency will never arise. I hold, too, that every right carries with it a duty, better still, there is no right which does not flow from duty duly performed.[4]

Why does not Pakistan plead with the Hindus and the Sikhs and ask them not to leave their homes and ensure their safety in every way? Why cannot they in the Indian Union ensure the safety of every Muslim?

Today both the parties appear to have gone crazy. The result can be nothing but destruction and misery.[5]

The fear of the Hindus and the Sikhs in Pakistan is a very sad reflection on the Government there and contrary to the assurance of protection given to the minorities by the Quaid-i-Azam himself. It is the bounden duty of the majority in Pakistan, as of the majority in the Union, to protect the small minority whose honour and life and property are in their hands.[6]

I have seen a deputation of the Hindus and the Sikhs from Rawalpindi as also from Dera Gazi Khan. The Hindus and the Sikhs have made Rawalpindi what it is. They were all well off there. Today they are refugees without shelter. This hurts me deeply. Who has made modern Lahore as it is if not the Hindus and the Sikhs? They are exiles from their own lands. Similarly, the Muslims have not a little to do with the making of Delhi. Thus, all communities have worked together to make India what it was on the 15th of August last. I have no doubt that the Pakistan authorities should assure full protection to the remaining Hindus and Sikhs in every part of Pakistan. It is equally the duty of the two Governments to demand such protection for their minorities.[7]

Minority rights

I cannot understand the misgivings of the Musalmans in that Murshidabad and Malda went to West Bengal, nor can I understand the misgivings of the Hindus in Khulna and Gopalganj and of the Buddhists in the Chittagong Hill tracts. For, in view of the friendship professed by all the parties, there is not the slightest occasion for entertaining any fear. Surely, there will be no compulsion used against the minorities in either part of Bengal. The minorities will enjoy equal rights with the majorities.[8]

My one aim with respect to the Hindu-Muslim question is that the solution will be complete only when the minority, whether in the Indian Union or Pakistan, feels

perfectly safe even if they are in the minority of one. There will be no favoured and no depressed community anywhere. All should forget their religious affiliations. I am working to this end. I am working in such a manner that the majority community in each State should go forward and create the necessary conditions of freedom.[9]

The Muslim leaders in East Bengal have to produce conditions which will inspire the minority community with confidence. It is in the interests of all concerned to work for peace. If Pakistan will be a purely Muslim State and the Indian Union a purely Hindu and Sikh State, with no rights for the minorities on either side, it will mean ruin for both the States. I hope and pray that God will give them the wisdom to steer clear of the danger.[10]

No expulsion

To drive every Muslim from India and to drive every Hindu and Sikh from Pakistan will mean war and eternal ruin for the country. If such a suicidal policy is followed in both the States, it will spell the ruin of Islam and Hinduism in Pakistan and the Union. Good alone can beget good. Love breeds love. As for revenge, it behoves man to leave the evil-doer in God's hands. I know no other way.[11]

There must be consistency between one’s thoughts, words and actions. Driving away the minority community or ill treating them does not fit in with the profession of Ahimsa. Independence does not mean that people can act in any way they like. Can anyone pray for and work for the freedom to commit murders and tell lies? That will be surrender to Satan instead of God.[12]

Unless the Dominions turn a new leaf, both are doomed. The trouble has no doubt started in West Pakistan, but some parts of the Indian Union have resorted to retaliation. The question, therefore, of time and extent is now beside the point. If either Dominion behaves correctly, the other will follow suit and both will be saved.[13]

2 NON-MUSLIM MINORITIES IN PAKISTAN

Muslim attitude

What will be the state of Hindus under Pakistan? Will they be suppressed as barbarians? There is no attempt in the papers at looking at the other side. The policy adopted in the papers must lead to the promotion of bitterness and strife between the two communities. If the end is to be attained through strife and force and not by persuasion and argument, I can have nothing to say. But I observe from Quaid-i-Azam's speeches that he has no quarrel with the Hindus. He wants to live at peace with them. I plead, therefore, for a juster estimate of men and things in papers representing the policy and programme of the Muslim League.[14]

Dire situation

The Quaid-i-Azam says, 'All minorities will be safe in Pakistan.' There is already Muslim Raj in the Punjab and Bengal and Sindh. But does it augur well for future peace if things happen in these provinces as threatened? [15]

If they did not mean it, they should say so and openly tell all the Hindus in the Muslim majority areas to quit. But that is not their position as I understand it. The Quaid-i-Azam has said that the minorities in Pakistan will get unadulterated justice in Pakistan. Where is that justice? Today the Hindus ask me if Noakhali is an indication of what they are to expect in Pakistan.[16]

Minority rights

He [Quaid-i-Azam Jinnah] had further said: "We must prove politically that we are brave, generous and trustworthy ... that in the Pakistan areas the minorities will enjoy the fullest security of life, property and honour just as the Musalmans themselves, nay, even greater." I should like you to ponder over this statement, if on examination you find that my quotation is correct.[17]

I had said that it is open even to one province to vindicate its position and become wholly independent of the British Power. Thus, supposing that following the prescription Bengal alone became truly and completely independent, there will be complete Pakistan of my definition in Bengal. Islam is nothing if it does not spell complete democracy. Therefore, there will be one man one vote and one woman one vote irrespective of religion. Naturally, therefore, there will be a true Muslim

majority in the province. Has not Jinnah Saheb declared that in Pakistan minorities will, if possible, be even better off than the majority? Therefore, there will be no underdog. If Pakistan means anything more, I do not know, and if it does, so far as I know, it will make no appeal to my reason.[18]

['Where are people to go if they are afraid to live as a minority in any place?'] The whole of India is open to them—will be my reply—only they must not be beggars wherever they go.[19]

Is Pakistan to be seized by terrorism such as they seem to be witnessing in the Frontier Province, in the Punjab, in Sindh and elsewhere? [20]

The fear that has seized the Hindus of Sindh is an ominous beginning. Even if the allegations [about the sufferings and fears of the Muslim minority in the U. P.] are proved true, there will be no justification for similar treatment in Sindh as Sindh's misdeeds will be none in the U.P.[21]

This is a sad state of affairs. In the Union also Pandit Jawaharlalji and the Sardar have said that they will give protection to the Muslims and they do not want a single Muslim to leave the Union out of fear. What I have told you about Panipat yesterday shows that they cannot have that assurance implemented to the full. If that is the state of affairs in the Union, what can I say to Pakistan? The Harijans of Sindh, I am told, want to come away, but are not allowed to do so. They are forced to do Bhangi's work, even when they are not used to such work. If true, it is wholly wrong. The Pakistan Government should not act in a way that may leave a permanent sore spot on the Sikh and the Hindu mind. Those Harijans who want to leave Sindh should be given facilities to do so. No one can be forced to do Bhangi's work. Today a Harijan can choose any profession for himself. Shri Jagjivanramji has said that the Harijans should come away from Pakistan. But while they remain there, they should be allowed to live honourably. All conversions, even when they are said to be voluntary, should be considered null and void in both the Dominions.[22]

Non-Muslims in Sindh

What I have said about Bahawalpur applies equally to Sindh too. From the reports which I have received, it seems clear that no Hindu or, for that matter, any non-Muslim can today remain in Sindh, and feel safe. Even educational institutions are

being requisitioned and respectable, well-to-do people are being asked to vacate their premises to make room for in-coming "refugees" from the Union. Members of the so-called depressed classes are not permitted to leave Sindh. I would appeal to Quaid-i-Azam Jinnah and the Prime Minister of Sindh and his Cabinet to remedy this state of affairs. All those who want to go out of Sindh should be free to do so. That is the only way of retaining or regaining the confidence of the minorities. With the return of normal conditions in Sindh, even those who have gone away might feel like returning to their homes. Compulsion, on the other hand, will have just the opposite effect and defeat its purpose.[23]

We all know of the happenings in Karachi. Although many people have said that Sindh is quiet and people can continue to stay there, I have my doubts. My fears have come true. Not only the Hindus and Sikhs, but other non-Muslims also are not safe in Sindh today. The Pakistan Government has said that they have been powerless to prevent the disturbances, but they are trying to suppress them as fast as they can. My advice to the Pakistan Government and to the Union Government is that, if they are powerless to prevent the outbreak of violence, they should resign. They may make things worse for a while, but ultimately they will improve. The only condition on which they should continue to hold the reins is that things should begin to improve, however slowly. There should be no setback.[24]

No evacuation

I have supported the proposition [evacuation of the Hindus from the affected areas if the League Government or the majority community agrees to give them due compensation] from the non-violent standpoint. It is applicable to all provinces whether the majority is Hindu or Muslim. What can the Government do if the majority has become so hostile that they will not tolerate the presence of the minority community? In my opinion, it will be improper for them to force the majority into submission, nor can they undertake to protect the minority at the point of the bayonet. Suppose, for instance, that the majority will not tolerate Ramadhun or the clapping [to keep time to the chant], will not listen to the fact that Rama is not a person but the name is synonymous with God, and that the Hindus believe in clapping; suppose further that the Muslims will not tolerate that, I have then no hesitation in saying that the majority should evacuate if adequate compensation is paid. [25]

Repentance far past

I am glad that many Hindus in Bihar have publicly expressed their regret for the shameful deeds done by the Hindus and assured me that such deeds will not be repeated. I shall appeal to the Muslim leaders likewise to ask their fellow Muslims in the Muslim majority provinces not to try to wipe out the non-Muslims. Whatever provocative language the Hindus and the Sikhs used in the Punjab—I am told that they have done so—that is no reason whatsoever for the orgy of cruelty perpetrated by mad Muslims in areas where they are in the majority.[26]

I miss in the Quaid-i-Azam's fervent appeal for funds for the Muslim evacuees from the Union any reference to the misdeeds of the Muslims in Pakistan. I plead for a frank and bold acknowledgment by the respective Governments of the misdeeds of their majorities.[27]

Mutual confidence

After all, wherever you live, you have to live by creating mutual goodwill and friendly relations with your neighbours. Even the Quaid-i-Azam once said that in the Pakistan areas the majority must so behave as to win the confidence of the minority. In the same manner, I am urging upon the Hindus here [in Bihar] to win your confidence. Either Pakistan or Hindustan, whichever is established, it must be based on justice and fairplay.[28]

People have suggested that everything will be all right and non-Muslims in the Muslim majority provinces will be put on absolute equality with the Muslims, if not specially favoured as against them. I suggest that it is an impossible dream. If the Muslims are taught otherwise while Pakistan is not established, they cannot be expected to behave better after Pakistan has become a settled fact. It is up to the Quid-i-Azam and his lieutenants to inspire trust in the minds of the minorities in the provinces or parts which are designed for Pakistan. Then there will no longer be fear of Pakistan-cum-partition.[29]

How happy I shall be if I can be told truly that the information ['that the difference in Muslim behaviour is undoubtedly there, but for the worse.'] is coloured or that it is wholly wrong and that the fact is that the Muslims are going out of their way to fraternize with the Hindus, the Sikhs and the other non-Muslims!...

I hope that I have no fear of any man, much less of Pakistan, for I fear only God. Therefore, I have no hesitation in saying to you that you should have no fear about your own safety because the area which you occupy is to be part of Pakistan. My assurance, however, cannot produce much or any effect on you. You are frightened like most of the other non-Muslims who have to be in Pakistan. In reality, therefore, it is not I but Jinnah Saheb and other Muslim leaders of the League who have to give convincing assurances to all the frightened non-Muslims and dispel their fears.[30]

What then are they to do, the Hindus and the Sikhs and the other non-Muslims in Pakistan? They will not anticipate evil and leave their homes for fear of evil overtaking them. I should give the Muslim fellow countrymen credit for common honesty and human behaviour. There are *mandirs* and *gurudwaras* in the Pakistan areas. Are they to be demolished? Is admission to them to be forbidden to the Hindus, the Sikhs and the others? I cannot bring myself to entertain any such fear. Taking the contrary example, one of the finest Juma Masjids in the world is in the Indian Union, the Taj is there, the Aligarh University is there. Does the partition make the slightest difference in the Muslims approaching these great places and many others I can name? I think not.[31]

Rehabilitation of minorities

I cannot rest in peace till every Muslim and Hindu and Sikh in India and Pakistan is rehabilitated in his own home. What is to become of the Juma Masjid, the biggest mosque in India, or of the Nankana Saheb or Punja Saheb if no Muslim can live in Delhi or India, and no Sikh live in Pakistan? Are these sacred places to be turned to other purposes? Never.[32]

Freedom for all

If Pakistan means independence only to the Muslims in the Muslim majority provinces and vice versa, it is summarily rejected. Happily not one Muslim leader, certainly not the Quaid-i-Azam, has ever given that meaning. Are the Hindus in Bihar to be independent and the Muslims helots? Or are the Hindus to be helots in Bengal? I hope not.[33]

I have read in the *Morning News* that Quaid-i-Azam Jinnah has said that Pakistan cannot be established through force. He has also said that in Pakistan there will be perfect freedom and safety for the minorities.[34]

Jinnah Saheb has rebuked his followers for calling him *Shahanshah-e-Pakistan* (Emperor of Pakistan) and he has said that in Pakistan the minorities will get a square deal. If he lives up to what he has said, things will go right. Having got what they want, they are expected to live in peace with their non-Muslim fellow countrymen. In Pakistan they have to assure religious freedom and equal rights for all. Why should the Hindus in Sindh, for instance, be unable to live there in peace and security? If a single Hindu left Sindh, the Muslims should plead with him and welcome him back. To the Hindus I would say that they should shed all fear. No one can force them to change their religion or status.[35]

We should remember that the Muslim League is fighting for a political objective viz., the establishment of Pakistan. The rest of India is against the vivisection; its aim is to preserve India undivided. Whatever the cause actuating the parties, they, the British Government, the Congress, the League and the Sikhs, ultimately accepted partition of India. Having got Pakistan, Quaid-i-Azam Jinnah says that in Pakistan there is equality of treatment for all, Muslims and all minorities, the Congress claiming likewise.[36]

It is up to the Government today in power and the Quaid-i-Azam to see to it that all the Hindus and the Sikhs are as safe there as the Muslims.[37]

To secure justice for the Hindus and the Sikhs is the function of the Government of Pakistan. The people can make the Government do their will.[38]

Respect for flag

That [Pakistan] flag has not yet come into being. Probably it will be the same as the Muslim League flag. If it is identified with Islam, it must have a flag which is common to all Muslims of the World and it should command the universal respect of all who are not inimical to Islam. I know of no such flag either for Islam, Christianity, Hinduism or any other faith. Not being a student of history I am subject to correction. If the Pakistan flag, whatever its design, represents all its inhabitants equally,

irrespective of religion, it will command my salute as it should yours. In other words, the Dominions must not be enemies one of the other.[39]

This [what the Hindus are to do if asked to join the Army] is a difficult question to answer in the present state of things. Almost every Muslim is a suspect in the Union and every Hindu or Sikh likewise in Pakistan, West or East. If there is a hearty invitation, I would advise joining the body, assuming, of course, that the terms are equal and there is no interference with one's religion. If there is no such invitation, I should, for the time being, submit to the exclusion without harbouring any resentment.[40]

Pakistan is proud of being the biggest Islamic power in the world. But they [the Pakistanis] cannot be proud of themselves unless they ensure justice to every single Hindu and Sikh in that State.[41]

It will not redound to the credit of Pakistan if it is made impossible for non-Muslims to remain in it as free citizens and they can remain there only as serfs and helots.[42]

Protection of minorities

This question [as to what would be the plight of the minorities in Sindh in the case of a partition of India] is to be fought out in the Constituent Assembly, but I am certain that all protection that is humanly possible will be stipulated for. You must not be weaklings.[43]

I adhere to my statement [that Jinnah Saheb's assurances about the protection of the minorities in Pakistan would be valued according to the corresponding deeds of the Muslims in Pakistan], and hold that it carries no reflection. I have said the same of the Viceroy and the Congress Ministers.[44]

There are two ways of protecting the minorities in Pakistan. The best way is that Quaid-i-Azam Jinnah and his Ministers should inspire the minorities with confidence as to their safety so that they may not have to look to the sister Dominion. It is up to the Pakistan authorities to keep the vacated properties in trust for the evacuees. Surely, there should be no forcible conversions nor abductions. Even a little girl, Muslim or Hindu, should feel perfectly safe in the Union or in Pakistan. And there should be no attack on anyone's religion.[45]

Dedicated to minorities

My non-violence bids me dedicate myself to the service of the minorities. It would be like a new birth and give me additional strength if the Hindus and the Musalmans of both these places began to live at peace with each other and shed their animosity. God knows what will come out of this travail. Man can only try and perish in the attempt. God is all in all. We are only zeroes. The same mission takes me to Delhi. I hope to return within a short time and resume duty.[46]

I am [not] indifferent to the sufferings of the minority community in the other Dominion [Pakistan]. On the contrary, their sufferings only accentuate my impatience. I would have liked to be able to go to their succour—in Sindh, in the Western Punjab, in the N.W.F.P. But with what face, with what confidence can I go there when I cannot guarantee full redress to the Delhi Muslims? I feel helpless, and helplessness I have never put up with in all my life.[47]

"Some members of the Muslim League are openly saying that they will not be content with the truncated Pakistan that has been secured. Their eyes are on Delhi, Agra, Ajmer, Aligarh. Some even dream of dominating the whole of India. It is a vain dream; yet, what guarantee is there that the Muslims in the Union of India will not use their energies and influence towards the realization of that dream? Is it right on the part of the Congress governments to take the risk of trusting them?"

The Congress governments cannot discriminate against anyone on grounds of religion. My eldest son has often come to me saying, 'I will be good in future. I will not touch wine.' I tell him, 'Though I do not trust you, I shall give you a chance.' He has not been able to keep to his word so far. Yet, if he comes again, I will not turn him out and I shall hope that he will be good as his word, until I know he has come back only to deceive me. We must trust the Muslims in the same way and, at the same time, be vigilant.

You must not act on suspicion...The world cannot go on without trust. The minorities must realize that they have to be loyal to the State under which they live. If they prove unworthy, the State can take necessary action. But you must not prejudge them. Why die before death? Yes ["We must, however, be prepared to fight the danger."]. The real preparation lies in purging ourselves of our inherent weaknesses—selfishness and disunity.[48]

3 MUSLIM MINORITY IN INDIA

"**How** are we [the Hindus] to behave towards the Muslims in the Union in view of the atrocities committed by them in many places? It has become difficult to trust the Muslims we meet—and how are we to ensure the protection of the non-Muslims in Pakistan?" I have, I hope, answered the question more than once.

Minorities in the Union

Yet evidently the answer bears repetition. India is equally the home of the Hindus and the non-Hindus. All religions are on their trial. I have already confessed my own mistake. I had imagined that the weak can be non-violent. It is not so. If we can shed our cowardice, the Muslims will recognize their bravery and will cease to worry them. In the Union we are, therefore, bound to treat all with equal regard. In the absence of this bravery which non-violence alone gives, we have the law of revenge—division of the army may well mean a graphic lesson in this law. The division rendered the army weak, if not useless, as an effective defence against foreign aggression. I have shown how, if we do not take care, India may even have to pass through military dictatorship. Is it to be the fate of India to win freedom with one hand and lose it with the other? The Dutch seem to be trying to deprive Indonesia of her freedom. Whatever their previous faults, the British are leaving India of their own accord. A fratricidal war is bound to result in the loss of this freedom. If we act correctly in the Indian Union, no one will dare touch the non-Muslims in Pakistan, however small their number may be. It is, therefore, a good sign that the leaders of both the communities have made a statement that they will accept the decision of the Boundary Commission whatever it is. They have also said that the minorities and even erstwhile political opponents will be quite safe in either part of India. Correct conduct requires that we should believe what they have said till proved otherwise.[49]

The non-Pakistani Muslims are all the dearer to me. They are not to look to Pakistan for the safety of their honour, person and property. Such a thing would be, a shame for us of the Union. Sanatana Hindu Dharma is not circumscribed like the proverbial frog in the well. It is as broad as the ocean. Thus interpreted, it is the property of all mankind, no matter by what name it is called. A Malayali commentator of the great epic the Mahabharata has, in my opinion, correctly called it the history of mankind. But be it as it may, the word Hindu is not derived from Sanskrit. The foreigners called

the inhabitants on this side of the river Sindhu Hindus. We have adopted the title. Manu is not the name of any one man. It is an equivalent of Adam, the first man. The Law of Manu is known as Manava Dharma Shastra (the Law for Mankind). It is given by the first man under inspiration. One can only guess as to how many of the *shlokas* are the original work of Manu and how many are interpolations. Dr. Bhagavandas has pointed out certain interpolations. The Arya Samaj looks upon certain others as such. There has been some difference of opinion even on the interpretations. In my opinion, whichever out of them appeals to the head and heart of the wise is the law for mankind. There is, therefore, always room for addition or subtraction. The *shlokas* looked upon as interpolations are the result of the efforts, successful or unsuccessful, of the reformers in different ages. Such a law belongs to all mankind. It does not permit of discrimination on grounds of caste and class. It knows no distinctions between the Hindus, the Muslims and the others. "This is mine and that is someone else's is the calculation of narrow minds," is one of the pearls of wisdom. [50]

Now that the struggle for Pakistan and *Akhand* Hindustan is over, we must settle down to the reality that in each State Hindus and Musalmans have to live together as common citizens. If any of them still swears by the past, it will not help but hinder us in our forward march. We have to accept facts and try to convert every citizen into a worthy member of either State. If we treat the Musalmans in the Indian Union as aliens who have fought for Pakistan and try to keep them in subjection, we will only succeed in proving our political bankruptcy. Today they are no less citizens of the Union than anyone else. The Musalmans have accepted the fact of their Indian citizenship; and as proof of that, everyone of them, from Mr. Suhrawardy downwards, has been lustily shouting *Jai Hind.*[51]

No copying Pakistan

I do not propose that the Indian Union Government should ignore the ill treatment of the Hindus and the Sikhs in Pakistan. They are bound to do their utmost to save them. But the answer is undoubtedly not that they are to drive away the Muslims and copy the reputed methods of Pakistan. Those who wish to go to Pakistan of their own free will should be safely conducted to the border. To ensure the safety of the Hindus and the Sikhs in Pakistan is the duty of the Indian Union Government. But, for that the Government should be given a free hand and should receive the full and sincere co-

operation of every Indian. It is no co-operation for the citizen to take the law into his own hands.[52]

Dealing with traitors

It is rather late in the day to tell me that non-violence cannot work in politics. In politics we cannot begin with distrust. Those in charge of the Government are men of great courage and self-sacrifice. They will deal with traitors when the occasion comes. Traitors may be found in any community and not only among the Muslims. You have decided to live with the Muslims as brothers and I want you to stick to your resolve. All Leaguers are not bad. You should report against those who indulge in questionable activities and let the Government deal with them as severely as it likes. You must on no account take the law into your own hands. This will be barbarous.[53]

4 POST-PARTITION RELATIONS

Seeing that India is cut into two, we have to consider our conduct accordingly. Unfortunately it has become the fashion nowadays to act as if we are enemies one of the other. I cannot subscribe to any such belief. [54]

Settlement of differences

I am wedded to non-violence for all time and can never advocate war. In a State run by me there will be no police and no military. But I am not running the Government of the Indian Union. I have merely pointed out the various possibilities. India and Pakistan should settle their differences by mutual consultations and failing that, fall back upon arbitration. But if one party persists in wrong doing and will accept neither of the two ways mentioned above, the only way left open is that of war. You should know the circumstances that prompt my remark. In almost all my prayer speeches in Delhi, I have to tell the people not to take the law into their own hands, but let their Government secure justice for them. I put before them the logical steps which exclude lynch law. The latter will make decent government impossible. That does not mean that my faith in non-violence has weakened in the least degree.[55]

No war

It is true that there should be no war between the two Dominions. They have to live as friends or die as such. The two will have to work in close co-operation. In spite of being independent of each other, they will have many things in common. If they are enemies, they can have nothing in common. If there is genuine friendship, the people of both the States can be loyal to both. They are both members of the same Commonwealth of Nations. How can they become enemies of each other? [56]

Persistent wrong-doing

If Pakistan persists in wrong doing, there is bound to be war between India and Pakistan.[57]

If India and Pakistan are to be perpetual enemies and go to war against each other, it will ruin both the Dominions and their hard-won freedom will be soon lost. I do not wish to live to see that day.[58]

I have been an opponent of all warfare. But if there is no other way of securing justice from Pakistan, if Pakistan persistently refuses to see its proved error and continues to

minimize it, the Indian Union Government will have to go to war against it. War is not a joke. No one wants war. That way lies destruction. But I can never advise anyone to put up with injustice. If all the Hindus are annihilated for a just cause, I shall not mind it. If there is a war, the Hindus in Pakistan cannot be fifth columnists there. No one will tolerate that. If their loyalty lies not with Pakistan, they should leave it. Similarly, the Muslims whose loyalty is with Pakistan should not stay in the Indian Union.

As for myself, my way is different. I worship God, which is Truth and Ahimsa...

Pakistani 'dreams'

Some dream of converting the whole of India to Islam. That never will happen through war. Pakistan can never destroy Hinduism. The Hindus alone can destroy themselves and their faith. Similarly, if Islam is destroyed, it will be destroyed by the Muslims in Pakistan, not by the Hindus in Hindustan.[59]

Possibility of war

My reference to the possibility of a war between the two sister Dominions seems, I am told, to have produced a scare in the West. I do not know what reports were sent outside by newspaper correspondents. Summaries are always a dangerous enterprise except when they truly reflect the speaker's opinion...

I hold that not a single mention of war in my speeches can be interpreted to mean that there was any incitement to or approval of war between Pakistan and the Union unless mere mention of it is to be taboo. We have among us the superstition that the mere mention of a snake ensures its appearance in the house in which the mention is made even by a child. I hope no one in India entertains such superstition about war.

I claim that I rendered a service to both the sister States by examining the present situation and definitely stating when the cause of war could arise between the two States. This was done not to promote war but to avoid it as far as possible. I endeavoured, too, to show that if the insensate murders, loot and arson by people continued, they would force the hands of their Governments. Was it wrong to draw public attention to the logical steps that inevitably followed one after another? [60]

I am convinced that, if the Hindus and the Muslims continue to be enemies of one another, it is bound to lead to war, which will mean the ruin of both the Dominions.[61]

It is the duty of both the Governments to act correctly and in co-operation. If this desirable thing does not happen, the logical result will be war. I am the last person to advocate it. But I know that Governments which possess arms and armies cannot act in any other way. Any such procedure will mean annihilation.[62]

In the event of a war between the Union and Pakistan, the Muslims of the Indian Union should be prepared to fight against Pakistan.[63]

Duty of Indian Muslims

It is undoubtedly true that the possibility of a war between the two States should not be discussed by way of a joke. The adverb 'even' does not fit in. For, if the possibility be a reality, it would be a duty to discuss it. It might be folly not to do so.

It is my firm opinion that the rule that applies to the Muslims of the Union must in the same circumstances apply to the Hindus and other non-Muslims of Pakistan. I have expressed this view in my after-prayer speeches as also in my talks with friends here.

Of course, behind the opinion lies a train of reasoning. Loyalty cannot be evoked to order. If circumstances do not warrant it, it may be said to be impossible to achieve. There is a large number of people who do not believe in the possibility of such genuine loyalty and hence laugh out my opinion. Surely, there is nothing to laugh at in conceiving such a possibility. The Muslims of the Union will fight those of Pakistan when they regard it as a duty, in other words, when it is clear to them that they are being fairly treated in the Union and that the non-Muslims are nor so treated in Pakistan. Such a state is not beyond the range of possibility.

Similarly, if the non-Muslims of Pakistan clearly feel that they are being fairly treated there and that they can reside there in safety and yet the Hindus of the Union maltreat the minorities, the minorities of Pakistan will naturally fight the majority in the Union. Then the minorities will not need any argument to induce them to do their duty...

It has been repeatedly asked whether in the event of a war between the two, the Muslims of the Union will fight against the Muslims of Pakistan and the Hindus of one against those of the other. However unlikely it may appear at present, there is nothing inherently impossible in the conception. There is any day more risk in distrusting the profession of loyalty than in trusting it and courageously facing the danger of trusting. The question can be more convincingly put in this way: Will the Hindus ever fight the

Hindus and the Muslims their co-religionists for the sake of truth and justice? It can be answered by a counter question: Does not history provide such instances?

In solving the puzzle, the great stumbling block in the way is that truth is at a discount. Let us hope that in this holocaust some there are who will stand firm in their faith in the victory of truth.[64]

I would like to impress on the leaders of Pakistan that partition having been conceded, there is no justification for animosity. Partition is demanded on religio-communal grounds and it is, therefore, the duty of Pakistan, as its name implies, to remain clean in all its dealings. Both Hindus and Muslims have resorted to cruel acts and made grievous blunders, but that does not mean that this mad race should go on, culminating in war. A war will bring both the Dominions under the sway of a third power and nothing can be worse.[65]

'Pakistan the 'pure'

You have heard of the cowardly attack on the Sikhs in Karachi. Innocent men, women and children were butchered and looted and others have had to flee. Now comes the news of an attack on a refugee train at Gujarat. The train was carrying non-Muslim refugees from the Frontier Province. Large numbers are reported to have been killed and women abducted. It distresses me. How long can the Union put up with such things? How long can I bank upon the patience of the Hindus and the Sikhs in spite of my fast? Pakistan has to put a stop to this state of affairs. They must purify their hearts and pledge themselves that they will not rest till the Hindus and the Sikhs can return and live in safety in Pakistan.

Supposing that there is a wave of Self-purification throughout India, Pakistan will become *pak* [pure]. It will be a State in which past wrongs will have been forgotten, past distinctions will have been buried, the least and the smallest in Pakistan will command the same respect and the same protection of life and property that the Quaid-i-Azam enjoys. Such Pakistan can never die. Then and not till then shall I repent that I ever called it a sin, as I am afraid I must hold today, it is. I want to live to see that Pakistan, not on paper, not in the orations of Pakistani orators, but in the daily life of every Pakistani Muslim. Then the inhabitants of the Union will forget that there ever was any enmity between them, and if I am not mistaken the Union will proudly copy Pakistan, and if I am alive, I shall ask her to excel Pakistan in well-doing...

Then, though legally and geographically we may still be two States, in daily life no one will think that we were separate States. The vista before me seems to me to be, as it must be to you, too glorious to be true. Yet like a child in a famous picture, drawn by a famous painter, I shall not be happy till I have got it. I live and want to live for no lesser goal. Let the seekers from Pakistan help me to come as near the goal as it is humanly possible. A goal ceases to be one when it is reached. The nearest approach is always possible. What I have said holds good irrespective of whether others do it or not. It is open to every individual to purify himself or herself so as to render him or her fit for that land of promise.[66]

New chapter

There should be complete forgetting of the past if there is a thorough, inward cleansing. I have noticed with much pain that each Dominion accuses the other of bad faith. If they are to give a good account of themselves, this thing has to stop.[67]

Let us permit ourselves to hope that, though geographically and politically India is divided into two, at heart we shall ever be friends and brothers helping and respecting one another and be one for the outside world.[68]

XII. Communal Relations in Free India

1 THE COMING OF INDEPENDENCE

Observance of Independence Day

If the Congress decides on celebrations on August 15th, those who feel like joining must join in them. Congress, as a democratic organization, is never going to force anyone to do anything against his or her wishes.[1]

Prayer, introspection

This much I certainly believe, that the coming 15th August should be no day for rejoicing whilst the minorities contemplate the day with a heavy heart. It must be a day, for prayer and deep heart-searching. There is one condition on which it might become a day of universal rejoicing in spite of the two divisions. Let both [Hindus and Muslims] try from now onwards to become true friends so that they are ready on the 15th August to give themselves to rejoicing. This, however, is an opinion confined to me alone.[2]

The 15th instant is to be a landmark in India's history. It is a day when India will be declared free of the foreign yoke. It is to be an independent nation. I have said how the day is to be observed, but I am probably alone in the view. Already there is an announcement that the Muslims of Calcutta are to observe it as a day of mourning. I hope that it is not true. No man can be compelled to observe the day in a particular manner. It is to be a perfectly voluntary act. I would ask my Muslim countrymen not to mourn over the freedom. The present distemper is to go.[3]

Tomorrow is the fixed day of deliverance from the foreign yoke. It is, therefore, a great day. You are bound to celebrate it. In my opinion, it is a day when both the Dominions are to shoulder a heavy burden. I invite everyone to have a twenty-four hours' fast and prayer during the day for the well-being of India as a whole and pass it in spinning as much as possible. For, it is hand-spinning that has knit the poor and the rich together and that has given occupation to countless men and women who are without occupation.[4]

The right flag

What are the Hindus in Pakistan to do? They should salute the Pakistan flag if it means the freedom and equality of all in every respect, irrespective of caste, colour or creed.[5]

It should not matter that, on the 15th, the day is celebrated according to the national division. If I had been consulted, I would have advised non-celebration because of the state of uncertainty. But having by mistake flown in the respective places the wrong flag, there should be no hesitation whatsoever in replacing the wrong flag by the right one. But as I have already said, there is no flag [that is] wrong in their Dominion for the simple reason that there is no quarrel left between the parties. Both the Dominions have sincerely professed mutual friendship and mutual regard. Therefore, I would advise the parties to fly the flags of both the Dominions or be equally respectful whichever flag is flown for the time being.[6]

Hope of new order

This day, 26th January, is Independence Day. This observance was quite appropriate when we were fighting for Independence we had not seen nor handled. Now! We have handled it and we seem to be disillusioned. At least I am, even if you are not.

What are we celebrating today? Surely not our disillusionment. We are entitled to celebrate the hope that the worst is over and that we are on the road to showing the lowliest of the villagers that it means his freedom from serfdom and that he is no longer a serf born to serve the cities and towns of India but that he is destined to exploit the city dwellers for the advertisement of the finished fruits of well-thought-out labours, that he is the salt of the Indian earth, that it means also equality of all classes and creeds, never the domination and superiority of the major community over a minor, however insignificant it may be in number or influence. Let us not defer the hope and make the heart sick.[7]

2 RESORT TO FORCE

Eschew force

One thing I must stress that, in both the Dominions of India, the use of force for the assertion of rights must be eschewed altogether if we are to make any progress...
It is the first lesson to be learnt in a democratic, independent India. Our independence is yet only a fortnight old. Liberty never means the licence to do anything at will. Independence means voluntary restraint and discipline, voluntary acceptance of the rule of law in the making of which the whole of India has its hand through its elected representatives. The only force at the disposal of democracy is that of public opinion. Satyagraha, civil disobedience and fasts have nothing in common with the use of force, veiled or open. But even these have restricted use in democracy. They cannot even think of them whilst the Governments are settling down and the communal distemper is still stalking from one province to another.[8]

Surrender unlawful arms

I have been told that the Muslims here [in Delhi] are in possession of arms. They should surrender these at once and the Government here should take no action against them. The Hindus and the Sikhs must do likewise. I have also been told that the West Punjab Government is arming the Muslims. If this is true, it is wholly wrong and would in the long run lead to their own destruction. It should cease forthwith. No one anywhere should have unlicensed arms.[9]

Our independence is a baby of one month and ten days. If we continue the mad career of retaliation, we will kill the baby even in its babyhood.[10]

Respect for law

I am prepared to understand your resentment and consequent impatience. But if you deserve your independence, you will learn to subdue your resentment and trust your Government to do the best. I am not presenting to you my own way of non-violence, much as I would like to, as I know that I am out of court today. I suggest to you the adoption of the path that all democratic nations have adopted. In democracy the individual will is governed and limited by the social will which is the State, which is governed by and for democracy. If every individual takes the law into his own hands, there is no State; it becomes anarchy, i.e., absence of social law or State. That way lies destruction of liberty. Therefore, you should subdue your anger and let the State secure justice.[11]

3 EQUALITY OF ALL

Oneness of man

I believe in absolute oneness of God and, therefore, also of humanity. What though we have many bodies? We have but one soul. The rays of the sun are many through refraction. But they have the same source. I cannot therefore detach myself from the wickedest soul (nor may I be denied identity with the most virtuous). Whether, therefore, I will or no, I must involve in my experiment the whole of my kind. Nor can I do without experiment. Life is but an endless series of experiments.[12]

Break through the crust of limitation and India becomes one family. If all limitations vanish, the whole world becomes one family, which it really is. Not to cross these bars is to become callous to all fine feelings which make a man.[13]

No religious divisions

If a free India is to live at peace with herself, religious divisions must entirely give place to political divisions based on considerations other than religious. Even as it is, though unfortunately religious differences loom large, most parties contain members drawn from various sects.[14]

No privileged class

No privileges should be given to anyone in the new India. It is the poor and neglected and down-trodden and weak that should be our special care and attention. A Brahmana should not grudge it if more money is spent on the uplift of the Harijans. At the same time, a Brahmana may not be done down simply because he is a Brahmana. In fact, the Brahmanas are a very small minority. There must be pure and undefiled justice for everyone in both Pakistan and Hindustan[15]

It is the duty of every citizen to treat the lowliest on a par with the others.[16]

Regard for lowliest

What should we do then? If we would see our dream of Panchayat Raj, i.e., true democracy realized, we would regard the humblest and lowest Indian as being equally the ruler of India with the tallest in the land. This presupposes that all are pure or will become pure if they are not. And purity must go hand-in-hand with wisdom. No one would then harbour any distinction between community and community, caste

and out-caste. Everybody would regard all as equal with oneself and hold them together in the silken net of love. No one would regard another as untouchable. We would hold as equal the toiling labourer and the rich capitalist. Everybody would know how to earn an honest living by the sweat of one's brow and make no distinction between intellectual and physical labour. To hasten this consummation, we would voluntarily turn ourselves into scavengers. No one who has wisdom will ever touch opium, liquor or any intoxicants. Everybody would observe Swadeshi as the rule of life and regard every woman, not being his wife, as his mother, sister or daughter according to her age, never lust after her in his heart. He will be ready to lay down his life when occasion demands it, never want to take another's life.[11]

4 SOCIALISTIC EQUALITY

The economic conflict [after a socialist revolution]... is likely to make the Hindu-Muslim tension less acute. Even the end of the Hindu-Muslim conflict will not end all our troubles. What is happening is this. With the end of slavery and the dawn of independence, all the weaknesses of society are bound to come to the surface. I do not see any reason to be unnecessarily upset about it. If we keep our balance at such a time, every tangle will be solved.

As far as the economic question is concerned, it has to be solved in any case. Today, there is gross economic inequality. The basis of socialism is economic equality. There can be no Ramarajya in the present state of iniquitous inequalities in which a few roll in riches and the masses do not get even enough to eat. I accepted the theory of socialism even while I was in South Africa. My opposition to the socialists and others consists in attacking violence as a means of effecting any lasting reform.[18]

5 FRANCHISE

No communal representation

Independent India cannot afford to have communal representation, and yet it must placate all communities if the rule of Independence is not based on coercion of minorities.[19]

As to the franchise, I swear by the franchise of all adult, males and females, above the age of twenty-one or even eighteen. I shall bar old men like myself. They are of no use as voters. India and the rest of the world does not belong to those who are on the point of dying. To them belongs death, life to the young. Thus I shall have a bar against persons beyond a certain age, say fifty, as I shall against youngsters below eighteen. Of course, I shall debar lunatics and loafers. In India free, I cannot contemplate communal franchise. It must be joint electorate, perhaps with reservation of seats. Nor can I contemplate favouritism for anyone, say Muslims, Sikhs or Parsis, for example.[20]

6 USE OF MILITARY IN CIVIL DISTURBANCES

Communal feuds

Governments can deal with abnormal situations. When quarrels become a normal thing of life, it is called civil war and parties must fight it out themselves. The present Government, being foreign and in reality a veiled military rule, has resources at its command for its protection against any combination we can make and has, therefore, the power, if it has the will, to deal with our class feuds. But no Swaraj Government with any pretension to being a popular Government can possibly be organized and maintained on a war footing. A Swaraj Government means a Government established by the free, joint will of the Hindus, Musalmans and others.[21]

Forces above corruption

Partisan behaviour is attributed to the military and the police. It is sad if it is true. If the custodians of law and order are to become partial and participants in crime, how can law and order be maintained? I appeal to the military and the police to be above prejudice and corruption. They are to be faithful servants of the people irrespective of caste and creed.[22]

The whole world is impressed by the fact that India has achieved independence without bloodshed. We have to be worthy of that independence by our right conduct. Moreover, the military and the police must be incorruptible under independence. No free government can function unless every citizen does his duty by the State. I am not here asking you to take to non-violence. I merely plead for correct conduct irrespective of non-violence. I warn you that, unless you pay attention to my words, you will have to repent afterwards.[23]

Protection of minorities

Just as the Press is a powerful arm of the State, so are the military and the police. They cannot take sides. The communal division of the military and the police is deplorable. But if the military and the police become communally minded, it will be disastrous. The military and the police are bound, in the Union, to protect the minorities at the cost of their lives. They cannot for one moment afford to neglect this primary duty. I would say the same of the Pakistan military and the police who are bound to protect the minorities there. Whether the latter listen to me or not, if I can make those in the Union do the right thing, I am convinced that Pakistan will have to do likewise.[24]

7 CONDUCT OF THE MAJORITY

Art of living

It is not enough that you acquire the art of reading, writing etc., but it is necessary that you should learn the art of living on friendly terms with your neighbours.

Men should live in co-operation and work for the common good. For this, you should not look up to political parties for direction, but to your own souls or God.[25]

No 'brute' majority

The so-called majority community has no right to impose itself on the others. Might of numbers or of the sword shall not be right. Right is the only true might, appearances to the contrary notwithstanding.[26]

The minorities must be made to realize that they are as much valued citizens of the State they live in as the majority.[27]

...My one aim with respect to the Hindu-Muslim question is that the solution will be complete only when the minority, whether in the Indian Union or in Pakistan feels perfectly safe even if they are in the minority of one. There will be no favoured and no depressed community anywhere. All should forget their religious affiliations. I am working to this end. I am working in such a manner that the majority community in each State should go forward and create the necessary conditions of freedom. [28]

My advice is precise and firm. Its soundness is manifest. Trust your Government to defend every citizen against wrong-doers, however well-armed they may be. Further, trust it to demand and get damages for every member of the minority wrongfully dispossessed. All that neither Government can do is to resurrect the dead.[29]

I have been speaking every day about the vital duty of the Hindus in Western Bengal, who are the majority community, towards their Muslim brethren. This duty they will perform truly, if they are able to forget the past. We know how all over the world enemies have become fast friends. The example of the Britons and the Boers, who fought one another strenuously, becoming friends we all know. There is much greater reason why the Hindus and the Muslims should become friends. We cannot do that if we are not great enough to shed all malice.[30]

Regret far past

The majority community in both the Dominions have to repent for their evil deeds and ask the forgiveness of the minority community. They will then become good neighbours instead of being the enemies they have become. They have won their independence through means that are above board. The world has complimented them for so doing. Let them maintain their independence in the same way. If they said goodbye to goodness, they will not be able to keep their independence.[31]

The Union of India has to show by its action that, no matter what is done in the so-called Pakistan Provinces, the Union Provinces will be strictly just and fair in their treatment of their Muslim brethren. Pakistan should make no difference in their regard for the Muslims as well as the other minorities. This has no reference to the apples of discord which the foreign power has thrown in their midst such as separate electorates.[32]

If the vast bulk of the Hindus want to go in a particular direction, even though it may be wrong, no one can prevent them from doing so. But even a single individual has the right to raise his voice against it and give them warning. This is what I am doing.[33]

No expulsion of Muslims

I cannot associate myself with the contention that India should drive out all its Muslim population to Pakistan as the Muslims of Pakistan are driving out all non-Muslims. Two wrongs cannot make one right. I therefore invite the audience to listen to my advice and act bravely and fearlessly and be proud to live in the midst of a large Muslim population.[34]

After all, four and a half crores of Muslims in India are spread over the length and breadth of the land. The Muslims in the villages are harmless and poor, as in Sevagram. They have no concern with Pakistan. Why turn them out? [35]

Today the spirit of revenge and retaliation fills the atmosphere. The Hindus and the Sikhs in Delhi do not want the Muslims there. If they have been driven away from Pakistan, why should the Muslims have a place in the Indian Union, or in Delhi at least, they argue.[36]

Hakim Ajmal Khan had served Hindus and Muslims alike in Delhi. He had started the Tibbia College, which was opened by me. It will be a shame if the descendants of Hakim Ajmal Khan should have to quit Delhi and the Tibbia College.[37]

[An Arya Samajist friend says that] while the Congress has already committed three blunders, they are now committing a fourth one of the highest magnitude. This lies in their desire to reinstate the Muslims in Hindustan side by side with the Hindus and Sikhs. I say that, while I am not speaking for the Congress, I dare to say that I myself am perfectly prepared to commit the supposed blunder. Supposing Pakistan has gone mad, are we to do likewise? This, indeed, will be a blunder and a crime of the first magnitude. I am sure that when the insanity has died down, you will realize that I was right and you were wrong.[38]

I appeal to you to be true to your religion and to the Congress creed. Has the Congress done anything during the past 60 years to injure the interests of the country? If the Congress has now lost your confidence, you are at liberty to remove Congress Ministers and put other men in power. Only you must not take the law into your own hands.[39]

Am I to tell millions of Muslims in the Indian Union to leave India? Where are they to go? They are not safe in the trains even! It is true that the Hindus are suffering a similar fate in Pakistan. Two wrongs do not make one right. You cannot help the Hindus and the Sikhs in Pakistan by retaliating on the Muslims in the Union.

The public, in this case, representing the majority community (that hateful expression), should rigidly refrain from taking the law into their own hands. If they do not, they will be cutting the very branch on which they are sitting. It will be a fall from which it will be difficult to rise. Let wisdom dawn on them while there is yet time. Let them not be swayed by ugly events even when the report thereof happens to be true. They must trust the representative Ministers to do the needful for the vindication of justice.[40]

Enmity towards the Muslims amounts to enmity towards India. The least I expect you to do is not to take the law into your own hands and commit inhuman acts. This will mean the end of society. You are bound as respectable citizens to leave justice in the hands of your chosen Government. You and your newspapers are never tired of condemning in unmeasured terms the acts of those Americans as barbarous who lynched Negroes. Do similar acts on your part become less barbarous? [41]

The Government

Free India will be no Hindu Raj, it will be Indian Raj based, not on the majority of any religious sect or community, but on the representatives of the whole people without distinction of religion. I can conceive a mixed majority putting the Hindus in a minority. They would be elected for their record of service and merits.[42]

The question [if 'the quiet citizens were to have no voice in shaping the destiny of the country'] is relevant and important. If the Sikhs and the Hindus and the Muslims think themselves to be the only people that matter and that the rights of the other communities are in any way less than their own, they will prove themselves utterly unworthy. The curses of the innocent will destroy them. Such a Government will never be Ramaraj or the Kingdom of Heaven on earth.[43]

Duty of 'caste Hindus'

... In the ocean of Indian humanity and even Hindu humanity, they ['caste Hindus'] are but a microscopic minority if the Shudras are excluded. By "caste Hindus" are generally known Brahmanas, Kshatriyas and Vaishyas. Jinnah Saheb himself excludes the Scheduled Classes from this category and therefore will have to exclude the Shudras. For the wretched caste system has always traduced the Shudras who, together with the Atishudras, make the millions.[44]

I am aware that Quaid-i-Azam Jinnah has rendered a disservice to Islam by calling Hindu or, better still, the caste Hindus "our enemies". I would plead with the so-called caste Hindus not to wear the cap, but unselfishly and bravely prove themselves friends of every Indian because they love India. There is grave danger of insanity proving infective. Pakistan is there. Why will the Quaid-i-Azam not be happy now that he has got it? Or has the poison gone too deep to be brought under control? Is it a variety of, and that worse than the atom bomb? Let those who have eyes see the thing and avoid it well before India is caught in the poisonous coil. [45]

No domination

How is this Union to behave? Already the taunt is being levelled against the Union that the much-maligned caste Hindus... will ostracize the millions of the Scheduled Classes and (I will add) an equal number of Shudras and the so-called aboriginal tribes. And then, what of the other insignificant minorities? The so-called caste Hindus are on

their trial. Will they recognize and do their obvious duty and give place to the least in the Union by affording them all the facilities to rise to the highest status? And what will they do to the Muslim minorities? Will they be regarded as aliens or will they be made to feel that they cannot be treated as aliens in their own land and that they will have all the opportunity that the tallest in the Union enjoy? Heaven forbid that the caste Hindus so behave as to prove Quaid-i-Azam Jinnah's thesis that the Muslims and the Hindus are separate nations. Will they rise to the occasion and by their character, bravery, incorruptibility and toleration prove to the Muslims of Pakistan that in the Union there is no discrimination whatsoever on the ground of religion, caste or colour, and that the only test is merit which every industrious citizen of the Union will have ample opportunity to acquire?[46]

Right action

To the Hindus in the Hindu majority areas I will say that they should do the right thing irrespective of what the Muslims do. Thus only they will be able to disprove Jinnah Saheb's two-nation theory.[47]

If the major partner is true to his salt, the foreshadowed wisdom can be confounded not in the shape of avoiding partition however distasteful it might be, but by right behaviour on the part of the major partner by always acting as one nation, by refusing to treat the Muslim minorities as aliens in their own home.[48]

Every person, as every institution, above all every religion, is to be judged not by the amount of atrocities or the wrong committed by them but by their right conduct. Who will dare say that what I have suggested is less than right? That the Hindus of larger Hindustan cannot or will not do the right is another question. So much the worse for those who do not do the right, no matter whether they are Hindus, Muslims or any other. The law is no respecter of persons. Only, for the occasion, my remarks are addressed to the Hindus. For, it is they who by their action are to prove or disprove the two-nation theory. In this connection I cannot help saying that my advice is meant for brave, unselfish and godly people. Persons and people lose by their own mistakes, never by those of others. Our own sad history is filled with illustrations of how through personal greed, selfishness and cowardice we have lost our liberty.[49]

Good neighbourliness

If all simply insist on rights and no duties, there will be utter confusion and chaos. If instead of insisting on rights everyone does his duty, there will immediately be the rule of order established among mankind... What is the duty of the Hindu towards his Muslim neighbour? His duty is to befriend him as man, to share his joys and sorrows and help him in distress. He will then have the right to expect similar treatment from his Muslim neighbour and will probably get the expected response.

Supposing the Hindus are in a majority in a village with a sprinkling of Muslims in their midst, the duty of the majority towards the few Muslim neighbours is increased manifold, so much so that the few will not feel that their religion makes any difference in the behaviour of the Hindus towards them. The Hindus will *then* earn the right, *not before,* that the Muslims will be natural friends with them and in times of danger both the communities will act as one man. But suppose that the few Muslims do not reciprocate the correct behaviour of the many Hindus and show fight in every action, it will be a sign of unmanliness. What is then the duty of the many Hindus? Certainly not to overpower them by the brute strength of the many; that will be usurpation of an unearned right. Their duty will be to check their unmanly behaviour as they would that of their blood brothers. It is unnecessary for me to dilate further upon the illustration. I will close it by saying that the application will be exactly the same if the position is reversed. From what I have said, it is easy enough to extend the application with profit to the whole of the present state, which has become baffling because people do not apply in practice the doctrine of deriving every right from a prior duty well performed.[50]

Inspire trust

The Quaid-i-Azam has unwittingly placed Hinduism also on its trial. The Hindus have the rare opportunity of refining it of all dross and showing by strict justness that the brand of Hinduism of the Indian Union is the same as universal religion. I have said only yesterday that those who believe in India as a nation can have no minority and majority question. All are entitled to equal privileges and equal treatment. Thus viewed, the Indian Independence Bill can be taken as the final examination of all the parties involved in the Bill. It is possible to turn Pakistan which I have declared an

evil into unadulterated good, if all the forebodings are dispelled and the enmities are turned into friendships and mutual distrust gives place to trust.[51]

There is neither excuse nor extenuation for the majority in Pakistan or Hindustan. If the Hindu majority treasure their religion and duty, they will be just at all cost. They will overlook the limitations or mistakes of the minority who have no one but the majority to look to for justice.[52]

Minorities from other States

"Whether the minorities will have recognition as religious minorities have ...whether Bengalis of Bihar, though a minority, will have recognition..." is a ticklish question. In my opinion, an Indian is a citizen of India enjoying equal rights in every part of India. Therefore, a Bengali has every right in Bihar as a Bihari. But I wish to emphasize that the Bengali must merge in the Bihari. I must never be guilty of exploiting Biharis or feeling a stranger or be having as a stranger in Bihar. If the speaker brings my Gujarat manners to Bengal and imposes himself on the province, I would expect the Bengalis to expel him. I cannot then claim the rights of an Indian as against Bengalis. All rights flow from duties previously and duly performed.[53]

Land of all

The whole of India can be a Pakistan if you look upon every fellow Indian as a brother. If Hindustan means a land only for the Hindus and Pakistan only for the Muslims, Pakistan and Hindustan will then be lands flowing with poison. The land of my dreams is a land watered by rivers of love.[54]

If the Hindus feel that in India there is no place for any one else except Hindus and if non-Hindus, especially Muslims, wish to live here, they have to live as the slaves of the Hindus, they will kill Hinduism. Similarly, if Pakistan believes that in Pakistan only the Muslims have a rightful place and the non-Muslims have to live there on sufferance and as their slaves, it will be the death-knell of Islam in India.[55]

Surely, you will not like to rewrite Congress history and make the Union a Hindu State in which people of other faiths have no place. I hope that you will not stultify yourselves.[56]

There can be nothing more wrong on our part than to hold that Hindustan belongs only to the Hindus and the Muslims can have no place in it, or on the reverse, that

Pakistan belongs to the Muslims only and the Hindus and Sikhs can have no place in it.[57]

Live as brothers

I am proceeding to the Punjab in order to make the Muslims undo the wrong that they are said to have perpetrated there. But I cannot hope for success unless I can secure justice for the Muslims in Delhi. They have lived in Delhi for generations. If the Hindus and the Muslims of Delhi will begin to live as brothers once again, I shall proceed to the Punjab and "do or die" in Pakistan. The condition for success is that those in the Union should keep their hands clean. Hinduism is like an ocean. The ocean never becomes unclean. The same should be true of the Union. It is natural for the Hindus and the Sikhs to feel resentment at what they have suffered. But they should leave it to their Government to secure justice for them.[58]

Join me in the prayer that God will fulfil this dream [that the Hindus, the Muslims and the other Indians will live together as brothers and friends] or take me away and save me from witness in the awful tragedy of one part of India being inhabited by the Muslims only and the other part by the Hindus.[59]

Scrupulous regard for the rights of minorities well becomes a majority. Disregard of them makes of a majority a laughing stock. Robust faith in oneself and brave trust of the opponent, so-called or real, is the best safeguard. Therefore, I plead with all the earnestness at my command that all the Hindus, the Sikhs and the Muslims in Delhi should meet together in friendly embrace and set a noble example to the rest of India, shall I say, to the world? Delhi should forget what other parts of India have done or are doing. Then only will it claim the proud privilege of having broken the vicious circle of private revenge and retaliation. They belong, if they ever do, to the State, never to the citizens as individuals.[60]

8 STATUS OF MUSLIM MINORITY

Loyalty to Union

[Do] not see evil everywhere. All Muslims are not bad just as all Hindus are not bad. It is generally the impure who see impurity in others. It is your duty to see the best and have no fear.[61]

I appeal to the Sikhs, the Hindus and the Muslims to forget the past, not to dwell on their sufferings but to extend the right hand of fellowship to each other and determine to live at peace with each other. Muslims must be proud to belong to the Indian Union, they must salute the tri-colour. If they are loyal to their religion, no Hindu can be their enemy. Similarly, the Hindus and the Sikhs must welcome peace-loving Muslims in their midst.[62]

I am free to confess that I shall lose all interest in life if Muslims who have produced such men [as Hakim Ajmal Khan and Dr. Ansari] cannot live with perfect safety in the Union. It is suggested to me that the Muslims are all fifth columnists in the Union. I decline to believe in this sweeping condemnation. There are four and a half crores of Muslims in the Union. If they are all so bad, they will dig the grave of Islam. The Quaid-i-Azam has asked the Muslims of the Union to be loyal to it. Let people trust their Government to deal with traitors. They must not take the law into their own hands.[63]

Some said to me that every Muslim in the Indian Union is loyal to Pakistan and not to India. I would deny the charge. Muslim after Muslim has come and said the contrary to me. In any event, the majority here need not be frightened of the minority...

As for traitors, if there are any, they can always be dealt with by the law. Traitors are always shot, as happened in the case even of Mr. Amery's son, though I admit that that is not my law.[64]

Surely, it is cowardly on the part of the majority to kill or banish the minority for fear that they will all be traitors.[65]

If the Muslims prove traitors, their treachery will kill them. It is the biggest offence in any State. No State can harbour traitors. But it is unbecoming to turn out men on suspicion.[66]

All Muslims cannot be traitors. Those who prove traitors will be dealt with severely by the Government.[67]

There can be no two opinions that those who wish to live in the Union must be loyal to the Union whatever may be their faith and they should surrender unlicensed arms unsolicited. [A third condition] is to leave the execution of the conditions mentioned by me to the Government.[68]

...A friend has told me that he found a Muslim trader who had proper scales and a Hindu one who had improper scales, and asked me whether it is not true that the Muslim traders are honest and the Hindu traders dishonest. I am sure that the inference is wrong. In this imperfect world no community is wholly honest or dishonest. All I can say is that a man who sports false scales for deceiving his customers is a criminal. But I cannot take it upon myself to condemn the whole group or community.[69]

No wholesale condemnation

To liken a human being, however degraded he may be, to a snake to justify inhuman treatment is surely a degrading performance. To damn crores of human beings for the faults of a few or many belonging to a particular faith seems to me to be the height of madness. The correspondent should also remember that I have known rabidly fanatical Muslims to use the very analogy in respect of Hindus. No Hindu would like to be regarded as a snake.

To treat a man as a brother is not to say that he should be trusted even when he is proved untrustworthy. And is it not a sign of cowardice to kill a man and his family for fear that he may prove untrustworthy? Picture a society in which every man is permitted to judge his fellow. Yet, that is the state to which we are being reduced in some parts of India.

Lastly, let me, for the sake of the snake kind, correct the common error by saying that eighty snakes out of every hundred are perfectly harmless and they render useful service in nature.[70]

[A telegram had] said that 98% of the Muslims are traitors and will betray India in favour of Pakistan at a given moment. I do not believe it. The Muslim masses in the

villages cannot be treacherous. Supposing that they are, they will destroy Islam. If the charge can be proved, the Government will deal with them.[71]

Is there any ground for the suspicion that the Muslims do not regard India as their country? They live in it in the midst of the Hindus because they cannot help it, but one day they have to part company. I hope that this suspicion is baseless. Similarly, if there is a Hindu who regards the Muslims as Yavanas or Asuras incapable of realizing God, he is guilty of the worst blasphemy, which can possibly have no room in the covenant which they have signed.[72]

I do not regard all the Musalmans of India to be innocent. What is obvious is that, after the birth of Pakistan, the Muslims in the Indian Union have been placed in a very difficult situation and it is up to the majority community to mete out exact justice to them. It would spell the ruin of both Hindu religion and the majority community, if the latter, in the intoxication of power entertains the belief that it can crush the minority community and establish a purely Hindu Raj. I consider the present occasion to be particularly auspicious for purging out the dross from the hearts of both the communities by a strenuous effort at Self-purification.[73]

Befriend Muslims

We should forget the past and learn the duty of having friendly feelings towards all and being inimical to none. The crores of Muslims are not all angels nor are all the Hindus and the Sikhs. There are good and bad specimens among all communities. Would we be less than friendly towards the so-called criminal tribes amongst us?

Muslims are a numerous community scattered all over the world. There is no reason why we, who stand for friendship with the whole world, should not be friends with the Muslims. I am not a fortune-teller, but God has given me intellect and understanding enough to know that, if for some reason or other we cannot be friends with the Muslims of the Union, the Muslims of the whole world will be antagonized and we will lose India. Then India, including both the Dominions, will once again pass under foreign domination.[74]

No exodus

Even if I am the only one to say it, I will never advise the Muslims to leave their homes. If they live as law-abiding, honest and loyal citizens of India, no one can touch them.

I am not the Government, but I have influence with those in the Government. I have had long talks with them. They do not believe that in India the Muslims have no place or that if the Muslims wished to stay there they have to do so as slaves of the Hindus. Some people have said that Sardar Patel encouraged the idea of Muslims going away to Pakistan. The Sardar is indignant at the suggestion. But he told me that he has reasons to suspect that the vast majority of the Muslims in India are not loyal to India. For such people it is better to go to Pakistan. But the Sardar does not let his suspicion colour his actions. I am convinced that for the Muslims who wish to be citizens of the Indian Union, loyalty to the Union must come before everything else and they should be prepared to fight against the whole world for their country. Those who wish to go to Pakistan are free to do so. Only I do not wish a single Muslim to leave the Union out of fear of the Hindus or the Sikhs. Muslims in Delhi have assured me by their written declaration that they are loyal citizens of the Union. I shall believe their word as I wish others to believe me. As such, it is the duty of the Government to protect them. I for one shall not like to live if I cannot achieve this. The wrong has to be undone wherever it is. Abducted women have to be returned, forcible conversions considered null and void.[75]

Let this auspicious day mark the beginning of a new chapter in your life. Let the disgrace of driving out the Muslims from Delhi cease from today. I found to my shame that as our motor-car was passing through Chandni Chowk, which used to be filled with Hindus, Sikhs and Muslims, there was not a single Muslim passer-by. Surely we have not come to such a pass as to be afraid of the minority of the Muslims scattered throughout the Indian Union. If there are any traitors in their midst, our Government is strong enough to deal with them. We must be ashamed of hurting children, women or old men. Every man must be considered innocent before he is found guilty by a properly constituted court of law. I fervently hope that such misdeeds will become now a thing of the past. [76]

I have been told that the Meos are almost like criminal tribes. If the statement is correct, it calls for an all-out effort on their part to reform themselves. It should not be left to others to do the work of reclamation. I hope that the Meos will not resent my advice, but take it in the spirit in which it is offered. To the Government I would say that, even if the allegation regarding the Meos is correct, this is no argument for sending them out into Pakistan. The Meos are subjects of the Indian Union and it is its

duty to help them to reclaim themselves by providing them with facilities of education and establishing settlements for them to settle in.[77]

Common cause with minorities

That the Muslims in India find themselves in a minority without protection from the majority in Pakistan is no disadvantage if they at all followed the technique of non-violence during the past thirty years. It was not necessary for them to have faith in non-violence to be able to appreciate the fact that a minority, however small it might be, never has any cause for fear as to the preservation of their honour and all that must be near and dear to man. He is so made that if he understood his Maker and himself as made in His image, no power on earth could rob him of self-respect except he himself. A dear English friend in Johannesburg, while I was fighting the mighty Government of the Transvaal, told me that he always made common cause with minorities. For, he said, they were hardly ever in the wrong and if they were, they could be weaned from it without difficulty, whereas majorities could not, owing to the intoxication that power gave them. The friend had uttered a great truth, if by majority we would also understand the power that exclusive possession of weapons of destruction gave an aggregate of men. We know to our cost that a handful of Englishmen were able to be the majority, keeping under their heels millions of Indians by possession of arms which India did not have and could not know how to wield even if she had. It is a thousand pities that neither the Hindus nor the Muslims learnt the lesson whilst the English power was in operation in our country. The Union Muslims are now free from the oppressiveness they were under, whilst they were falsely proud of the Muslim majority in the West and the East. If they would realize the virtue of being in a minority, they would know that they could now express in their own lives the best that is in Islam. Will they remember that Islam gave its best during the Prophet's ministry in Mecca? Christianity waned when Constantine came to it. But I must not here carry this argument further. My advice is based upon implicit belief in it. Therefore, if my Muslim friends do not share the belief, they will perhaps do well to reject the advice.[78]

Muslims and Congress

In my opinion, while they should hold themselves in readiness to join the Congress, they should refrain from applying for admission until they are welcomed with open

arms and on terms of absolute equality. In theory at least the Congress has no major and minor communities. It has no religion but the religion of humanity. For the Congress every man or woman is equal to any other. It is a purely secular, political, national organization in which Hindus, Muslims, Sikhs, Christians, Parsis, Jews are equal. Because the Congress has not always been able to live up to its professions, it has appeared to many Muslims as a predominantly caste Hindu organization. Anyway, Muslims should have dignified aloofness so long as the tension lasts.

They would be in the Congress when their services are wanted by it. In the meantime they should be of the Congress even as I am. That I have an influence without being a four-anna member is because I have served it faithfully ever since my return from South Africa in 1915. Every Muslim can do so from now and he will find that his services are as much valued as mine. Today, every Muslim is assumed to be a Leaguer and, therefore, to be an enemy of the Congress. Such, unfortunately, has been the teaching of the League. There is now not the slightest cause for enmity. Four months are too short a period to be free from the communal poison. Unfortunately for this unhappy land, the Hindus and the Sikhs mistook the poison for nectar and have, therefore, become enemies of the Muslims of India and have, to their disgrace, retaliated and become so even with the Muslims of Pakistan. I would, therefore, urge the Muslim minority to rise superior to the poisonous atmosphere and live down the thoughtless prejudice by proving by their exemplary conduct that the only honourable way of living in the Union is that they should be full citizens without any mental reservations. It follows then that the League cannot remain a political organization, even as the Hindu Mahasabha or the Sikh Sabha or the Parsi Sabha cannot. They may function as religious organizations for internal religious reform and for the purpose of exploring the best and living the best that is in their religions. Then they will purify the atmosphere of all poison and vie with one another in well-doing. They will be friendly to one another and thus help the State. Their political ambition can only be satisfied through the Congress, whether they are in it or not. The Congress will be a caucus when it thinks of those only who are in it. It has very few such even now. It has as yet an unrivalled position because it strives to represent the whole of India without exception. It aims to serve "even unto this last".[79]

I do not like this stampede to join the Congress. They should—it is their right to—join the Congress. But the time for it, in my opinion, is not yet. I would rather that they

waited till the Congress was ready to welcome them with open arms. Today, that warmth is lacking. Under the circumstances, it would be best for them to serve the Congress from outside—even as I am doing.[80]

Nationalist Muslims

The Nationalists are not worth the proud name they bear if they fear the Muslim League. Can the Nationalists exclude the followers of the League from the sphere of their action? I am not thinking of vote-catching devices. I am thinking of the Muslims as Indians, the same as others, needing their care and attention.[81]

The Nationalist Muslims, who are good enough to see me... twit me for giving importance and life to the Muslim League and neglecting the Nationalist Muslims. I cannot plead guilty to either charge. The League has gained importance without my or the Congress aid. It became great because, rightly or wrongly, it caught Muslim fancy. The Congress and I have to deal with and recognize the fact that faces us. I am not sorry for having visited Quaid-i-Azam Jinnah eighteen times in Bombay. My friends should also know that I alone can have done nothing without Shaheed Saheb and Osman Saheb and the other League members. There is no question of neglect of the Nationalist Muslims. Nationalism of a man is its own merit. It demands no recognition. I would advise my friends to remain what they are and exhibit in their every act courage, self-sacrifice and true knowledge born of study, and I am certain that whether they are few or many, they will make their mark on India's future. I would even advise them to join the League and oppose it from within, whenever they find it to be reactionary. Whilst I say all this, I would advise my League friends to approach the Nationalist Muslims in a friendly spirit, whether they remain out or come in. True friendship does not admit of exclusion without the soundest reason.[82]

I am not guilty of asking you to discard nationalism or of expecting the Congress to be another Hindu Sabha. I hope that the Congress will never commit suicide by being a communal organization. When the Congress ceases to represent all who are proud to call themselves Indians, whether prince or pauper, Hindus, Muslims or any other, it will have destroyed itself. Therefore, I cannot advise a Muslim Congressman to join the League if the condition of joining the League is to discard or suppress his Congress membership. He will vote for those resolutions of the League which are in the nation’s interest and against those which are contrary to this interest. I have several Muslims

of staunch faith in mind who are neither in the Congress nor in the League. I advise the Nationalist Muslim friends to join the League if they want to affect the Muslim masses. Real nationalists need no encouragement from me or anyone else. Nationalism, like virtue, is its own reward. My one warning is that they should never think of power or bettering their worldly prospects by joining the one or the other organization. A nationalist will ever think of service, never of power or riches. It is, I hope, clear to the Nationalist Muslims under what conditions I advise them to join the League.[83]

Under a responsible Government, which ours is, services and favours I can expect only from the Ministers who are the representatives of the people. The Governor has undoubtedly powers with reference to the minorities but these too he can exercise only with great restraint.[84]

Communalism in the Services

...Are the services disloyal? I hope not. Yet the complaint is universal. Various reasons are given for the alleged disloyalty. The most plausible one is that the military and the police are largely divided on a communal basis and their members are carried away by the prevalent prejudice. I have given my opinion that if these members, on whom depends the preservation of law and order, are affected by the communal taint, orderly government must give place to disorder and if the latter persists, to disruption of society. It is up to the upper ranks of these services to rise superior to communalism and then to infect the lower ranks with the same healthy spirit.[85]

Many Muslims, principally from the Postal and Railway Departments, say that they had opted for the sake of propaganda. Therefore, they would now like to reconsider their view. There are Muslims who have been discharged from their posts, I presume, on the ground of suspected anti-Hindu bias. My sympathy goes out to all such men. But I feel that the right course is not to resent pardonable suspicion, although it may be unjustified in individual cases. I can only prescribe my old, well-tried remedy.

Only very few can be accommodated in the various Government departments. To get a Government job should never be the aim of life. Honest living is the only worthy aim. This is always assured when and if one is ready to do any labour that comes to hand. Until the dominating and corroding communal poison is eliminated, I think it is necessary and dignified for Muslims not to aim at the loaves and fishes in Government

employ. Power comes from sincere service. Actual attainment often debases the holder. To fight for it is unseemly. At the same time, it is surely the duty of a government to ensure bread labour for all unemployed men and women, no matter how many they are. To do so intelligently pays the State instead of costing it, assuming, of course, that the unemployed are physically fit and are not shirkers but willing workers.[86]

9 THE TWO SCRIPTS

Adoption of both scripts

My advice about the adoption of two scripts [Hindi and Urdu] by Hindus and Muslims is based on the unitary method. My equal love for all communities dictates its adoption.[87]

Roman

A correspondent writes to me to say that the strained relations between the Hindus and the Muslims bid fair, if timely warning is not taken, to replace Nagari and Urdu scripts with Roman. There are undoubtedly protagonists of the Roman as the universal script. It seems to me that it would be a great human tragedy if such a result comes about. Time-saving devices are good up to a certain point. But they take the form of a mania when they destroy human relations and desirable restraints. I must not tarry to examine what they are. Suffice it to say that lovers of the Nagari script, which is scientifically almost perfect, and the Urdu script, which is so graceful, will not be carried away by the lazy craze for the Roman script.

Would that both the communities will be sane enough to realize that the mutual dislike is not allowed to replace the two Indian scripts. But if that happy consummation does not take place, let those few or many who have regard for sacred human understanding assiduously learn both the scripts and thus enrich the Indian national language, Hindustani, as the easy fusion of Hindi and Urdu. Let the Provincial Governments beware of the lure of the Roman script. Let it not be said of India that it is so degraded as to become the blotting sheet of civilization.[88]

[An earnest] friend has reminded me that my insistence on the two scripts is likely to displace both and make room for the Roman script. The friend has partiality for the Roman script. I do not share it. Nor do I fear that the two scripts will ever be displaced by the Roman. I do not wish to enter into argument over the question. I simply refer to the subject to show that our nationalism is poor stuff if it shirks the learning of the two scripts. Our love of our country should make the learning of the two scripts a matter of joy. I instance the example of Sheikh Abdullah Saheb who informed me only this afternoon that during his imprisonment in Kashmir, he was able with ease to learn

Hindi and the Nagari script. What the Sheikh Saheb was able to do is surely equally easy for other nationalists.[89]

Hindustani

I am told that there are people in the Union who have wrongly come to the conclusion that now there is no occasion for Hindustani—a compatible mixture of Hindi and Urdu. There are many holy shrines of Islam. Will they be honoured equally with the others? Will it be the same with the Muslim seats of learning? On the proper treatment of these and such other questions depends the real unity of India, and I say this irrespective of what is said or done in Pakistan.[90]

If the Muslims in India own loyalty to India and have chosen to make it their home of their own free will, it is their duty to learn the two scripts...

The Union must have a common inter-provincial speech. I will go a step further and say that, if the two States are friends, Hindustani should be the common speech between the two. This does not mean that Urdu and Hindi will cease to exist as distinct forms of speech. They must continue to live and progress. But, if the Hindus and the Muslims or, rather, people of all religions in India are friends, they must accept a common language evolved from Hindi and Urdu. They should learn the two scripts. This will be a test for the Muslims and the Hindus in the Indian Union.[91]

Of all the Muslims in the Indian Union, nearly one-fourth reside in the U. P. There are many Hindus like Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru who are Urdu scholars. Are they to forget the Urdu script? The right thing will be to keep both the scripts and make the use of either acceptable in all official dealings. This will result in the compulsory learning of both the scripts.

The language then will take care of itself and Hindustani will become the language of the Province. This knowledge of the two scripts will not be a waste. It will enrich them and enrich your language. No one should cavil at such a step.[92]

I have no doubt that Hindustani will be the best suited inter-provincial language for all Indians. Neither persianized Urdu nor sanskritized Hindi can easily be understood by the masses.[93]

If Hindustani is taken to be the inter-provincial language of India, it follows that both the scripts, Nagari and Urdu, should be equally acceptable. If the State recognizes

only Nagari as the character in which Hindustani should be written, it would certainly be unjust to our Muslim brethren and when it is remembered that they are a minority, the guilt is enhanced.

I have never contended that all the forty crores of Indians have to learn both the scripts. I have, however, held that those who have inter-provincial contacts and who want to serve not merely their own province but the whole of India should know both the scripts. The reason is obvious. They ought to be able to read letters written whether in the Nagari or the Urdu script. Hence, it is necessary that both the scripts are accepted as national.

If Hindi is to be the national language, naturally Nagari alone will be the national script, and if Urdu is to take that place, Urdu script alone will be the national script. But, if Hindustani, which is a resultant of the junction of Hindi and Urdu, is to be the national language, a knowledge of both the scripts is essential in the manner indicated by me.

It is worth remembering that in reality neither the Urdu character nor the Urdu form of the same language is the exclusive property of the Muslims of India. There is quite a large number of Hindus and others whose mother-tongue is Urdu and who know only the Urdu character. It is further to be remembered that the necessity of knowing both the scripts was stressed by me on my return from South Africa in 1915. I submitted the same proposition to the Hindi Sahitya Sammelan in Indore as its President. So far as I recollect, there was hardly any opposition to the proposition. It is true that then I did not suggest any alteration in the name. The definition, however, was the same as that of today. When perfect anarchy prevails in the thought world and we express different views without regard to facts, it is obligatory that we should have one strong helm to weather any storm.

In so far as it is believed that the Muslims only are concerned with the retention of the Urdu character, at this juncture it becomes our special duty to emphasize the necessity of Hindustani written in either character. This should appear self-evident. Whatever were the reasons in justification, it must be admitted that within the Union, in many places, the Muslims have been dealt with harshly. It would be beside the point to contend that Pakistan made the beginning with harsh treatment against the Hindus and the Sikhs. For the State to ordain that the inter-provincial script in the

Union shall be only the Nagari, it would be an imposition upon the Muslims. If the result of the act of justice is to be that the Muslims are to confine themselves to the Urdu character and gratuitously regard the word Hindustani as synonymous with Urdu, it would amount to cussedness and, perhaps, a sign that their heart is not in the Union.

Comparison of scripts

This sister further says that the Nagari script is, comparatively speaking, fairly perfect, whereas the Urdu script is imperfect and difficult to decipher. To write Sanskrit words in the Urdu script is, she holds, well-nigh impossible. There is some force in these three statements. They amount to this that the Devanagari *lipi* though comparatively perfect admits of improvement and the Urdu script demands it because it is imperfect. It will be difficult for Raihanabehn to sustain the charge that it is not possible to write Sanskrit words in the Urdu script. I have in my possession the whole of the Gita transcribed in that script. Improvement is possible only when fanaticism has died out. After all, what is the Sindhi alphabet but an improved edition of the Urdu script?

Lastly, I suggest to Raihanabehn that her letter under discussion is a fine specimen of Hindustani. She has woven in that letter Urdu words as freely as Sanskrit words. The beauty of Hindustani is that it has no quarrel either with Sanskrit or with Arabic words. In order to strengthen Hindustani consistently with its genius, if a language can be said to have a 'genius', it must borrow from all the languages of the world. Its grammar must remain as it always has been in indigenous Hindi. Thus, the plural of 'Hindu' in Hindustani will always be *Hindu-o* (हिंदुओ) and not *Hunud* (हुनुद) as it is in highly Arabicized Urdu. Raihanabehn is an Urdu scholar. Though not a scholar in Hindi, she knows it well. She reads and writes both the Nagari and Urdu characters. When I was in the Yeravda prison, she and Zohra Ansari were my Urdu teachers. Naturally, they taught me through correspondence. My advice, therefore, to her is that she should devote her energy to the strengthening and spreading of Hindustani and making the teaching of the two characters as easy as possible. This work she can only do, if her ignorance, as I call it, is removed. If what she has now begun to believe is true, I could have nothing to say to her. Then, indeed, I shall have to unlearn the past and learn a new lesson and displace the Urdu character from the position which I think it should occupy.[94]

"It does not matter whether the lingua franca be called Hindi or Hindustani; in any case, the common language in actual use will remain Hindustani. It cannot, however, be gainsaid that in advanced literature and science, certain words will be necessary which can only be derived from Sanskrit. Where is the harm in making this clear to the public?"

The first part of the question would be correct provided the name adopted were accepted by all in the same light. The controversy arises not over the name but what it is meant to convey. In advanced literature and science we should not draw exclusively from Sanskrit. A small committee can be appointed to prepare a dictionary of current words irrespective of their original source.[95]

The question whether telegraph and other offices would also have to use both the scripts is a minor one. When we get rid of the incubus of the English language and the Roman script, our minds will be clearer and we shall realize the futility of such controversies. [96]

Opposition to Urdu

I do not approve of the dislike of the writers for the Urdu script, though I would be prepared to account for it. But for the life of me I cannot understand this thoughtless dislike of the script. Does it not betray a bankruptcy of wisdom? The Gujaratis are reputed as businessmen. In doing business they do not discriminate between friends and foes. They gladly make money from both. Will this same businesslikeness forsake them in politics or in the use of the script?

In Delhi I daily come in contact with Hindus and Muslims. The number of the Hindus is larger. Most of them speak a language which has very few Sanskrit words and not many more Persian or Arabic. They or the vast majority do not know the Devanagari script. They write to me in indifferent English and when I take them to task for writing in a foreign language, they write in the Urdu script. If the lingua franca is to be Hindi and the script only Devanagari, what will be the plight of these Hindus?

But I confess that my insistence on Hindustani is a proof of my partiality for the Muslim brethren, though not of Gujarat. The Muslims of Gujarat do not know Urdu. They learn it not with out difficulty. Their mother-tongue is Gujarati. But the language of the Muslims in North India is undoubtedly Hindustani i.e., simple Urdu. I do not mind

their calling it Urdu. The millions of the villagers of India have nothing to do with books. They speak Hindustani, which the Muslims write in the Urdu script and the Hindus in the Urdu or in the Nagari script. Therefore, the duty of people like you and me is to learn both the scripts. The Gujaratis decided to perform this duty with gladness. They joyously accepted Hindustani as the lingua franca. They did not swallow it like a bitter pill. Why, then, have they developed a dislike for the Urdu script now? For me it has become all the sweeter in the midst of the deadly bitterness surrounding us...

The omens today seem to point to the contrary [absence of 'heart-unity']. During the crisis the Congress must stand firm like a rock. It dare not give way on the question of the lingua franca of India. It cannot be persianized Urdu or sanskritized Hindi. It must be a beautiful blend of the two simple forms written in either script. How I wish Gujarat would remain unaffected by the gathering storm! Will those who have soared high now crash at the first blow? If I could have my way, such a thing would not happen. There is a Gujarati hymn which says, "Will he who, has been purified by the fire of love ever turn back?" Let us follow the poet. Let us not turn away from the Urdu script. One slip of the foot is likely to hurl us down...Let us hope sanity will prevail.[97]

It would be wrong to say that, if the Muslims of the Union refuse to learn the Nagari script, Hindustani cannot become the national language. Whether the Muslims learn the Nagari script or not, the Hindus and the people of all other religions ought to learn the two scripts. It is possible that, in view of the poisoned atmosphere of the day, people may not appreciate this simple proposition. If the Hindus wish to, they can boycott the Urdu script and Urdu words, but all will be the losers thereby. Therefore, those engaged in Hindustani Prachar should not weaken in their faith or efforts.

I agree that people like Maulana Azad and other prominent Muslims of the Indian Union should be the first ones to adopt Hindustani and the two scripts. Who will take the lead if not they? Difficult times lie ahead of us. May God guide us aright.[98]

No boycott of Urdu

With the adoption of the two scripts, the easier one will ultimately survive. All that is wanted is that the Urdu script should not be boycotted, as such boycott would imply

discrimination. A controversy arose over such discrimination and this has now been accentuated. With this background, we who believe in unity and are opposed to civil strife are bound to adopt both the scripts. Again, we cannot forget that many Hindus and Sikhs are ignorant of the Nagari script. There is no question of all people having to learn both the scripts, but only of those liable to serve outside their province. Nor is it suggested that all notices should be issued by the Central Government in both the scripts—but only those meant for all.

Having regard to the present communal antagonism, the boycott of the Urdu script would be regarded as an anti-democratic measure.[99]

My view remains unalterable, especially at this critical juncture in our history. It is wrong to ruffle Muslim or any other person's feeling when there is no question of ethics. Those who take the trouble of learning the Urdu script in addition to the Nagari will surely lose nothing. They will gain a knowledge of the Urdu script, which many of our countrymen know. If it was not for cussedness, this proposition will be admitted without any argument. The limitations of this script in terms of perfection are many. But for elegance and grace it will equal any script in the world. It will not die so long at least as Arabic and Persian live, though it has achieved a status all its own without outside aid. With a little adaptation it can serve the purpose of shorthand. As a national script, if it is set free from the bondage of orthodoxy, it is capable of improvement so as to enable one to transcribe Sanskrit verses without the slightest difficulty.

Lastly, those who in anger boycott the Urdu script put a wanton affront upon the Muslims of the Union who, in the eyes of many Hindus, have become aliens in their own land. This is copying the bad manners of Pakistan with a vengeance. I invite every inhabitant of India to join me in a stern refusal to copy bad manners. If they will enter the heart of what I have written, they will prevent the impending collapse of the Nagari and Urdu editions of the *Harijan*. Will Muslim friends rise to the occasion and do two things—subscribe to the Urdu edition and diligently learn the Nagari script and enrich their intellectual capital? [100]

You should treat the Muslims as equal citizens. Equality of treatment demands respect for the Urdu script.[101]

No 'appeasement'

It would be confusion of thought for Raihanabehn to argue that keeping of the Urdu character side by side with the Nagari would be construed to be in pursuance of the policy of appeasement. Though the word has come to have a bad odour about it, I would submit that appeasement can be a praiseworthy duty, as it can also be, at times, a blameworthy gesture. Thus, for instance, it can conceivably be a duty on the part of a brother to walk with his brother towards the North, whilst alone he would have gone to the South. But it would certainly be criminal for him, a confirmed teetotaller, to drink spirituous liquors with his drunken brother in order to appease him. He would then harm both himself and his brother. I must not recite the *Kalma* in order to appease or flatter my Muslim brother, as he must not recite the *Gayatri* in order to appease or flatter me. It would be another matter if both of us recite either at will, because we believe the two incantations are one in essence. I hold that it is so. Hence it is that in the daily recital of the Ashram prayers, among the eleven observances occurs equal respect for all the accepted religions in the world. The upshot of all this argument is that the policy of appeasement is not always bad. It may even become a duty at times.[102]

While we must always refrain from an improper course with the object of appeasing others, there is no harm in conciliating when the course itself is intrinsically proper. If all accepted our script willingly, it would be so good, but even to achieve this end it is necessary to retain both the scripts at present.[103]

I do not subscribe to the view often put forward that the two-script proposal is meant to appease the Muslims. Our concern should be to select the script which might be advantageous to the nation as a whole without wishing any injustice. It would not be correct to hold that the adoption of the Nagari script would be harmful to Muslim interests. As far as I can see, it would be necessary to adopt both the scripts, but only as a temporary measure—ultimately one script should be acceptable to all. How can this be disputed? [104]

No oppression of minorities

[I am warned] that I have to make allowance for the Anglo-Indians, the Goans and others with whom English has become the mother tongue. Do I ever contemplate that these will be suddenly dismissed for want of knowledge of Hindi or Hindustani,

whichever finally became the inter-provincial speech? ... I will never entertain any such idea. The writer is correct in his fear. Nevertheless, I do expect that within a given period we will all attain a working knowledge of Hindustani. No oppression should be felt by the minorities, however small they may be. There is need for the gentlest handling of all such questions.[105]

10 POLITICAL PARTIES

The business of every well-wisher of the country is to condemn those parties who promote mischief and to leave no stone unturned to stop it.[106]

Narrow slogans

[The purport of a complaint is that] the organization ...consisting of 3,000 members goes through a daily lathi drill which is followed by reciting the slogan, 'Hindustan belongs to Hindus and to nobody else.' This recital is followed by a brief discourse in which speakers say: 'Drive out the English first and then we shall subjugate the Muslims. If they do not listen, we shall kill them.' Taking the evidence at its face value, the slogan is wrong and the central theme of the discourse is worse. I can only hope that the slogan is unauthorized and that the speaker who is reported to have uttered the sentiments ascribed to him was no responsible person. The slogan is wrong and absurd, for Hindustan belongs to all those who are born and bred here and who have no other country to look to. Therefore, it belongs to Parsis, Beni Israels, to Indian Christians, Muslims and other non-Hindus as much as to Hindus.[101]

Need for national body

In my opinion, the need for such an organization [as the Congress] will be greater [after Independence] than it has been up to now. No doubt the function will be different. Unless Congressmen foolishly subscribe to the theory of two nations based on two religions, there can be only one Congress for one India. Division of India does not, ought not to, divide the All-India body. India does not become two nations because it has been cut up into two sovereign States. Supposing one or more States remain outside the two Dominions, will the Congress exclude them and their people from the National Congress? Will they not rather demand special care and attention from the Congress? Problems more intricate than before will certainly arise. Some of them may defy solution. That will be no reason for cutting the Congress in twain. It will evoke greater statesmanship, deeper thinking and cooler judgment than hitherto. Let us not anticipate paralysing difficulties. Sufficient unto the day is the evil thereof.

This question [now that the Muslims regard themselves as aliens, why should we not call the Union Hindu India, with an indelible stamp of Hindudom on it?] betrays gross ignorance. The Congress can never become a Hindu body. Those who will make it so

are enemies of India and Hinduism. We are a nation of millions. Their voice no one has heard. Insistence, if there is any, is confined to the busybodies of our cities. Let us not mistake their voice for the voice of the millions of India's villagers. Thirdly, the Muslims of the Union have not declared themselves as aliens. Lastly, in spite of the many shortcomings of the Hindus, it can be safely claimed that Hinduism has never been known to be exclusive. Many persons claiming different faiths make us one and an indivisible nation. All these have an equal claim to be the nationals of India.[108]

Although the Working Committee has passed a definite resolution to be put before the forthcoming A.I.C.C., the members and the special invitees are unanimously of the opinion that the Congress, which has stood from its inception for over sixty years for perfect communal harmony, is not to go back upon that unbroken record of perfect harmony persisted [in] often in the face of heavy odds. They are quite clear that even though the Congress may for a time find itself in a minority, they should cheerfully face that ordeal rather than succumb to the prevalent insanity.[109]

11 SECULAR STATE

Challenge to Hinduism

The hindus want Swaraj in India, and not a Hindu Raj. Even if there is a Hindu Raj, and toleration one of its features, there will be place in it for the Musalmans as well as the Christians.[110]

Undoubtedly, there should be no untouchability whatsoever in Hinduism, no scheduled classes, therefore, in India, no caste divisions whatsoever in the eyes of the law. Hindus are all one, no high or low. All the neglected classes such as the scheduled classes, the so-called aboriginal classes, should receive special treatment in the matter of education, housing etc. On the electoral roll they will be one. This must never mean a worse state than the present, but better in every way. Will Hinduism come up to the high level or will it court extinction by hugging infamous superstitions and aping bad manners? [111]

Complete secularism?

There are indications that all is not well with the Musalmans. Some Hindus are now beginning to feel that they have the upper hand, and some Musalmans are afraid that they will have to play the underdog in the Union today. This will be shameful indeed. If a minority in India, minority on the score of its religious profession, is made to feel small on this account, I can only say that this India is not the India of my dreams. In the India for whose fashioning I have worked all my life, every man enjoys equality of status, whatever his religion is. The State is bound to be wholly secular. I go so for as to say that no denominational educational institution in it should enjoy State patronage.

Cultural democracy

All subjects will thus be equal in the eye of the law. But every single individual will be free to pursue his own religion without let or hindrance, so long as it does not transgress the common law. The question of the 'protection of minorities' is not good enough for me; it rests upon the recognition of religious grouping between citizens of the same State. What I wish India to do is to assure liberty of religious profession to every single individual. Then only India can be great, for it was perhaps the one nation in the ancient world which had recognized cultural democracy, whereby it is held that

the roads to God are many, but the goal is one, because God is one and the same. In fact, the roads are as many as there are individuals in the world.[112]

Correct conduct

We must not produce a State in which respectable life is impossible and still claim that we do not want the Muslims to go. If, in spite of really equal treatment, they (the Muslims) choose to go to Pakistan, it is their own look-out. There should be nothing in our behaviour to scare away the Muslims. We should be correct in our conduct. Then we can serve India and save Hinduism. We cannot do so by killing the Muslims or driving them away or suppressing them in any way...[113]

Education

Take the Hindu-Muslim question. The poison has assumed dangerous proportions, such that it is difficult to forecast where it will land us. Assume that the unthinkable has happened and that not a single Muslim can remain in the Union safely and honourably and that neither Hindu nor Sikh can do likewise in Pakistan. Our education will then wear a poisonous form. If, on the other hand, Hindus, Muslims and all the others who may belong to different faiths can live in either Dominion with perfect safety and honour, then, in the nature of things our education will take a shape altogether pleasing.[114]

Democratic State

Freedom, without equality, for all irrespective of race or religion, is not worth having for the Congress. In other words, the Congress and any government representative of the Congress must remain a purely democratic, popular body leaving every individual to follow that form of religion which best appeals to him, without any interference from the State. There is so much in common between people living in the same State under the same flag, owing undivided allegiance to it. There is so much in common between man and man that it is a marvel that there can be any quarrel on the ground of religion. Any creed or dogma which coerces others into following one uniform practice is a religion only in name, for a religion worth the name does not admit of any coercion. Anything that is done under coercion has only a short lease of life. It is bound to die. It must be a matter of pride to us, whether we are four-anna Congress members or not, that we have in our midst an institution without a rival which

disdains to become a theocratic State, and which always believes and lives up to the belief that the State of our conception must be a secular, democratic State, having perfect harmony between the different units composing the State.[115]

'Land of hope and promise'

Has not the Quaid-i-Azam said that Pakistan was not a theocratic State and that it is purely a secular State? That the claim cannot always be justified in action is, unfortunately, too true. Is the Union to be a theocratic State and are the tenets of Hinduism to be imposed on non-Hindus? I hope not. The Indian Union will then cease to be a land of hope and promise, a land to which all Asiatic and African races look, indeed, the whole world. The world expects not littleness and fanaticism from India whether as the Union or Pakistan. It expects greatness and goodness from which the whole world can derive a lesson and light in its prevailing darkness.[116]

12 RELIGION AND NATIONALISM

No conflict

There never can be any conflict between the real interest of one's country and that of one's religion. Where there appears to be any, there is something wrong with one's religion, i.e., one's morals. True religion means good thought and good conduct. True patriotism also means good thought and good conduct. To set up a comparison between two synonymous things is wrong.[117]

I hope those in the Union of India would be worthy of their faiths and would be proud to all themselves sons and daughters of the same soil, claiming perfect equality in the eyes of the law. Religion is no test of nationality but a personal matter between man and his God. In the sense of nationality they are Indians first and Indians last, no matter what religion they profess.[118]

A friend asked me the other day whether I share the opinion, often expressed, that as between nationalism and religion, the former was superior to the latter. I said that the two were dissimilars and that there could be no comparison between dissimilars. Each was equal to the other in its own place. No man who values his religion as also his nationalism can barter away the one for the other. Both are equally dear to him. He renders unto Caesar that which is Caesar's and unto God that which is God's. And if Caesar, forgetting his limits, oversteps them, a man of God does not transfer his loyalty to another Caesar, but knows how to deal with the usurpation. A rehearsal of this difficulty gave rise to Satyagraha.

Take a homely illustration. Suppose I have mother, wife and daughter. All the three must be equally dear to me in their own places. It is a vulgar error to think that a man is entitled to forsake his mother and his daughter for the sake of his wife. He dare not do the converse. And if any of the three oversteps her limits, the law of Satyagraha comes to his assistance for the restoration of the equilibrium of the three forces.[119]

The Hindus, the Muslims, the Sikhs, the Christians, the Parsis and the Jews should be Indians first and Indians last. Religion is the personal affair of each individual. It must not be mixed up with politics or national affairs.[120]

State religion

I do not believe in State religion even though the whole community has one religion. The State interference will probably always be unwelcome. Religion is purely a personal matter. There are in reality as many religions as minds. Each mind has a different conception of God from that of the other.

Religious education

I am also opposed to State aid partly or wholly to religious bodies. For I know that an institution or group which does not manage to finance its own religious teaching is a stranger to true religion. This does not mean that the State schools will not give ethical teaching. The fundamental ethics are common to all religions.[121]

I do not believe that the State can concern itself or cope with religious education. I believe that religious education must be the sole concern of religious associations. Do not mix up religion and ethics. I believe that fundamental ethics is common to all religions. Teaching of fundamental ethics is undoubtedly a function of the State. By religion I do not have in mind fundamental ethics but what goes by the name of denominationalism. We have suffered enough from State-aided religion and a State Church. A society or a group which depends partly or wholly on State aid for the existence of its religion does not deserve—better still—does not have any religion worth the name. I do not need to give any illustrations in support of this truth obvious as it is to me.[122]

State funds

A letter of a Christian in a newspaper holds that the temple of Somanath cannot undergo renovation from State funds. I sympathize with the objection. The Sardar happened to be with me. He was shown the cutting and he said that not a pie would be spent from the Junagadh State funds or, for that matter, from the Central fund for such purposes. The temple of Somanath will be renovated from funds donated by the Hindus and others who may be interested in the renovation. The Indian Union is a secular State and not a religious one.[123]

13 RELIGIOUS FESTIVALS

Holi

I have no doubt in my mind that a religious ceremony like *Holi* should never be marked by wild revelry, but by a disciplined effort to put oneself in communion with God.

There was a time when the Hindus and the Musalmans lived side by side as peaceful neighbours. If things have today come to such a pass that they cannot look upon one another as friends, they may at least not behave as enemies. There is fear among the Musalmans that the occasion of *Holi* may be marked by renewed attacks upon them. It is surprising that I am hearing... what I had heard from the Hindus in Noakhali and Tipperah, and I feel ashamed to have to listen to the same tales in Patna as in Noakhali. I shall therefore venture to say to my Muslim brothers in Bihar what I have said to the Hindus in Noakhali, viz., that they should shed all fear of man and trust God; but I know that it is a counsel of perfection...

I want everyone to celebrate *Holi* in such a manner that every single Muslim feels that the Hindus have not only repented for what has been done to them, but have also gathered love for them to an extent which outdid their previous sentiments. If *Holi* is marked by this revival of the old friendly relations, then, indeed, it will be a truly religious celebration. . .

It is not enough that the Hindus should express lip-repentance or compensate the sufferers by means of money. What is really needed is that their hearts should become pure and, in place of the hatred or indifference which is sweeping over them, love should reign so that under its glow every single Muslim man, woman and child feels perfectly secure and free to pursue his or her own religious practices without the least let or hindrance. Let us all, I pray, make *Holi* an occasion for the initiation of this relation between the two sister communities.[124]

Dussehra

I would remind you of the origin *of the Dussehra* festival. It is to commemorate the victory of Rama over Ravan. *Durga Puja* means worship of the all pervading Shakti. The ten days are followed by *Bharat Milap*. All this connotes self-restraint, not lenience. The nine days are the days of fasting and prayer. My mother used to fast during these nine days. We, her children, were taught to practise as much abstinence

as we could. Are we to celebrate the sacred occasion by killing and harassing our brothers? ... Shed all enmity and bitterness on the occasion of these festivals.[125]

No festivities during distress

A sister who is a refugee writes:

> The question whether we should or should not celebrate *Divali* as a festival agitates most of us. I wish to put before you our thoughts on the question, no matter how lisping my Hindi words may be. I am a refugee from Gujaranwala. I have lost my all in that place. Nevertheless, our hearts are full of joy that after all we have our independence. This will be the first *Divali* in Independent India. Therefore, it behoves us to forget all our sorrows and wish to have illuminations throughout India. I know that your heart is sore over our sufferings and you would have all India to abstain from the rejoicings. We are thankful for your sympathy. Notwithstanding the fact that your heart is full of sorrow, I would like you to tell all the refugees and the rest of India that they should rejoice during the festival and ask the moneyed men to help those who are without means. May God Almighty give us the wisdom to rejoice over all the festivities that might come to us after Independence.

Whilst I admire the sister and others like her, I cannot help saying that she and those who think like her are wrong. It is well known that a family which is overtaken by sorrow abstains from participation in festivities according to capacity. It is an illustration of the doctrine of oneness on a very limited scale...

We must not be self-centred or, being falsely sentimental, ignore facts. My advice to abstain from the rejoicings is broadbased on many solid considerations. The refugee problem is there, affecting lakhs of Hindus, Muslims and Sikhs. There is as well want (albeit man-made) of food and clothing. The deeper cause is dishonesty of the many who can mould public opinion, obstinate refusal of sufferers to learn from their sufferings and extensive inhumanity of man to man. I can see in this misery no cause for joy. A resolute and wise refusal to take part in festivities will be an incentive to introspection and Self-purification. Let us not do anything which will throw away a blessing which has been won after hard toil and tribulation.

14 MINORITIES IN THE SERVICES

Majority example

Our services must be...impartially manned by the most qualified men and women. But till that time comes and communal jealousies or preferences become a thing of the past, minorities who suspect the motives of majorities must be allowed their way. The majorities must set the example of self-sacrifice.[127]

My belief is that the British policy of divide and rule has accentuated our differences and will continue to do so till we recognize that we must unite in spite of the policy. This cannot and will not happen unless we refrain from a scramble for place and power. The beginning must be made by the Hindus.[128]

No favouritism

So far as employment in Government departments is concerned, I think it will be fatal to good government, if we introduce the communal spirit there. For administration to be efficient, it must always be in the hands of the fittest. There should be certainly no favouritism. But, if we want five engineers, we must not take one from each community, but we must take the fittest five even if they were all Musalmans or all Parsis. The lowest posts must, if need be, be filled by examination by an impartial board consisting of men belonging to different communities. But distribution of posts should never be according to the proportion of the numbers of each community.

The educationally backward communities will have a right to receive favoured treatment in the matter of education at the hands of the national government. This can be secured in an effective manner. But those who aspire to occupy responsible posts in the Government of the country can only do so if they pass the required test.[129]

The British had carried on their rule through the policy of divide and rule, but their power is over and so should be the favouritism. What matters it if a minority gets a little more than its share of the spoils of service or office anywhere? Minorities are entitled to the fullest justice. Efficiency and merit alone should count, and the spoils of office given to the minorities over a long period by the British to serve their own ends, should no longer lure them. They must realize that all these are in the nature of bribes.[130]

15 SEPARATISM

Hindu and Musalman tea is sold at railway stations. Separate arrangements for meals for the two communities are sometimes made and none seem to be there for Harijans. All this is a sign of our pitiable condition and constitutes a blot on British administration. One can understand their not interfering in religious matters, but for them to allow separate arrangements for tea, water etc., for the two communities is to set the seal of approval on separatism.

Railway travel

Railways and railway travelling offer a golden opportunity which could be used for social reform and for educating the public in sanitation and hygiene, good manners and communal unity. Instead, however, an utter neglect of and indifference to these desiderata are shown. Railway travel serves to strengthen, rather than mitigate, evil customs and bad habits.

And when ... separatism and untouchability are recognized by the Railway authorities, it is the very limit. If any passenger wishes to impose restrictions on himself, he is at liberty to do so at his own expense and suffer, may be, even hunger and thirst. But let him not demand special facilities for himself from Railway authorities.[131]

As I have often said ... trains and steamers are the best media for the practical education of the millions of travellers in spotless cleanliness, hygiene, sanitation and camaraderie between the different communities of India.

A stranger travelling in Indian trains may well have a painful shock when he hears at railway stations, for the first time in his life, ridiculous sounds about *pani*, tea and the like being either Hindu or Muslim. It would be repulsive now that the Government at the Centre is wholly national ... It is to be hoped that we shall soon have the last of the shame that is peculiarly Indian.

We have a right ... to assume that this unholy practice of having separate everything for every community at railway stations will go. Scrupulous cleanliness is a desideratum for all. If taps are used for all liquids, there need be no compunction felt by the most orthodox about helping themselves. A fastidious person may keep his own *lota* and cup and receive his milk, tea, coffee or water through a tap. In this there is no interference with religion. No one is compelled to buy anything at railway stations.

As a matter of fact, many orthodox persons fast for water and food during travel. Thanks we still breathe the same air, walk on the same mother earth. All communal cries at least at railway stations should be unlawful.[132]

Chambers of Commerce

The secretary [of the Muslim Chamber of Commerce, Calcutta] complains that the Central Government has decided to withdraw recognition from the Muslim Chamber. The complaint will be proper if the Muslim Chamber is the exception. But I shall justify the step if recognition is withdrawn, say, from the European, and the Marwadi Chambers of Commerce and such others. Surely, in a secular State there is no room for separate communal organizations except for internal reform. The European Chamber had undue recognition from the late foreign Government. Its annual function was a great event. The Viceroys used to make serious pronouncements [on the occasion]. I hope that no such importance will be given to the body. I shall expect the great European Houses to make common cause with the indigenous population and seek their advancement in common with that of the whole of India. I advise them to take the lead in disbanding their separate Chamber.[133]

Why should there be separate Chambers if there is no communal spirit behind? [134]

16 SYNTHESIS OF CULTURE

India is a big country, a big nation composed of different cultures, which are tending to blend with one another, each complementing the rest. If I must wait for the completion of the process, I must wait. It may not be completed in my day. I should love to die in the faith that it must come in the fullness of time. I should be happy to think that I had done nothing to hamper the process. Subject to this condition, I would do anything to bring about harmony.[135]

Either people of different faiths having lived together in friendship have produced a beautiful blend of cultures, [of] which we shaill strive to perpetuate and increasingly strengthen the shape, or we shall cast about for the day when there was orily one religion represented in Hindustan and retrace our steps to that exclusive culture. It is just possible that we might not be able to find any such historical date and if we do and we retrace our steps, we shall throw our culture back to that ugly period and deservedly earn the execration of the universe. By way of example, if we make the vain attempt to obliterate the Muslim period, we shall have to forget that there was a mighty Jumma Masjid in Delhi second to none in the world, or that there was a Muslim University in Aligafh, or that there was the Taj in Agra, one of the seven wonders of the world, or that there were the great forts of Delhi and Agra built during the Moghal period. We shall then have to rewrite our history with that end in view. Surely, today we have not the atmosphere which will enable us to come to a right condusion about the conflicting choices. [136]

17 COMMUNAL LIFE IN VILLAGES

New basis

The new basis has to be built here in the villages where the Hindus and the Muslims have lived and suffered together on the land of their forefather and murt live together in the future.[137]

I ask all Hindus and Muslims to devote themselves to the noble task of reorganizing village life and in improving their economic condition. Through cottage industries they will find themselves working together in the common task, and unity will thereby grow among them. You must carry out my eighteen-point constructive work which will spread like a life-giving influence over the entire country-side.[138]

You should banish intoxicating drinks and drugs from your midst. I hope that you will eradicate untouchability if there is any trace of it still left in your village. The Hindus, the Muslims, the Sikhs, the Parsees and the Christians should all live as brothers and sisters. If you achieve all I have mentioned, you will demonstrate real independence, and people from all over India will come to see your model village and take inspiration from it.[139]

That the edifice of unity can rest on constructive work alone is a maxim which everybody should remember. The question is how to realize it. It is up to every worker who believes in it to live it in his life and to bring it home to his neighbours. By going into explaining the scientific basis of the constructive programme, it can be made interesting. Our daily experience shows that this programme cannot be advanced by mechanical or unintelligent work.[140]

18 'INDIA OF MY DREAMS'

Unity, non-violence

India by finding true independence and self-expression through an imperishable Hindu-Muslim unity and through non-violent means, i.e., unadulterated self-sacrifice, can point a way out of the prevailing darkness.[141]

I believe that nothing remains static. Human nature either goes up or goes down. Let us hope, in India, it is going up. Otherwise, there is nothing but deluge for India and, probably, for the whole world.[142]

I am not thinking of the eternal law of love, much as I believe in it. If the whole of India accepted this, India will become the unquestioned leader of the whole world. Here I merely wish to suggest that there should be no surrender except to reason.[143]

I am only hoping and praying, and I want all the friends here and in other parts of the world to hope and pray with me, that this blood-bath will soon end and out of that perhaps inevitable butchery will rise a new and robust India—not warlike, basely imitating the West in all its hideousness, but a new India learning the best that the West has to give and becoming the hope not only of Asia and Africa, but the whole of the aching world.

I must confess that this is hoping against hope, for, we are today swearing by the military and all that naked physical force implies. Our statesmen have for over two generations declaimed against the heavy expenditure on armaments under the British regime, but now that freedom from political serfdom has come, our military expenditure has increased and still threatens to increase and of this we are proud! There is not a voice raised against it in our legislative chambers. In spite, however, of the madness and the vain imitation of the tinsel of the West, the hope lingers in me and many others that India shall survive this death dance and occupy the moral height that should belong to her after the training, however imperfect, in non-violence for an unbroken period of thirty-two years since 1915.[144]

'Will the war-weary Asiatic countries follow in the foot-steps of Japan and turn to militarization?' The answer lies in what direction India will throw its weight. India is becoming the laughing stock of the world. The world asks, where is your non-violence with which you have won your independence? I have to hang down my head in shame.

Will a free India present to the world a lesson of peace or of hatred and violence, of which the world is already sick unto death? [145]

Hope of exploited races

If India fails, Asia dies. It has been aptly called the nursery of many blended cultures and civilizations. Let India be and remain the hope of all the exploited races of the earth, whether in Asia, Africa or in any part of the world.[146]

'Paradise on earth'

I remember to have read, I forget whether in the Delhi or the Agra Fort, when I visited them in 1896, a verse on one of the gates, which when translated reads: 'If there is paradise on earth, it is here, it is here, it is here.' That Fort, with all its magnificence at its best, was no paradise in my estimation. But I should love to see that verse with justice inscribed on the gates of Pakistan at all the entrances. In such paradise, whether it is in the Union or in Pakistan, there will be neither paupers nor beggars, nor high nor low, neither millionaire employers nor half-starved employees, nor intoxicating drinks nor drugs. There will be the same respect for women as vouchsafed to men, and the chastity and purity of men and women will be jealously guarded. Where every woman, except one's wife, will be treated by men of all religions, as mother, sister or daughter according to her age. Where there will be no untouchability and where there will be equal respect for all faiths. They will be all, proudly, joyously and voluntarily, bread labourers. I hope everyone who listens to me or reads these lines will forgive me if, stretched on my bed and basking in the sun, inhaling life-giving sunshine, I allow myself to indulge in this ecstasy.[147]

SOURCES

A Bunch of Old Letters: Written mostly to Jawaharlal Nehru and some written by him: Asia Publishing House, Bombay, 1958, xvii + 511 pp.

An Autobiography or The Story of My Experiments with Truth: M. K. Gandhi: Navajivan Publishing House, Ahmedabad, 1956, XV+ 528 pp.

Gandhiji began writing the autobiography in 1922, in prison. It first appeared in Gujarati in December 1925. The English translation by Mahadev Desai, approved by Gandhiji, was serialized in *Young India*. The autobiography appeared in book form—Vol. I in 1927 and Vol. II in 1929. It was issued in a one-volume edition in 1940 and has since been reprinted several times.

Gandhiji's Correspondence with Government: 1944-47: Foreword and introduction by Pyarelal, Navajivan Publishing House, Ahmedabad, 1959, xlviii + 375 pp.

A collection of Gandhiji's letters' to Government from Aga Khan's Palace, Poona, where he was in detention during 1942-44, and after his release.

Harijan: Weekly journal founded by Gandhiji and published under the auspices of the Servants of the Untouchables Society, (Harijan Sevak Sangh) Poona. It had a succession of editors: R. V. Sastri (February II, 1933 to April 5, 1935); Mahadev Desai (April 13, 1935 to October 20, 1940 and January 18, 1942 to August 16, 1942), and Pyarelal (February 10, 1946 to February 22, 1948), K. G. Mashruwala (April 4, 1948 to September 13, 1952) and M. P. Desai (September 20, 1952 to February 25, 1956), when it was published from Ahmedabad. The paper was suspended during the "Individual Satyagraha" against War in 1940, and again in 1942 on the eve of the "Quit India" movement and Gandhiji's arrest and incarceration. The management came over to the Navajivan Trust, Ahmedabad, simultaneously with its revival on January 18, 1942. In 1946 (when publication was resumed) and 1947, the paper published reports of Gandhiji's prayer speeches during his tours of West and East Bengal and Bihar and stay in Delhi, during a period of unprecedented communal turmoil. Started originally as the mouthpiece of the movement for the removal of untouchability under Gandhiji's leadership, *Harijan* soon became the authentic forum for the expression of his

views on all major subjects, constituting thus a basic source of his writings until his death.

Indian Review: Monthly magazine founded in 1900 and edited and published by G. A. Natesan from Madras.

Speeches and Writings of Mahatma Gandhi: G. A. Natesan & Co., Madras, 1934, 4th edition, viii + 1072 + xv pp.

With Gandhiji in Ceylon: Ed. Mahadev Desai: S. Ganesan, Madras, 1928, 159 + vii pp.

A journal of Gandhiji's Ceylon tour in 1927 and authorized version of his speeches in course of it.

'Young India': Weekly paper edited by Gandhiji and published by Navajivan Publishing House, Ahmedabad, from October 8, 1919. On Gandhiji's imprisonment in 1922, Shuaib Qureshi took over the editorship, from March 30, and continued as editor till May 25. C. Rajagopalachari then assumed editorship on June 1, and functioned till September 20, 1923. After him, George Joseph took over the responsibility from September 27 and acted as editor till March 27, 1924. Gandhiji resumed editorship of the paper, on release from jail, on April 3, 1924 and carried on as editor till May 8, 1930. One issue after this date appeared under the editorship of J. C. Kumarappa. During the period July 17, 1930 to March 5, 1931, the paper appeared in the form of cyclostyled sheets, published by M. M. Bhatt. On March 12, 1931, Gandhiji once again became the editor, holding that position till December 31, 1931, after which the weekly ceased publication. During 1919-31, except for the term of his imprisonment in 1922-24 and his absence at the second Round Table Conference in 1931, the weekly carried his innumerable writings and reports of his important speeches, becoming a basic source for the period.

NOTES

I. Approach to Communal Unity

I. Early Background

1. *Harijan*, November 24, 1946, p. 409; speech during tour of Noakhali.
2. *Harijan*, September 15, 1946, p. 316; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi.
3. *Young India*, May 14, 1919; speech at a meeting of Anjuman Ziaul Islam in Bombay.
4. *Harijan*, September 15, 1946, p. 316; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi.
5. *Autobiography*, pp. 125, 126.
6. *Young India*, May 14, 1919; speech at a meeting of Anjuman Ziaul Islam in Bombay.
7. *Harijan*, November 24, 1946, p. 410; speech at Chaumuhani.
8. *Harijan*, March 3, 1947, p. 59; speech at Raipura, February 16.
9. *Harijan*, September 15, 1946, p. 316; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi.
10. *Autobiography*, p. 441.
11. *Young India*, May 14, 1919; speech at a meeting of Anjuman Ziaul Islam in Bombay.
12. *Autobiography*, p. 441.
13. *Young India*, September 25, 1924, p. 314.

2. Character of Communal Unity

14. *Young* India, May 7, 1919.

15. *Young India,* February 26, 1925, p. 75, in commenting on a letter from a Bengali *zamindar*.

16. *Young India,* December 24, 1931, p. 413; speech at Plenary Session of the Round Table Conference in London.

17. *Harijan,* April 21, 1946, p. 94; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, April 6. Gandhiji was referring to the Rowlatt Act Satyagraha, inaugurated on April 6, 1919.

18. *Harijan*, March 16, 1947, p. 62; speech at prayer meeting February 19.

19. *Harijan,* May 25, 1947, p. 165; at prayer meeting, May 10.

3. Hindu-Muslim Unity

20. *Young India,* May 7, 1919.

21. *Young India,* October 6, 1920, p. 4.

22. *Young India,* September 29, 1921, p. 307; in reply to a friend.

23. *Young India,* May 11, 1921, p. 148.

24. *Ibid.*

25. *Young India,* January 26, 1922, p. 62.

26. *Young India,* October 11, 1928, p. 342; in reply to a volunteer from Ahmedabad who had written to him seeking advice as to what Hindus should do in cases of Muslim assaults.

27. *Harijan*; March 16, 1947, p. 62; *vide* note 18 above.

28. *Young India,* September 29, 1921, p. 307.

29. *Young India,* April 2, 1925, p. 115; in reply to a Muslim lawyer.

30. *Young India,* November 26, 1925, p. 413; Gandhiji was asked by Maulana Abul Kalam Azad to call a meeting of the Congress Working Committee in order to consider the Hindu-Muslim question.

31. *A Bunch of Old Letters,* p. 46; letter to Jawaharlal Nehru, April 23, 1926.

32. *Young India,* September 9, 1926, p. 316; the alternative way referred to was Non-co-operation, adopted unanimously at a Hindu-Muslim Conference at Allahabad on June 30, 1920.

33. *Young India,* January 27, 1927, p. 31; in the course of a speech in Hindi at Sewan in Bihar when asked to speak on Hindu-Muslim unity.

34. *Young India,* September 24, 1931, p. 273; in an address to an Arab audience at Aden on August 30, 1931, on his way to the Round Table Conference in London.

35. *Young India,* December 12, 1931, p. 413; speech at Plenary Session of the Round Table Conference on November 28, 1931.

4. Equal Servant of All

36. *Young India,* March 10, 1927, p. 80; speech at Sholapur.

37. *Ibid.*

38. *Harijan,* January 27, 1940, p. 429; in reply to a visitor who charged him with having offered to sell his soul to win the favour of his Muslim friends.

39. *Harijan*, March 8, 1947, p. 59; speech at Raipura, February 16; *vide* note 8 above.

40. *Harijan*, July 6, 1947, p. 218; speech at prayer meeting.

41. *Harijan*, June 8, 1940, p. 156.

42. *Harijan*, May 11, 1947, p. 146; speech at prayer meeting, Patna, April 28. The reference to Iqbal's song is to *Saare jahanse achchha, Hindusthan hamara.*

43. *Harijan*, May 25, 1947, p. 165; speech at prayer meeting, Calcutta, May 10.

44. *Harijan*, September 28, 1947, p. 349; address at a meeting of Rashtriya Swayam Sevak Sangh (RSS) on September 16, at New Delhi.

45. *Harijan*, September 21, 1947, p. 336; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, September 13.

5. Communalism

46. Young India, September *9, 1926, p. 316.*

47. Harijan, January 6, 1940, p. 403, referring to the communal riots at Sukkur and Shikarpur in Sindh.

48. Harijan, September 15, 1940, p. 284.

49. Harijan, November 17, 1946, p. 402; speech at Calcutta.

50. Harijan, February 23, 1947, p. 38; speech at prayer meeting, Panchgaon, January 29.

51. *Harijan*, March 23, 1947, p. 78; in reply to a question at prayer meeting, February 26.

II. Achievement of Communal Unity

I. Common Interests

1. *Young India*, February 25, 1920, p. 3.
2. *Young India,* June 19, 1924, p. 205; in reply to questions raised by Babu Bhagwandas in a letter to him, printed in the same issue (pp. 207-8).
3. *Young India,* February 14, 1929, p. 52.
4. *Harijan*, June 24, 1939, p. 173; interview to Mr. Steel of the *New York Times*, at Rajkot. Mr. Steel asked him whether the Hindu-Muslim situation was getting worse.

2. Arbitration: Key to Solution

5. *Young India,* June 5, 1924, p. 185.
6. *Young India*, May 11, 1921, p. 148.
7. *Young India*, September 29, 1921, p. 307.
8. *Young India*, May 29, 1924, p. 177.
9. *Young India*, June 19, 1924, pp. 205-6; *vide* note 2 above.
10. *Young India*, September 18, 1924, p. 312.
11. *Ibid.*
12. *Young India*, December 26, 1924, p. 423; presidential address, at the 39th session of the Indian National Congress at Belgaum, December 1924.
13. *Young India*, June 16, 1927, pp. 196-7.
14. *Young India*, November 5, 1931, p. 335; in reply to a question, at the end of his speech at meeting in Woodbrooke Hall, Woodbrooke Settlement, Birmingham.
15. *Young India*, November 12, 1931, p. 356; in the course of a talk with members of the Raleigh Club, Oxford.
16. *Young India*, November 26, 1931, p. 372; speech in the Minorities Committee at the Round Table Conference, November 13.

17. *Harijan*, May 24, 1942, p. 166; in reply to a question by a newspaper representative at Bombay.

18. *Harijan*, February 9, 1947, p. 14; at the foundation ceremony of a Girls' High School performed by Fatima Jinnah, Jinnah had said: "Muslims should develop a high sense of responsibility, justice and integrity. Wrong was not to be imitated. If after consulting one's conscience one felt that a contemplated action was wrong, one should never do it, irrespective of any consideration or influence. If people acted up to this rule, no one would be able to prevent the Muslims from attaining Pakistan."

19. *Harijan*, March 30, 1947, p. 85; speech at prayer meeting, Patna, March 10.

3. Mutual Tolerance

20. *Young India*, May 7, 1919.

21. *Ibid*.

22. *Young India*, February 25, 1920, p. 3.

23. *Young India*, May 11, 1921, p. 148.

24. *Harijan*, May 31, 1942, p. 172; Gandhiji was commenting on hooliganism at Rajaji's meetings: "Hooliganism is no answer to Rajaji's argument. The disturbances at his meetings are a sign of great intolerance." The latter had advocated, *inter alia*, conceding the Muslims the right of secession.

25. *Harijan*, October 13,1946, p. 347; Gandhiji was commenting on Hindu rowdyism at a benefit performance in aid of a Convent School over a drama in which reference was made to Christ.

26. *Harijan*, October 5, 1947, p. 354; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, September 22.

27. *Young India*, January 26, 1922, p. 22.

28. *Harijan*, December 14, 1947, p. 466; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, on December 1. There had been exaggerated reports in the *Dawn* and *Pakistan Times* about atrocities against Muslims in Kathiawad.

4. The Unitary Method

29. *Indian Review*, October 1909, pp. 760f; quoted from a letter to a Mohammedan correspondent.

30. *Young India*, October 20, 1921, p. 333.

31. *Harijan*, February 1, 1942, p. 27; the Lucknow Pact, signed in December 1916, conceded separate electorates and increase in the 'weightage' to Muslims in the Punjab and Bengal legislatures, in excess of representation on a population basis. Representation at the Centre too was enhanced. Muslims agreed to give up their right to vote both in the general and the separate electorates, and agreed to a constitutional formula which would amount to dominion status for India.

32. *Ibid*.

5. Pacts

33. *Young India*, May 11, 1921, p. 148.

34. *Young India*, May 29, 1924, p. 176.

35. *Ibid*, p. 182.

36. *Young India*, August 21, 1924, p. 276; in the course of a reply to the charge from some American friends that, in the name of religion, he was introducing Bolshevism in India.

37. *Young India*, June 16, 1927, p. 196.

38. *Harijan*, June 18, 1938, p. 152.

39. *Harijan*, May 4, 1940, p. 115.

40. *Harijan*, January 25, 1942, p. 13.

6. Interdining and Intermarriage

41. *Young India*, February 25, 1920, p. 3.

42. *Young India*, October 20, 1921, p. 334.

43. *Young India*, June 4, 1931, p. 129; commenting on a letter from a student.

44. March 16, 1947; Gandhiji was asked about his views on the abolition of caste and on inter-religious marriages.

7. Oneness of Costume

45. *Harijan*, October 20, 1946, p. 368; in answer to a question in "Question Box".

8. The Vow of Unity

46. *Young India*, May 7, 1919; April 6, 1919 was observed as a "day of humiliation and prayer" in view of the passing of the Rowlatt Act in March despite unanimous opposition in the country. Gandhiji issued a leaflet on Hindu-Muslim unity, in Hindi, of which a free translation appeared in *Young India*.

9. The Meaning of Unity

47. *Young India*, May 29, 1924, pp. 182-3.

48. *Young India*, January 26, 1922, p. 62; with reference to the Moplah trouble in Malabar and the Musalman attitude.

49. *Young India*, September 29, 1921, p. 307.

50. *Young India*, March 16, 1922, p. 161; letter to Hakim Ajmal Khan from Sabarmati Jail, Ahmedabad, on March 12.

51. *Harijan*, November 23, 1947, p. 425; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, November 16.

10. Work for Unity

52. *Young India*, May 29, 1924, p. 182.

53. *Young India*, June 5, 1924, p. 185.

54. *Young India*, June 16, 1927, p. 196.

55. *Young India*, September 29, 1919; speech at public meeting of Musalmans in Bombay, September 18, on a resolution on the threatened dismemberment of Turkey.

56. *Young India*, March 16, 1922, p. 161; letter to Hakim Ajmal Khan on March 12, from Sabarmati Jail.

57. *Young India*, June 5, 1924, p. 185.

58. *Harijan*, March 16, 1947, p. 61; speech at prayer meeting, February 17. Gandhiji was asked now workers for communal, unity could avoid divided counsels.

59. *Harijan*, March 16, 1947, p. 62; speech at prayer meeting, February 19.

60. *Harijan*, February 2, 1947, p. 3; speech at prayer meeting, on the way to Badalkote, January 18.

61. *Harijan*, May 25, 1947, p. 166; written message at prayer meeting on silence day, Calcutta, May 12.

62. *Young India*, March 12, 1931, pp. 32, 36; speech at Delhi, March 7.

63. *Harijan*, April 28, 1946, p. 103; in reply to a question by a Jamia Millia student, New Delhi.

64. *Harijan*, May 25, 1947, p. 166; speech at prayer meeting, Calcutta, May 12.

III. Religious Aspects of The Communal Problem

I. Religion and Communal Unit

1. *Young India*, May 11, 1921, p. 148.

2. *Young India*, August 20, 1925, p. 292; address to European Christians, Jamshedpur.

3. *With Gandhiji in Ceylon*, p. 89; speech at Zahira College, Colombo, November 22, 1927.

4. *Harijan*, June 8, 1940, p. 157.

5. *Harijan*, July 13, 1940, p. 207.

6. *Harijan*, August 9, 1942, p. 261.

7. *Harijan*, February 23, 1947, p. 37; speech on silence day, Palla, January 27.

8. *Harijan*, March 16, 1947, p. 63; speech at prayer meeting, February 19.

9. *Harijan*, April 20, 1947, p. 119; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, April 5.

10. *Harijan*, June 29, 1947, p. 214; in conversation with Khwaja Saheb Abdul Majid, at New Delhi.

11. *Harijan*, October 5, 1947, p. 361; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, September 26.

12. *Harijan*, October 5, 1947, pp. 362-3; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, September 27.

13. *Young India*, January 4, 1948, p. 497; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, December 23, 1947.

14. *Autobiography*, p. 33.

15. *Young India*, August 28, 1924, p. 284.

16. *Young India*, September 25, 1924, pp. 317-8.

17. *Young India*, October 2, 1924, p. 321.

18. *Young India*, December 22, 1927, p. 425; speech at a meeting of missionaries at Jaffna, Ceylon, during his tour.

19. *Harijan*, November 3, 1946, p. 383; in the context of a ban imposed by the Sindh Government on *Satyartha Prakash*, a sacred book of the Arya Samaj.

20. *Young India*, May 29, 1924, p. 180.

21. *Young India*, September 22, 1927, p. 320; quoted by Gandhiji from his earlier article in *Young India*: "Inflammatory Literature", June 19, 1924, on *Rangila Rasul*, a "highly offensive" pamphlet in Urdu by anonymous author, published by Arya Pustakalaya, Lahore.

22. *Young India*, September 25, 1924, p. 313.

23. *Young India*, September 22, 1927, p. 320; quoted by Gandhiji from an earlier article: "Half a Dozen and Six", *Young India*, July 10, 1924, p. 332.

24. *Harijan*, November 3, 1946, p. 383; *vide* 19 above.

25. *Young India*, August 25, 1927, p. 272.

26. *Harijan*, December 8, 1946, p. 444; speech at prayer meeting, Madhupur, November 19.

27. *Young India*, January 20, 1927, p. 21; in reply to a letter about "Swaraj and Martyrdom".

28. *Harijan*, May 11, 1947, p. 148; speech at prayer meeting, Delhi, May 2.

29. *Harijan*, May 25, 1947, p. 166; speech at prayer meeting, Calcutta, May 13, in reply to a question: "What could we do to save ourselves and our culture, whether Hindu or Muslim?"

30. October 12, 1947, p. 665; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, September 30.

31. *Harijan*, October 12, 1947, p. 372; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, October 5.

2. Hinduism and The Communal Problem

32. *Harijan*, February 1, 1948, p. 11; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, January 21, referring to the bomb attack the previous day.

33. *Harijan*, September 25, 1924, p. 314.

34. *Ibid*, p. 317.

35. *Harijan*, April 30, 1938, p. 99; Press statement on April 22, on eye of interview with Jinnah.

36. *Harijan*, March 30, 1940, p. 65; in comment upon Jinnah's statement (quoted by Gandhiji): "If there exists the will to come to a settlement with the Muslim League, then why does not Mr. Gandhi, as I have said more than once, honestly agree that the Congress is a Hindu organization and that it does not represent anything but the solid body of Hindus? Why should Mr. Gandhi not be proud to say: 'I am a Hindu and the Congress is a Hindu body'? I am not ashamed of saying that I am a Muslim and that the Muslim League is the representative of Muslims. Why all this camouflage, why this threat of civil disobedience, and why this fight for a Constituent Assembly? Why should not Mr. Gandhi come as a Hindu leader and let me meet him proudly representing the Musalmans?"

37. *Harijan*, April 13, 1940, p. 92.

38. *Harijan*, July 13, 1940, p. 207; *vide* pp. 68, 51.

39. *Harijan*, April 27, 1947, p. 122; speech at prayer meeting Delhi, April 7.

40. *Harijan*, June 8, 1947, p. 182; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, May 30, *vide* para 82, p. 55.

41. *Harijan*, August 10, 1947, p. 275; speech at prayer meeting New Delhi, July 28.

42. *Harijan*, November 30, 1947, p. 446; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, November 21.

43. *Harijan*, September 28, 1947, p. 349; address to the Rashtriya Swayam Sevak Sangh, Delhi, September 16.

44. *Harijan*, November 30, 1947, p. 446; *vide* 42 above.

45. *Harijan*, February 1, 1948, pp. 12-3; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, January 23.

46. *Ibid*, p. 13.

47. *Harijan*, September 28, 1947, p. 349; *vide* 43 above.

48. *Young India*, October 6, 1921, p. 318.

49. *Harijan*, October 19, 1947, p. 378; speech at prayer meeting New Delhi, October 7.

50. *Young India*, September 18, 1924, p. 308.

51. *Young India*, January 19, 1928, p. 22; speech at a meeting of the Friends of the International Fellowship at Sabarmati Ashram.

52. *Harijan*, January 6, 1940, p. 403.

53. *Harijan*, November 24, 1946, p. 412; in a discussion with Thakkar Bapa and Shrimati Sucheta Kripalani, commenting on a friend's remark that *Himsa paramo dharmah* (Violence is the supreme law).

54. *Harijan*, December 8, 1946, p. 432; speech at Kazirkhil. Gandhiji referred to an idea he had at Aga Khan Palace, Poona, while incarcerated in 1942, of writing a thesis on India as a protagonist of non-violence, but had to give it up.

55. *Harijan*, January 5, 1947, p. 478; speech at prayer meeting, Shrirampur, November 26, 1946.

56. *Harijan*, May 18, 1947, p. 149; in reply to a French friend who asked Gandhiji if religion would die in a future Socialistic State of India.

57. *Harijan*, September 28, 1947, p. 350; in reply to a question, at the end of his address to the RSS at Delhi, on September 16, if "Hinduism permitted the killing of an evil-doer".

3. Islam and The Communal Problem

58. *Autobiography*, p. 106.

59. *Autobiography*, p. 137.

60. *Ibid*, p. 159.

61. *Young India*, August 21, 1924, p. 276.

62. *Young India*, March 21, 1929, p. 95.

63. *Young India*, May 29, 1924, p. 183.

64. *Young India*, September 25, 1924, p. 317.

65. *Young India*, January 20, 1927, p. 21.

66. *Young India*, January 26, 1922, p. 55; commenting on a correspondent's letter.

67. *Harijan*, July 13, 1940, p. 193.

68. *Ibid*, p. 207.

69. *Autobiography*, p. 497.

70. *Young India*, December 30, 1926, p. 458; in an obituary on Swami Shraddhanand's assassination by a Muslim fanatic, Abdul Rashid.

71. *Young India*, January 20, 1927, p. 21.

72. *Harijan*, October 28, 1939, p. 310; commenting on a letter from a Muslim who charged Gandhiji with having hardened his heart and failing to bear an open mind.

73. *Harijan*, November 11, 1939 p. 336; in reply to a correspondent—an "M.A. of Aligarh"—who had referred to Islam and the Prophet allowing the use of force on certain occasions. The Prophet had met force with force at Badr.

The correspondent had also quoted a statement reported to have been made in court by Maulana Abul Kalam Azad, "I do not agree with Mahatma Gandhi that the use of force should not be allowed in any case. Because I am a Muslim I

believe that the use of force is allowed on the particular occasions specified by Islam. Against the non-Muslim Government, Islam prescribes only sword, protracted battle and the cutting of throats."

74. *Harijan*, July 13, 1940, p. 193.

75. *Harijan*, September 22, 1940, p. 294; speech at the AICC meeting, Bombay.

76. *Young India*, January 26, 1922, p. 161.

77. *Young India*, May 29, 1924, p. 183.

78. *Young India*, June 5, 1924, p. 185.

79. *Young India*, September 25, 1924, p. 317.

80. *Harijan*, September 7, 1947, p. 310; speech at prayer meeting, Calcutta, August 25.

81. *Harijan*, March 30, 1940, p. 70; speech at meeting of Subjects Committee, Ramgarh Congress, March 18.

82. *Harijan*, June 8, 1947; p. 182; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, May 30; *vide* para 40, p. 45.

83. *Harijan*, January 25, 1948, p. 533; speech at Muslim gathering, on occasion of breaking his fast, New Delhi.

4. Conversion

84. *Speeches and Writings of Mahatma Gandhi*, p. 631; speech at Ahmedabad Congress, December 1921, on the 'Independence' resolution.

85. *Young India*, August 28, 1924, p. 284; *vide* para 136, pp. 70-2.

86. *Young India*, January 6, 1927, p. 2.

87. *Ibid*, p. 1.

88. *Young India*, January 19, 1928, pp. 22-3; at the meeting of Friends of the International Fellowship at Sabarmati Ashram.

89. *Harijan*, August 8, 1936, p. 204.

90. *Harijan*, January 12, 1947, p. 488; in an interview to a friend at Shrirampur; *vide* para 103, p. 61.

91. *Young India*, May 29, 1924, pp. 180-1.

92. *Young India*, January 6, 1927, p. 2.

93. *Young India*, October 6, 1920, p. 4.

94. *Young India*, May 11, 1921, p. 148.

95. *Young India*, September 29, 1921, p. 307.

96. *Young India*, January 26, 1922, p. 62.

97. *Harijan*, November 3, 1946, p. 387; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, October 20.

98. *Harijan*, November 24, 1946, p. 413; speaking to a Muslim League delegation at Chandpur, East Bengal.

99. *Ibid*, p. 414; commenting on a booklet issued by the District Magistrate, Mr. Mc.Inerny, stating that "anyone who accepted Islam after the beginning of the recent disturbances was forcibly converted and, in fact, remained a Hindu."

100. *Harijan*, December I, 1946, p. 426; speech at prayer meeting, Kazirkhil, November 14.

101. *Ibid*, p. 427; speech at prayer meeting, Ramganj, November 15.

102. *Harijan*, January 1, 1947 p. 479; speech at prayer meeting, Shrirampur, December 4, 1946.

103. *Harijan*, January 12, 1947, p. 488; interview to a friend at Shrirampur, December 12, 1946.

104. *Harijan*, February 23, 1947, p. 37; in the course of a prayer meeting, January 29.

105. *Young India*, October 23, 1924, p. 354.

106. *Harijan*, July 6, 1947, p. 218; in a "silence day" written message at prayer meeting, June 23.

107. *Harijan*, October 12, 1947, pp. 365-6; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, September 29.

108. *Harijan*, October 19, 1947, p. 380; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, October 11.

109. *Harijan*, November 2, 1947, p. 391; speech at prayer meeting New Delhi, October 22.

110. *Harijan*, November 9, 1947, p. 407; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, October 31.

111. *Harijan*, November 3, 1946, p. 387; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, October 20.

112. *Harijan*, December 8, 1946, p. 444; speech at prayer meeting, Madhupur, November 19.

113. *Harijan*, December 28, 1947, p. 482; address at meeting of Meos in Jesarah village, Gurgaon Tehsil, Punjab, December 9.

5. The Scriptures

114. *Young India*, July 21, 1920, p. 4.

115. *Young India*, December 8, 1920, p. 4.

116. *Young India*, January 19, 1921, p. 22.

117. *Young India*, February 26, 1925, p. 74; in the context of the reported stoning to death of two Ahmedia sect Mohammedans in Afghanistan.

118. *Young India*, October 14, 1926, p. 359.

119. *Ibid*.

120. *Young India*, September 26, 1929, p. 316; commenting on observations of *Prabuddha Bharata* in its September issue.

121. *Young India*, August 27, 1925, p. 293; a reply to the criticism by a reader of his claim to be a follower of Sanatana Dharma.

122. *Harijan*, March 23, 1947, p. 78; speech at prayer meeting, Chandpur, February 25.

123. *Young India*, October 6, 1921, p. 317.

124. *Young India*, September 25, 1924, p. 317.

125. *Young India*, September 2, 1926, p. 308; in reply to criticism by several correspondents of his reading the New Testament to students of the Gujarat National College, Ahmedabad.

126. *With Gandhiji in Ceylon*, p. 144; speech at Jaffna College, Ceylon, November 29, 1927.

127. *Harijan*, May 25, 1947, p. 166; speech at prayer meeting, Calcutta, May 14, answering a question: "Why do you ask the Hindus to study the Koran also? Is it not enough if they study their own religion?"

128. *Harijan*, January 25, 1948, p. 534; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, January 18.

129. *Harijan*, September 29, 1940, pp. 297-8.

130. *Harijan*, August 3, 1947, p. 259; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, July 21.

6. Temples and Mosques

131. *Young India*, August 28, 1924, p. 284.

132. *Young India*, January 27, 1927, p. 31.

133. *Harijan*, March 9, 1940, p. 30.

134. *Harijan*, February 23, 1947, p. 40; speech at prayer meeting, Sadurkhil, February 4.

135. *Harijan*, January 25, 1947, p. 533; speech on the occasion of breaking his fast, January 18.

136. *Young India*, August 28, 1924, p. 284.

137. *Young India*, September 18, 1924, p. 310.

138. *Young India*, December 18, 1924, p. 411.

139. *Harijan*, March 30, 1947, p. 86; speech at prayer meeting, Patna, March 12.

140. *Harijan*, April 13, 1947, pp. 107-8; speech at prayer meeting, Patna, March 28.

141. *Harijan*, August 17 1947, p. 278; in reply to an address in Gurumukhi at Panja Saheb, the famous Sikh *gurudwara* in West Punjab.

142. *Ibid*, Gandhiji observed this with reference to the protection of Panja Saheb, Nankana Saheb and other *gurudwaras* in Pakistan and elsewhere.

143. *Harijan*, December 7, 1947, p. 461; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, November 30.

144. *Harijan*, January 4, 1948, p. 495; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, December 22, 1947.

145. *Harijan*, February 8, 1948, p. 20; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, January 27. Gandhiji had visited the *Dargah Sharif* at Mehrauli that morning and was referring to damage done to it.

7. 'Music Before Mosques'

146. *Young India*, May 11, 1921, p. 148.

147. *Young India*, May 29, 1924, p. 181.

148. *Young India*, September 18, 1924, p. 312.

149. *Young India*, October 22, 1925, p. 360.

150. *Young India*, May 11 1921, p. 148.

151. *Young India* October 22, 1925, p. 360.

152. *Ibid*.

153. *Young India*, May 29 1924, p. 175.

154. *Ibid*, pp. 181-2

155. *Young India*, September 25, 1924, p. 317.

156. *Young India*, May 29, 1924, p. 177.

157. *Young India*, September 18, 1924, p. 312.

158. *Young India*, May 29, 1924, pp. 181-2.

159. *Ibid*, p. 182.

160. *Young India*, September 18, 1924, p. 312.

161. *Young India*, September 25, 1924, p. 317.

162. *Young India*, January 5, 1928, p. 4.

163. *Harijan*, February 23, 1947, p. 40; speech at prayer meeting; *vide* note 134 above.

164. *Harijan*, August 31, 1947, p. 298; speech at prayer meeting, Beliaghata, August 19.

8. Congregational Prayer

165. *Young India*, September 25, 1924 p. 313.

166. *Harijan*, January 5, 1947, p. 478; speech at prayer meeting, Shrirampur, November 28, 1946.

167. *Harijan*, April 27, 1947, p. 126; speech at prayer meeting, Delhi, April 8.

168. *Harijan*, January 5, 1947, p. 478; speech at prayer meeting, Shrirampur, November 28, 1946.

169. *Harijan*, April 2, 1947, p. 119; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, April 4.

170. *Harijan*, May 11, 1947, p. 148; speech at prayer meeting, Delhi, May 2.

171. *Harijan*, May 18, 1947, p. 155; speech at prayer meeting, Bhangi Colony, New Delhi, May 7 The verse quoted is the Hindi rendering of the Koran verse.

172. *Harijan*, April 27, 1947, p. 128; speech at prayer meeting, Delhi, April 12.

173. *Harijan*, August 17, 1947, p. 281; Gandhiji was replying to a question put to him at Srinagar during his visit.

174. *Harijan*, December 8, 1946, p. 443; speech at prayer meeting, Raniganj, November 16, referring to the need for silence during namaz and prayers.

175. *Harijan*, February 23, 1947, p. 37; *vide* note 104 above.

176. *Harijan*, April 20, 1947, p. 118; speech at prayer meeting, Delhi, April 3.

177. *Ibid*, pp. 118-9; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, April 4.

178. *Harijan*, May 18, 1947, p. 155; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, May 7.

179. *Harijan*, April 27, 1947, p. 126; speech at prayer meeting, Delhi, April 8.

180. *Harijan*, May 11, 1947, p. 148; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, May 2. A Hindu at the meeting had objected to the reciting of the Koranic verse and shouted *Hindu Dharma-ki jai*. The man had been arrested, but Gandhiji

requested the police to free him saying that it put him to shame if anybody was arrested for objecting to what he did.

181. *Harijan*, May 18, 1947, p. 155; speech at prayer meeting, Bhangi Colony, New Delhi, May 7.

182. *Harijan*, November 9, 1947, pp. 407-8; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, November 2, *vide* para 188, p. 87.

183. *Harijan*, May 18, 1947, p. 155; *vide* 181 above.

184. *Harijan*, May 25, 1947, p. 166; speech at prayer meeting, Bhangi Colony, New Delhi, May 12.

185. *Harijan*, October 5, 1947, p. 353; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, September 22.

186. *Ibid*, p. 354; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, September 23.

187. *Ibid*, pp. 353-4; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, September 22.

188. *Harijan*, November 9, 1947, pp. 407, 408; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, November 2; *vide* note 182 above.

9. Cow-slaughter and Cow-protection

189. *Young India*, May 11, 1921, p. 148.

190. *Young India*, May 29, 1924, p. 181.

191. *Young India*, May 11, 1921, p. 148.

192. *Young India*, January 29, 1925, pp. 38-9.

193. *Young India*, May 7, 1919.

194. *Young India*, May 18, 1921, pp. 156-7.

195. *Young India*, January 29, 1925, p. 38.

196. *Harijan*, May 11, 1947, pp. 145-6; speech at prayer meeting, Patna, April 25.

197. *Harijan*, April 27, 1940, p. 101.

198. *Young India*, April 8, 1926, pp. 131-2.

199. *Young India*, May 18, 1921, p. 157.

200. *Young India*, June 18, 1921, p. 182.

201. *Young India*, June 29, 1921, p. 237.

202. *Young India*, October 20, 1921, p. 333; in the course of a reply to the editor, *Modern Review*.

203. *Young India*, January 29, 1925, p. 38.

204. *Autobiography*, pp. 478-9.

205. *Young India*, May 29, 1924, p. 181.

206. *Young India*, April 27, 1940, p. 101; in reply to a question if, under a Hindu majority government, Muslims will be allowed to eat their 'national' food, beef.

207. *Harijan*, May 11, 1947, p. 146; speech at prayer meeting, Patna, April 25.

208. *Harijan*, November 16, 1947, p. 411; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, November 4; *vide* para 245, p. 102.

209. *Young India*, June 8, 1921, p. 182.

210. *Young India*, October 6, 1921, p. 318.

211. *Young India*, January 29, 1921, p. 38.

212. *A Bunch of Old Letters*, p. 42; letter to Jawaharlal Nehru, April 25, 1925.

213. *Harijan*, August 31, 1947, p. 300.

214. *Harijan*, September 7, 1947, p. 310; speech at prayer meeting, Calcutta, August 25.

215. *Young India*, May 7, 1919.

216. *Young India*, May 18, 1921, pp. 156-7.

217. *Young India*, June 29, 1921, p. 237.

218. *Young India*, September 18, 1924, p. 311.

219. *Young India*, January 29, 1925, p. 39.

220. *Young India*, January 27, 1927, p. 31; speech at Sewan, Bihar.

221. *Young India*, June 8, 1921, p. 182.

222. *Young India*, January, 29, 1925, p. 38.

223. *Harijan*, August 10, 1947, p. 300.
224. *Harijan*, August 10, 1947, p. 273; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, July 25.
225. *Harijan*, August 31, 1947, p. 300.
226. *Harijan*, November 16, 1947, pp. 410-1.
227. *Young India*, June 5, 1924, p. 65.
228. *Young India*, September 18, 1924, p. 311.
229. *Young India*, January 29, 1925, p. 39.
230. *Young India*, June 8, 1921, p. 182.
231. *Young India*, May 29, 1924, p. 181.
232. *Young India*, September 18, 1924, pp. 311-2.
233. *Young India*, January 5, 1928, p. 4.
234. *Young India*, May 7, 1919.
235. *Young India*, May 18, 1921, p. 157.
236. *Young India*, July 28, p. 237.
237. *Young India*, January 29, 1925, pp. 38-9.
238. *Harijan*, August 31, 1947, p. 300.
239. *Young India*, June 8, 1921, p. 182.
240. *Young India*, May 29, 1924, p. 181.
241. *Young India*, January 29, 1925, p. 38.
242. *Harijan*, May 11, 1947, pp. 145, 146; speech at prayer meeting, Patna, April 25.
243. *Harijan*, August 10, 1947, p. 273; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, July 25.
244. *Harijan*, August 31, 1947, p. 300.
245. *Harijan*, November 16, 1947, p. 411; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, November 4.
246. *Young India*, May 7, 1919.

247. *Young India*, May 29, 1924, p. 181.

248. *Young India*, December 18, 1924, p. 411.

249. *Harijan*, May 11, 1947, p. 145; speech at prayer meeting, Patna, April 25 *vide Hind Swaraj* (Navajivan, 1958 edn.) pp. 50-2.

250. *Harijan*, August 31, 1947, p. 300.

10. Untouchability and Caste

251. *Young India*, May 29, 1924, p. 177; the reference is to the 'untouchables'.

252. *Ibid*, p. 183; the reference to Vaikom is to the Satyagraha at Vaikom in Kerala for the right of the 'untouchables' and the 'unapproachables' to pass along certain streets prohibited to them.

253. *Young India*, March 11, 1926, p. 95; Murugesan, a *mala* (untouchable) by caste was tried at Tirupati for entering a temple at Tiruchanur and charged with "defilement with intent to insult the religion of a class". He was acquitted.

254. *Young India*, January 6, 1927, p. 2.

255. *Harijan*, August 8, 1936, p. 204.

256. *Harijan*, December 30, 1939, p. 394.

257. *Harijan*, June 1, 1940, p. 149; in reply to correspondents who had written to him protesting against his reference to exclusiveness as implicit in the Muslim League's demand for partition.

258. *Harijan*, January 5, 1947, p. 479; speech at prayer meeting, Shrirampur, December 4, 1946.

259. *Harijan*, January 26, 1947, p. 518; speech at a gathering of women in Chandipur, December 28, 1946.

260. *Harijan*, July 6, 1947, p. 218; written message at prayer meeting.

261. *Harijan*, July 27, 1947, p. 250; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, July 13.

262. *Harijan*, March 16, 1947, p. 62; speech at prayer meeting, February 20.

263. *Harijan*, September 28, 1947, p. 349; speech at a meeting of RSS, New Delhi, September 16.

264. *Harijan*, February 1, 1948, p. 12; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, January 22.

11. Communal Slogans

265. *Harijan*, March 23, 1947, p. 74; speech at prayer meeting, Patna, March 6.

266. *Harijan*, August 31, 1947, p. 299; speech at prayer meeting, Calcutta, August 21.

267. *Ibid*, p. 303; speech at prayer meeting, Alipore, August 23.

IV. Problem of Minorities

I. Muslims a Minority?

1. *Young India*, February 19, 1925, p. 64.

2. *Harijan*, October 21, 1939, p. 312.

3. *Young India*, February 19, 1925, p. 64.

4. *Ibid*, pp. 64-5.

5. *Young India*, April 2, 1925, p. 115; in reply to a question by Muslim lawyer.

6. *Ibid*.

7. *Young India*, April 24, 1930, p. 137; part of a nine-point statement issued by Gandhiji "as so much misrepresentation is being made about my attitude on the communal question".

8. *Harijan*, September 8, 1946, p. 296.

9. *Young India*, May 29, 1924, p. 182.

10. *Young India*, March 12, 1931, pp. 32, 36; speech at Delhi, March 7.

11. *Young India*, November 11, 1931, p. 352; talk to students at Eton, England.

12. *Harijan*, October 21, 1939, p. 312.

2. The Congress and The Minority Problem

13. *Young India*; January 9, 1930, pp. 13-4; commenting on the resolution on the communal question, adopted at the Congress session in 1929, at Lahore.

14. *Young India*, October 29, 1931, p. 327; speech in the Minorities Committee, Round Table Conference, London.
15. *Ibid*, p. 340; speech in London.
16. *Young India*, November 6, 1931, p. 372; speech at the Minorities Committee meeting, Round Table Conference, London, November 13.
17. *Harijan*, October 21, 1939, p. 312.
18. *Young India*, April 2, 1925, p. 115; in reply to a Muslim lawyer's question.
19. *Harijan*, November 4, 1939, p. 330.
20. *Harijan*, November 18, 1939, p. 341; Lord Zetland made the statement containing the charge that Congress was a Hindu organization in the House of Lords on October 18.
21. *Harijan*, February 24, 1940, p. 10.
22. *Harijan*, March 30, 1940, p. 65; *vide* para 36, p. 44 and note.
23. *Gandhiji's Correspondence with Government*, 1944-47 (1959), p. 18; telegram to Viceroy, June 15, 1945.
24. *Harijan*, October 6, 1946, pp. 337-8; at a meeting of the presidents and secretaries of District and Provincial Congress Committees in Delhi.
25. *Harijan*, March 23, 1947, p. 73; speech at prayer meeting Patna, March 5.
26. *Harijan*, July 27, 1947, p. 254; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, July 15.
27. *Harijan*, November 23, 1947, p. 425; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, November 16.
28. *Young India*, October 29, 1931, pp. 327, 328; speech at the meeting of the Minorities Committee, Round Table Conference, London.
29. *Harijan*, February 10, 1940, p. 441.
30. *Harijan*, October 21, 1939, p. 313.
31. *Harijan*, March 2, 1940, p. 22; in an interview to Manoranjan Babu and others from Noakhali during his stay in Malikanda.
32. *Harijan*, March 23, 1940, p. 49.

33. *Harijan*, October 21, 1939, p. 312.
34. *Ibid*, p. 313.
35. *Harijan*, November 4, 1939, p. 329.
36. *Harijan*, November 11, 1939, p. 339; he was commenting on an editorial in *The Times,* London.
37. *Ibid*, p. 340.
38. *Harijan*, December 2, 1939, p. 358.
39. *Harijan*, February 10, 1940, p. 441.
40. *Harijan*, February 24, 1940, pp. 9-10.

3. The Congress and The Muslims

41. *Young India*, April 16, 1931, p. 73; speech at a conference of *ulemas* in Karachi.
42. *Young India*, November 26, 1931, p. 372; speech in the Minorities Committee meeting, Round Table Conference, London, November, 13.
43. *Young India*, April 2, 1925, p. 115; in reply to a Muslim lawyer's question.
44. *Harijan*, October 7, 1939, p. 296.
45. *Harijan*, November 4, 1939, p. 330.
46. *Harijan*, December 2, 1939, p. 363; in reply to a correspondent.
47. *Ibid*, p. 358.
48. *Ibid*, p. 360.
49. *Harijan*, December 30, 1939, p. 394.
50. *Harijan*, January 20, 1940, p. 419
51. *Harijan*, April 6, 1940 pp. 73-4.
52. *Harijan*, April 13, 1940, p. 92; commenting on Liaquat Ali Khan's criticism of his reply to Jinnah.
53. *Harijan*, May 4, 1940, p. 109; in reply to a question.
54. *Harijan*, June 8, 1940, pp. 156-7; in reply to a "Khan Bahadur from Delhi".
55. *Ibid*.

56. *Harijan*, May 17, 1942, p. 158. Maulana Abul Kalam Azad, who was then the Congress President, had made the suggestion referred to in the passage. A correspondent had considered the suggestion as a "wise and patriotic" one and trusted that it would commend itself to Gandhiji.

57. *Gandhiji's Correspondence with Government*, 1944-47, 1959, p. 204; letter to Viceroy, June 12, 1946.

58. *Ibid*, p. 367; interview to Norman Cliff, June 29, 1946.

4. The Sikhs

59. *Young India*, March 19, 1931, pp. 42-3; speech at Sisganj Mosque, Delhi, March 6, to an audience of Sikhs.

60. *Harijan*, September 22, 1940, p. 294; *vide* para 23, p. 303.

5. Communal Settlement and Swaraj

61. *Young India*, August 28, 1924, p. 284.

62. *Young India*, December 26, 1924, p. 422.

63. *Young India*, April 24, 1930, p. 137; *vide* para 7, p. 114 and note.

64. *Young India*, November 24, 1921, p. 382; appeal to the men and women of Bombay on November 19, issued on the occasion of the riots connected with the boycott of the Prince of Wales' visit to the city, on November 17 and 18.

65. *Young India*, October 29, 1931, p. 324; in reply to a question, at the end of his address at Wood Brooke Hall, Birmingham.

66. *Harijan*, January 27, 1940, p. 429; *vide* para 38, p. 11 and note.

67. *Harijan*, March 30, 1940, p. 70; speech in the Subjects Committee, Ramgarh Congress, Bihar.

68. *Harijan*, April 6, 1940, p. 76.

69. *Harijan*, November 18, 1939, p. 340.

70. *Harijan*, December 2, 1939, p. 362; in reply to a question.

71. *Harijan*, April 13, 1940, p. 92; *vide* 52 above.

72. *Harijan*, September 22, 1940, p. 294; *vide* para 60, p. 135 and note.

73. *Harijan*, August 9, 1942, p. 261; *vide* para 107, p. 392.

74. *Young India*, May 11, 1921, p. 148.

75. *Young India*, September 29, 1921, p. 307, in the course of a reply to a friend.

76. *Young India*, November 5, 1931, p. 335; vide para 14, p. 19 and note.

77. *Ibid*, p. 340; speech in London meeting.

78. *Young India*, November 12, 1931, p. 356; in a talk to members of the Raleigh Club, London.

79. *Ibid*, p. 352; in a talk to the students of Eton, England.

80. *Young India*, December 24, 1931, pp. 412—3; speech at Plenary Session, Round Table Conference.

81. *Harijan*, December 2, 1931, p. 358.

82. *Harijan*, May 4, 1940, p. 115; commenting on what an English friend wrote:

"It is still at present reasonable to proceed on the assumption that the Muslims would accept something a good deal less than 'Pakistan'. But the trouble is that the longer the time that elapses without any compromise being reached, the stronger and more insistent will be the cry for 'Pakistan', so that in the end civil war or partition will be the only alternatives. I think the view held by some that there is nothing to be done but to wait upon events is fatal. It is up to the British now to use all their powers of persuasion and statesmanship to *compel* the parties to settle..."

83. *Harijan*, May 10, 1942, p. 152; the correspondent suggested that the Musalmans might rule for a period of five years and that the next section might rule for a similar period. It would allay present mistrust. A Committee of elected Princes could rule the States.

84. *Harijan*, July 12, 1942, p. 220.

85. *Gandhiji's Correspondence with Government*, 1944-47, (1959), pp. 365-6; interview to Norman Cliff, June 29, 1946.

86. *Ibid*, pp. 366-7; interview to Norman Cliff, June 29, 1946.

87. *Harijan*, September 15, 1946, p. 312; in answer to a friend's question.

88. *Ibid*, in answer to another question: "Do you realize that, if the present happenings are allowed to continue civil war will become inevitable? How would you advise your country to face such a catastrophe, if it comes?"

89. *Ibid*, p. 316; speech at prayer meeting.

90. *Harijan*, February 9, 1947, pp. 15, 18; speech at prayer meeting, Paniala, January 22.

91. *Harijan*, May 18, 1947, p. 149; in conversation with a French friend, at Delhi.

92. *Ibid*, p. 156; in answer to a question by Doon Campbell, Reuter's special correspondent in New Delhi, on May 5: "Do you subscribe to the opinion that Britain will be morally obliged to stay on in India if the outstanding Hindu-Muslim differences have not been resolved by June 1948?"

93. *Harijan*, July 20, 1947, p. 242; replying to a correspondent, who referred to George Bernard Shaw's famous statement that an Englishman "does everything on principle" and asked Gandhiji to clarify the situation in the country in the light of that dictum.

6. Separate Electorates

94. *Young India*, December 26, 1924, p. 423; presidential address at 39th session of the Indian National Congress at Belgaum, December.

95. *Young India*, February 19, 1925, p. 65.

96. *Young India*, October 29, 1931, p. 328; speech at meeting of Minorities Committee, Round Table Conference, London.

97. *Young India*, November 5, 1931, pp. 340-1; speech at a London meeting.

98. *Young India*, November 26, 1931, p. 372; speech at meeting of Minorities Committee, Round Table Conference, London.

99. *Harijan*, November 11, 1939, p. 337; in the course of a reply to "M.A. of Aligarh"; *vide* para 73, p. 53 and note.

100. *Harijan*, January 25, 1942, p. 13.

101. *Harijan*, February 15, 1942, p. 38.

V. Communal Disturbances

I. Tragedy of Riots

Harijan, October 13, 1946, p. 345; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, October 2. Nandita Kripalani had sung Tagore's song—"When the heart is hard and parched up, come upon me with a shower of mercy...When desire blinds the mind with delusion and dust, O thou holy one, thou wakeful, come with thy light and thy thunder." (*Gitanjali*, 1949, pp.30-1) There was gloom all over the country because of the grave communal disturbances in Calcutta, Dacca, Agra, Ahmedabad and Bombay.

2. *Harijan*, December 1, 1946, p. 428; speech at prayer meeting, Dattapara, November 10.

3. *Harijan*, February 9, 1947, p. 19; speech at prayer meeting Paniala, January 22.

4. *Harijan*, April 20, 1947, p. 119; speech at prayer meeting, Delhi, April 4.

5. *Harijan*, March 30, 1947, p. 86; speech at prayer meeting, Patna, March 12.

6. *Ibid*, p. 85; speech at prayer meeting, Patna, March 10, commenting on a letter from a friend.

7. *Harijan*, April 6, 1947, pp. 98-9; written message at prayer meeting, Patna, March 23.

8. *Harijan*, April 20, 1947, pp. 116-7; address to the Asian Relations Conference, Delhi, April 2.

9. *Ibid*, pp. 117-8; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, April 1.

10. *Ibid*, p. 120; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, April 6.

11. *Harijan*, April 27, 1947, p. 128; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, April 12.

12. *Harijan*, May 11, 1947; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, May 2.

13. *Harijan*, June 1, 1947, p. 172.

14. *Harijan*, June 8, 1947, p. 179; written message at prayer meeting.

15. *Ibid*, p. 177; in reply to a question by the Chinese Ambassador Dr. Lo Chia Luen, who had called on him in New Delhi: "How do you think things will shape themselves? How do you predict the future?"

16. *Harijan*, July 6, 1947, p. 218; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, June 24, referring to arson, stabbing and bomb explosions in Lahore, Amritsar and Calcutta.

17. *Harijan*, July 20, 1947, p. 240; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, June 25.

18. *Harijan*, July 27, 1947, p. 251; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, July 14.

19. *Harijan*, July 6, 1947, p. 219.

20. *Harijan*, October 12, 1947, p. 365; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, September 29; commenting on the reaction to his statement about the possibility of a war between the two Dominions which seems to have "produced a scare in the West".

21. *Ibid*, p. 371; speech at prayer meeting, on being acquainted with conditions in Kurukshetra refugee camp, near Delhi.

22. *Harijan*, November 16, 1947, p. 412; Gandhiji was commenting upon letters from two Americans, who wrote:

    "Your great distress due to the unhappy situation in your country demands that I intrude upon your contemplations of the painfid events now taking place in India, to remind you that your beautiful words have taken root in all the corners of the earth.

    "That you should feel a degree of disillusionment because of these sad happenings is natural. That, that disillusionment should be measured and certainly not turn into discouragement is the purpose of my letter.

    "Never does the seed turn directly into a beautiful fragrant flower without first going through certain phases of growth and development. And, if at some stage of its development or growth it falters, the presence of the gardener is more than ever required. In the complete absorption of the selfless task of nursing the ailing plant, the gardener perhaps cannot fully observe the growth of other

plants in his garden, to join with him in his compassion for their stricken brother.

"I plead with you to give consideration to the countless numbers of people in all countries on earth, of all classes, races and creeds, who are now also praying for peace. These people, whose hopes you have so well expressed and who took fresh courage from those victories which you did achieve with the Science of Peace, must now join me in prayer that the Master bless you and preserve you to continue your noble work, so much of which is still to be done."

2. Riots and Independence

23. *Harijan*, November 17, 1946, p. 402; speech at prayer meeting, Calcutta.
24. *Harijan*, March 23, 1946, p. 73; speech at prayer meeting, Patna, March 5.
25. *Harijan*, August 3, 1947, p. 258; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, July 20.
26. *Harijan*, September 21, 1947, pp. 334-5; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, September 12.
27. *Harijan*, October 5, 1947, p. 355; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, September 24.
28. *Harijan*, October 12, 1947, p. 366; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, October 1.

3. Partition Riots

29. *Harijan*; August 25, 1946, p. 280.
30. *Harijan*, November 10, 1946, p. 396; speech at prayer meeting, Calcutta.
31. *Harijan*, November 10, 1946, p. 395; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi.
32. *Ibid*, p. 396; speech at prayer meeting, Sodepur, Calcutta.
33. *Harijan*, November 24, 1946, p. 409; speech during his tour of Noakhali, Kushtia, Hacpur and Goalando in E. Bengal.
34. *Ibid*, p. 410; speech at Chaumuhani.
35. *Ibid*, p. 412.

36. *Harijan*, December 1, 1946, p. 426; speech at prayer meeting, Kazirkhil, November 14.

37. *Ibid*, p. 421; Press statement on eve of departure for Shrirampur, November 20.

38. *Harijan*, January 12, 1947, p. 488; interview to a friend at Shrirampur, *vide* para 90, p. 57.

39. *Ibid*, p. 490; in conversation with Dr. Amiya Chakravarty, Shrirampur.

40. *Harijan*, January 19, 1947, p. 495; speech at prayer meeting, Noakhali December 23, 1946, as reported by the Associated Press of India.

41. *Harijan*, January 26, 1947, p. 517; speech at prayer meeting, December 26, 1946.

42. *Harijan*, January 19, 1947, p. 508; speech at prayer meeting, January 6, 1947.

43. *Ibid*, pp. 493-4.

44. *Harijan*, November 10, 1946, p. 396; *vide* para 32, p. 162 and note.

45. *Ibid*, p. 392; open letter to Bihar, on the outbreak of communal disturbances there, from Sodepur, November 6.

46. *Harijan*, December 8, 1946, p. 432; letter to Sevagram Ashram inmates, prior to November 24.

47. *Harijan*, January 12, 1947, p. 488; interview to a friend at Shrirampur, who remarked that "it was painful to see how listless the Hindus had become".

48. *Ibid*, p. 490; in conversation with Dr. Amiya Chakravarty.

49. *Ibid*, p. 490; to Pyarelal.

50. *Ibid*, pp. 490-1; to a friend, in conversation.

51. *Harijan*, January 26, 1947, p. 517; speech at prayer meeting, December 27, 1946.

52. *Harijan*, January 19, 1947, p. 493; asked by a representative regarding the report that he (Gandhiji) found himself in darkness and why and when the darkness came over him and whether he saw any release from it.

53. *Ibid*; in reply to a question by the correspondent of a Madras newspaper.

54. *Harijan*, January 26, 1947, p. 517; speech at prayer meeting, Chandipur, December 28, 1946.

55. *Harijan*, February 9, 1947, p. 14; in reply to a question put to him at Narayanpur on January 15: "Why cannot the apostle of non-violence, the modern Buddha, stop internecine war and bloodbath in the country?"

56. *Harijan*, March 9, 1947, p. 57; at the prayer meeting on February 10, Gandhiji was asked: "Can there be any hope of establishing Hindu-Muslim unity here in spite of the Congress-League differences which are at the root of all the troubles everywhere?"

57. *Harijan*, May 25, 1947, p. 166; in reply to a question as to what could be done by the citizens of Calcutta, which had virtually become divided into Hindu and Muslim zones.

58. *Harijan*, September 7, 1947, p. 313.

59. *Harijan*, November 17, 1946, pp. 402-3; the report of violent outbreaks in Bihar appearing in the Press prompted Gandhiji, who was deeply concerned over the trouble, to send a wire to Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru through the Chief Minister of Bengal. Nehru had already proceeded to Patna from Calcutta along with three of his colleagues. He replied to Gandhiji's telegraphic message that "the situation was tense and grave in many parts, but Government were doing their utmost to bring it under control. He himself with his colleague, Sardar Abdul Rab Nishtar, had decided to stay on in Bihar as long as it might be necessary." While Bakr-Id passed off quietly all over India, Bihar had trouble... the news from Bihar had set Gandhiji at war with himself.

    It was in Champaran, in Bihar, that Satyagraha was first started by Gandhiji in 1917, over the grievances of tenants in the Indigo plantations.

60. *Harijan*, March 23, 1947, pp. 74-5; speech at prayer meeting, Patna, March 7.

61. *Ibid*, p. 73; speech at prayer meeting, Patna, March 5.

62. *Harijan*, March 30, 1947, pp. 86-7; speech at prayer meeting, Patna, March 12.

63. *Ibid*, p. 87; speech at prayer meeting, Patna, March 13.

64. *Harijan*, May 4, 1947, p. 133; speech at prayer meeting, Patna, April 15. Gandhiji referred to some letters he had received doubting his wisdom in going to Bihar at the instance of Dr. Syed Mahmud.

65. *Harijan*, April 20, 1947, p. 117; speech at prayer meeting, Delhi, April 1.

66. *Harijan*, September 21, 1947, pp. 334-5; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, September 12. Gandhiji was referring to violence in the N. W. F. Province.

67. *Harijan*, August 24, 1947, p. 295; speech at prayer meeting, Sodepur, August 12.

68. *Ibid*, pp. 295-6; speech at prayer meeting, Beliaghata, August 14.

69. *Ibid*, p. 296; speech at prayer meeting, Beliaghata, on Independence Day.

70. *Ibid*, p. 292; speech at prayer meeting, Beliaghata, August 16.

71. *Young India*, August 28, 1924, p. 284.

72. *Harijan*, April 20, p. 119; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, April 4.

73. *Ibid*, p. 120; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, April 6.

74. *Harijan*, September 21, 1947, p. 330; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, September 8.

75. *Ibid*, p. 335; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, September 12.

76. *Ibid*, p. 335; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, September 12.

77. *Harijan*, September 28, 1947, p. 338; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, September 15.

78. *Ibid*, p. 339; address to Muslims at Daryaganj, New Delhi, September 19.

79. *Harijan*, September 21, 1947, p. 336; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, September 14.

80. *Harijan*, October 5, 1947, p. 354; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, September 22.

81. *Ibid*, pp. 354-5; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, September 23.

82. *Ibid*, pp. 361-2; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, September 25.

83. *Harijan*, January 18, 1948, p. 513; in conversation with friends, at New Delhi, expressing his deep concern over the communal situation.

84. *Ibid*, p. 517; open letter to the "Men and Women of Gujarat" on January 14, the second day of his fast, at New Delhi.

85. *Harijan*, February 1, 1948, p. 10; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, January 20. The Peace Pledge was as follows:

"We wish to announce that it is our heart-felt desire that the Hindus, Muslims and Sikhs and members of other communities should once again live in Delhi-like brothers and in perfect amity, and we take the pledge that we shall protect the life, property and faith of Muslims, and that the incidents which have taken place in Delhi will not happen again.

"We want to assure Gandhiji that the annual fair at Khwaja Qutab-ud-din Mazar will be held this year as in the previous years.

"Muslims will be able to move about in Subzimandi, Karol Bagh, Paharganj and other localities just as they could in the past.

"The mosques which have been left by Muslims and which are now in the possession of Hindus and Sikhs will be returned. The areas which have been set apart for Muslims will not be forcibly occupied.

"We shall not object to the return to Delhi of the Muslims who have migrated from here if they choose to come back and Muslims shall be able to carry on their business as before.

"We assure that all these things will be done by our personal efforts and not with the help of the police or the military..."

VI. The Causes of Communal Riots

I. Specific Causes

1. *Young India*, May 29, 1924, p. 181: Gandhiji wrote a long and detailed survey entitled "Hindu-Muslim Tension: Its Cause and Cure", ibid, pp. 173-81.

2. *Young India*, June 5, 1924, p. 188, a summary of the long statement above.

2. Psychology of Fear

3. *Young India*, May 29, 1924, p. 176.
4. *Young India*, September 18, 1924, p. 312.
5. *Young India*, May 29, 1924, p. 177.
6. *Young India*, September 18, 1924, p. 308; in commenting on a correspondent's observations.
7. *Ibid*, p. 311.
8. *Young India*, October 11, 1928, p. 342; with reference to acts of Muslim vandalism at Godhra.
9. *Harijan*, January 6, 1940, p. 403; writing in the context of communal riots in Sukkur and Shikarpur in Sindh; *vide* para 15, p. 266-7.
10. *Harijan*, November 3, 1946, p. 388; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, giving a new year's message on the eve of Divali.
11. *Harijan*, December 1, 1946, p. 422; speech at a gathering of Hindus and Muslims, Dattapara, November 8.
12. *Harijan*, January 5, 1947, p. 479; speech at prayer meeting, Shrirampur, December 4.
13. *Ibid*, p. 477; speech at prayer meeting, Shrirampur, November 20.
14. *Harijan*, December 8, 1946, p. 442; written message at prayer meeting, Kazirkhil, silence day, November 18.
15. Harijan, January 5, 1947, p. 479; speech at prayer meeting, Shrirampur, December 6.
16. *Harijan*, January 26, 1947, pp. 517-8; speech at prayer meeting, Chandipur, December 28, 1946.
17. *Young India*, May 29, 1924, p. 174.
18. *Harijan*, January 6, 1940, p. 403, with reference to communal trouble in Sindh.
19. *Harijan*, April 20, 1947, p. 119; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, April 5. Gandhiji was referring to acts of violence in Noakhali, Bihar and the Punjab.

20. *Ibid*, p. 120; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, April 6. Gandhiji was writing against the background of violent outbreaks in the Punjab.

3. Distrust

21. *Young India*, May 7, 1919.

22. *Young India*, May 11, 1921, p. 148.

23. *Young India*, March 16, 1922, p. 161; letter to Hakim Ajmal Khan, February 12, 1922, from Sabarmati Jail.

24. *Young India*, May 29, 1924, p. 177; *vide* note 1 above.

25. *Young India*, June 19, 1924, p. 205; in reply to questions raised by Babu Bhagwandas in a letter addressed to Gandhiji and published in the same issue.

26. *Young India*, April 2, 1925, p. 115; in answer to a question by a Muslim lawyer.

4. Tiredness of Non-violence

27. *Young India*, May 29, 1924, pp. 174-5; discussing the causes of Hindu-Muslim tension.

5. Propaganda of Vilification

28. *Young India*, May 7, 1919.

29. *Young India*, May 18, 1921, p. 156; with reference to reported instances of forcible removal of fish and meat from people by overzealous vegetarians under the pretext that Gandhiji had made vegetarianism part of non-co-operation.

30. *Young India*, July 16, 1925, p. 248; Gandhiji had received abusive letters from Hindu correspondents after he had stated, in an interview to the Associated Press about the Hindu-Muslim riots in Kidderpore, that the Hindu labourers were wholly in the wrong.

31. *Young India*, May 29, 1924, p. 180.

32. *Young India*, July 10, 1924, p. 332, quoted in *Young India*, September 22, 1924, p. 320; Gandhiji was writing with reference to *Rangila Rasul*, controversy over which arose again in 1927.

33. *Young India*, December 30, 1926, p. 458; Gandhiji was writing in the context of the assassination of Swami Shraddhanand by Abdul Rashid, *vide* para 40, p. 193.

34. *Harijan*, May 4, 1940, p. 117.

35. *Harijan*, August 25, 1946, p. 298.

36. *Harijan*, October 6, 1946, p. 338; at a meeting of the presidents and secretaries of District and Provincial Congress Committees, on the occasion of the A.I.C.C. meeting, Delhi.

37. *Ibid*, pp. 338-9.

38. *Harijan*, September 28, 1947, p. 352; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, September 20.

39. *Harijan*, January 4, 1948, pp. 498-9; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, December 25, 1946.

40. *Young India*, December 30, 1926, p. 458; *vide* note 33 above.

41. *Young India*, September 22, 1927, p. 321; *vide* note 21 above.

42. *Harijan*, January 19, 1947, p. 496; 'silence day' message at prayer meeting, New Delhi, December 23 as reported by the Associated Press of India.

43. *Harijan*, February 1, 1948, p. 13; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, January 23.

44. *Harijan*, February 8, 1948, p. 21; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, January 27, Gandhiji was speaking with reference to a telegram from Muslims that "his fast had produced no effect in Mysore". This was disproved by another telegram later which claimed that, on the contrary, it had eased the tension.

6. The Third Party

45. *Young India*, October 6, 1920, p. 4.

46. *Young India*, June 8, 1921, p. 182.

47. *Young India*, October 20, 1921, pp. 333-4; in commenting on an editorial in the *Modern Review*, *vide* note to para 202, p. 91.

48. *Young India*, June 5, 1924, p. 185.

49. *Young India*, September 18, 1924, p. 311; Gandhiji was writing in the context of communal trouble in parts of Gujarat.

50. *Harijan*, November 3, 1946, p. 382; interview to Preston Grover at New Delhi, on October 21. Gandhiji was asked as to when this type of disturbances would end in India, the reference being to the outbreaks of disorder in East Bengal.

51. *Harijan*, June 8, 1947, p. 181; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, May 29.

52. *Young India*, June 16, 1927, p. 196; Gandhiji was referring to the desirability of "any agreement between the component parts of the nation" being voluntary and capable of enforcement, *vide* para 37, p. 26.

53. *Young India*, November 12, 1931, p. 356; in a talk to the members of the Raleigh Club, London, in answer to a question whether the British attitude was an obstacle in his path.

54. *Harijan*, October 21, 1939, p. 312.

55. *Harijan*, May 4, 1940, p. 109.

56. *Harijan*, May 24, 1942, p. 162; in reply to a question:

"You have repeated in your interview in Bombay (*vide* para 17, p. 20 and note) what you have said often that nothing can prevent the Muslims from having what they want unless the objectors would fight over the issue. What is the difference between you and Shri Rajagopalachari's attitude?" Gandhiji replied: "Though he has quoted me in his support, I see the same difference between him and me that is there between chalk and cheese. He yields the right of secession now to buy unity in the hope of keeping away the Japanese... My statement amounts to the enunciation of the proposition that I cannot prevent my neighbour from committing a sin. Shri Rajagopalachari would be a party to the sin, if the neighbour chooses to commit it. I cannot be party...Fear of the Japanese has blinded C.R. to the obvious truth. Independence sheds all fear—fear of the Japanese, of anarchy, and of the wrath of the British lion."

57. *Ibid*, p. 166; in answer to the question: "Would you review the situation created by the Allahabad A.I.C.C. meeting? What would you say regarding Rajaji's quoting your words regarding Pakistan in support of his latest move?" Gandhiji replied: "I would leave the Allahabad resolutions to themselves. C.R. has quoted me correctly." *vide* also, para 17, p. 20.

58. *Harijan*, June 7, 1942, p. 180; in commenting on a "cogent letter from a friend who is most anxious to bridge the political gulf between Rajaji and me" *vide* paras 25 and 26, pp. 303-4.

59. *Harijan*, June 14, 1942, p. 187; in answer to the question, "But what does a free India mean, if, as Mr. Jinnah said, Muslims will not accept Hindu rule?" Interview to two American newspaper-men Mr. Chaplin (International News Service, America) and Mr. Beldon (representing *Life* and *Time*) at Sevagram.

60. *Harijan*, June 21, 1942, p. 198. The Nagpur correspondent of *The Hindu* asked Gandhiji:

"Till the last day, you said there can be no Swaraj without Hindu-Muslim unity. Now, why is it that you think there will be no unity until India has achieved independence?"

VII. Social Implications of Communal Riots

1. The Goondas and Riots

1. *Young India*, May 29, 1924, p. 180.
2. *Harijan*, April 7, 1946, p. 74; speech at Shivaji Park, Bombay, March 14 *vide* para 65, p. 282.
3. *Harijan*, December 1, 1946, p. 422; speech on board *Kiwi*, at Chandpur, E. Bengal, November 7.
4. *Young India*, September 18, 1924, p. 309.
5. *Young India*, June 19, 1924, p. 205.
6. *Harijan*, September 15, 1940, p. 285.
7. *Harijan*, November 17, 1946, p. 402; speech at Calcutta, with reference to riots in Bihar.
8. *Harijan*, September 7, 1947, pp. 315-6; speech at prayer meeting, Calcutta, August 29. Gandhiji was asked whether the minorities would have recognition as religious minorities had.

9. *Harijan*, September 14, 1947, p. 318; speaking to an all-community deputation comprising Shaheed Suhrawardy, N. C. Chatterji, and Niranjan Singh Taleb, on September 4, at Calcutta, regarding the recrudescence of communal trouble.

2. Communal Crime and Truth

10. *Harijan*, November 17, 1946, p. 401; speech at prayer meeting, Calcutta.

11. *Harijan*, December 8, 1946, p. 444; speech at prayer meeting, Dasgharia, November 17.

12. *Harijan*, April 27, 1947, p. 127; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, April 11. Shaheed Suhrawardy, Chief Minister of Bengal, had issued a statement in the Press that the release of Satish Babu's wires regarding the Noakhali happenings had provoked fresh trouble in Calcutta.

13. *Harijan*, October 20, 1946, p. 368.

14. *Harijan*, June 8, 1947, p. 181; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, May 29.

15. *Ibid*, p. 182; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, May 30. Gandhiji was referring to murder and incendiarism in villages near Gurgaon, Delhi.

16. *Harijan*, February 9, 1947, p. 19; speech at prayer meeting, Muraim, January 24.

17. *Harijan*, July 27, 1947, p. 255; commenting on an editorial in Dawn of Lahore of July 18, which had taken him to task for his statement that Jinnah's assurances about the protection of the minorities in Pakistan would be valued according to the corresponding deeds of the Muslims there.

18. *Harijan*, September 1947, p. 322; Press statement, September 1, Calcutta. Dev Prakash, Gandhiji's secretary in Patna had wired: "Public agitated over Punjab happenings. Feel statement necessary impressing duty of public and the Press." Gandhiji accordingly issued a warning against unguarded writings in the Press.

19. *Harijan*, October 19, 1947, p. 378; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, October 8.

3. Crimes Against Women

20. *Young India*, December 18, 1924, p. 411.

21. *Young India*, October 22, 1925, p. 360.
22. *Ibid*.
23. *Young India*, October 11, 1928, pp. 341-2; *vide* para 8, p. 185 and note.
24. *Harijan*, February 10, 1946, p. 7; speaking to the villagers of Mahishdal and surrounding villages who met him on December 29, 1945.
25. *Harijan*, Septejnber 15, 1946, p. 312.
26. *Harijan*, October 27, 1946, p. 375; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi.
27. *Ibid*; Gandhiji was referring to his advice to women running the risk of dishonour to end their lives by taking poison, *vide* para 30, p. 208.
28. *Harijan*, January 26, 1947, p. 518; speaking to a gathering of women, Chandipur, December 28, 1946.
29. *Harijan*, February 9, 1947, p. 9; in reply to the question: "What is a woman to do when attacked by miscreants? To run away or resist with violence? To have boats in readiness to fly or to prepare to defend with weapons?"
30. *Harijan*, October 27, 1946, p. 375; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi.
31. *Harijan*, November 3, 1946, p. 387; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, October 20.
32. *Harijan*, November 24, 1946, p. 412; ill a discussion with friends at Kazirkhil.
33. *Harijan*, January 26, 1947, p. 518; speech at prayer meeting, Chandipur, December 28, 1946.
34. *Harijan*, February 9, 1947, p. 9; in reply to the question: "Can a woman be advised to take her own life rather than surrender?" *vide* para 29 above and note.
35. *Harijan*, October 5, 1947, p. 354; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, September 23; Gandhiji was referring to the plight of 18,000 Hindus and Sikhs in Rawalpindi refugee camp and 30,000 in Wah camp.
36. *Harijan*, March 23, 1947, p. 74; speech at prayer meeting, Patna, March 6.
37. *Ibid*, p. 75; speech at prayer meeting, Patna, March 7.

38. *Harijan*, December 7, 1947, pp. 459-60; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, November 29.

39. *Harijan*, December 14, 1947, p. 472; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, December 7.

40. *Harijan*, January 4, 1948, p. 497; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, December 26.

41. *Harijan*, February 1, 1948, p. 13; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, January 24, referring to the complaint that the inter-Dominion agreement regarding the restoration of abducted women was not being duly implemented.

42. *Harijan*, December 7, 1947, pp. 457-8; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, November 26.

43. *Ibid*, p. 460.

44. *Harijan*, December 14, 1947, p. 472; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, December 7.

45. *Harijan*, January 4, 1948, p. 499; speech at prayer meeting, December 26.

4. Restoration of Peace

46. *Harijan*, January 12, 1947, p. 489; in an interview.

47. *Ibid*.

48. *Harijan*, March 30, 1947, p. 88; speech at prayer meeting, Khusrupur, March 14. The secretary of the Provincial Muslim League had complained to Gandhiji that, though the Government had made arrangements for repatriation, the mental attitude of the Hindus was not sufficiently reassuring.

49. *Harijan*, April 4, 1947, p. 97; speech at prayer meeting, Masurhi, March 17.

50. *Harijan*, April 20, 1947, p. 119; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, April 5.

51. *Harijan*, June 1, 1947, p. 175; speech at prayer meeting, Hilsa (Bihar), May 20.

52. *Harijan*, February 2, 1947, p. 3; speech at prayer meeting, January 18.

53. *Ibid*.

54. *Harijan*, July 6, 1947, p. 218; on June 25 newspapers carried reports that Hindu, Sikh and Muslim leaders of Lahore had issued a joint peace appeal and that they were determined to put down violence.

55. *Harijan*, August 31, 1947, p. 299; speech at prayer meeting, Calcutta, August 20. The Central Peace Committee and local committees were set up soon after August 15.

56. *Harijan*, August 31, 1947, p. 310; speech at prayer meeting, Calcutta, August 25.

57. *Harijan*, October 26, 1947, p. 382; speech at prayer meetings, New Delhi, October 14.

58. *Ibid*, pp. 387-8; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, October 19. Gandhiji was referring to the presence, at the prayer meeting the previous day, of Sheikh Abdulla and the widow of Rafi Ahmed Kidwai's brother.

59. *Harijan*, December 28, 1947, p. 482; address to a gathering of Meos, who had been driven out of Alwar and Bharatpur States, in the village of Jesarah, Gurgaon, near Delhi, December 9.

60. *Harijan*, January 25, 1948, pp. 535-6; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, January 19.

61. *Harijan*, February 1, 1948, p. 10; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, January 20.

62. *Harijan*, May 11, 1940, p. 123; in reply to the questions: "You feel keenly about Bihar. You ask for justice about it and you want Muslims outside Hyderabad to see that justice is done. Do you feel equally keenly if Muslims are ill-treated as they were in Bihar?"

63. *Harijan*, June 1, 1940, p. 149. Five persons from Hyderabad, Deccan, writing to Gandhiji, had suggested the appointment of an impartial commission of inquiry to go into the communal disturbances in Bihar.

64. *Harijan*, August 18, 1946, p. 276; the reference to Rajabali was to the Muslim Congress worker who met his death in trying to pacify a mob at Ahmedabad, *vide* Harijan, July 14, 1946.

65. *Harijan*, January 4, 1948, p. 497; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, December 23, 1947.

66. *Harijan*, January 12, 1947, p. 488; in conversation with a friend who drew his attention to the "monstrosities that have been committed at Noakhali in the name of religion".

67. *Ibid*, p. 490; in conversation with Dr. Amiya Chakravarty.

68. *Harijan*, February 9, 1947, p. 14; answering a question at Narayanpur, January 15.

69. *Harijan*, February 23, 1947, pp. 37-8; speech at prayer meeting, January 29.

70. *Harijan*, March 9, 1947, p. 57; speech at prayer meeting, February 10.

71. *Harijan*, April 6, 1947, p. 98; speech at prayer meeting, Patna, March 22.

72. *Harijan*, June 1, 1947, pp. 174-5; speech at prayer meeting, Barh (Bihar), May 19.

73. *Harijan*, February 23, 1947, p. 39; speech at prayer meeting, February 1.

74. *Harijan*, March 23, 1947, p. 75; speech at prayer meeting, Patna, March 7.

VIII. Personal Reaction to Communal Riots

I. Religion and Riots

1. *Young India*, May 29, 1924, p. 176.

2. *Young India*, September 25, 1924, p. 313. Gandhiji was referring to the violent disturbances in Amethi, Shambhar, Gulbarga and Kohat; *vide* para 28, pp. 225-6.

3. *Young India*, December 30, 1926, p. 458. Gandhiji was writing in the context of the assassination of Swami Shraddhanand, *vide* para 40, p. 193.

4. *Young India*, June 16, 1927, p. 196.

5. *Harijan*, July 28, 1946, p. 244; writing of the "butchery" in Ahmedabad.

6. *Ibid*, p. 243; speech at prayer meeting, Panchgani, July 20.

7. *Harijan*, October 6, 1946, p. 342; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi (prior to October 1).

8. *Harijan*, April 6, 1947, p. 97; speech at prayer meeting, Patna, March 21.

9. *Harijan*, September 21, 1947, p. 335; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, September 12.

2. Fasts for Communal Peace

10. *Harijan*, October 27, 1946, pp. 372-3; in the course of a talk with two friends from Bengal who asked him whether he would recommend fasting to check violence in Bengal.

11. *Harijan*, April 20, 1947, p. 119; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, April 5.

12. *Young India*, September 25, 1924, p. 313.

13. *Ibid*.

14. *Young India*, October 23, 1924, p. 353; in a discussion about the fast with Mahadev Desai, who asked him: "Bapu, should the penance take only this shape, and no other? Is fasting prescribed by our religion?"

15. *Ibid*, p. 354; in the course of a discussion about the fast with Shaukat Ali.

16. *Ibid*, pp. 353-4; Shaukat Ali, it was expected, would probably shake Gandhiji's resolve to fast. "The long talk with him", wrote Mahadev Desai, "was however of no avail..."

17. *Ibid*; Shaukat Ali, in his discussion with Gandhiji, posed the question: "Are you not even bound to consider what a shock it will be to the country, this long fast of yours?"

18. *Ibid*; in the course of his argument, Shaukat Ali protested to Gandhiji that he had not failed to influence people through his writings on communal amity. He said: "... Do not, Sir, come in the way of the Lord. You are wrestling with Him… Let Him have His way."

19. *Ibid*, p. 353; in reply to Mahadev Desai's question; *vide* 14 above.

20. *Ibid*, p. 354; to Shaukat Ali.

21. *Young India*, September 25, 1924, p. 314.

22. *Young India*, October 23, 1924, p. 353; to Shaukat Ali, in a discussion of the fast.

23. *Young India*, September 25, 1924, p. 313.

24. *Ibid*, p. 314.

25. *Young India*, October 23, 1924, p. 354; to Shaukat Ali in a discussion of the fast.

26. *Young India*, October 9, 1924, p. 329; writing on October 6.

27. *Harijan*, November 17, 1946; letter to Amrit Kaur, from Calcutta, November 4.

28. *Ibid*; letter to Jawaharlal Nehru, from Calcutta, November 5.

29. *Harijan*, November 10, 1946, p. 392; 'open letter' to Bihar, from Sodepur, November 6.

30. *Harijan*, April 20, 1947, p. 119; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, April 5. The reference is to fasting as a technique.

31. *Harijan*, June 15, 1947, p. 94; on June 3, after the Viceroy's broadcast announcing the proposals of the British Government to divide India. Some people had asked Gandhiji if he would undertake a fast unto death in view of the decision of the Congress Working Committee to accept the division of India. Had he not called Pakistan a sin in which he would never participate? *Vide* also, para 4, p. 295 and para 19, p. 301-2.

32. *Harijan*, September 14, 1947, p. 323; Press statement, Calcutta, September 1.

33. *Ibid*, p. 317; in conversation with Pyarelal, Calcutta, September 1.

34. *Ibid*, p. 324; in a discussion with a party of visitors, including N. C. Chatterjee, President, and Debendra Nath Mookerjee, Secretary, Hindu Mahasabha, Sirdar Niranjan Singh Talib, editor of *Desh Darpan*, Dr. G. Jilani of the Muslim League, Dr. Abdur Rashid Chowdhury and Mohibur Rahaman of the Pakistan Seamen's Union; they called on Gandhiji on September 4 to report on the quiet situation and to request him to break the fast. Rajaji, Acharya Kripalani, Dr. P. C. Ghosh and H. S. Suhrawardy were also present.

35. *Ibid*.

36. *Ibid*, p. 323; during the days of the fast at Calcutta, September 1-4, Dr. Sunil Bose had advised Gandhiji to take plenty of rest and refrain from talking.

37. *Ibid*, p. 317; in reply to a friend who, after reading Gandhiji's Press statement of September 1, had asked him: "Can you fast against the *goondas?*"

38. *Ibid*, pp. 323-4; a deputation from Central Calcutta called on Gandhiji on the morning of September 1 to assure him that there would be no more communal incidents in Calcutta and that he should break his fast, else they would undertake a sympathetic fast. One of the party asked him: "Was it possible that his fast would have any effect on the anti-social elements? Today, i.e., during the present recrudescence, it was this element which had gained the upper hand. Could their hearts be converted by Gandhiji's crucifixion?"

39. *Ibid*, p. 318; to a group of some 50 people who called on Gandhiji on September 4, and who were "credited with the power to control the turbulent elements in the city. They gave an undertaking that they would immediately bring the troublemakers under check."

40. *Ibid*, p. 323; to the deputation from Central Calcutta. He referred to the Poona Fast of 1932 which led to the amendment of the Communal Award, and described as a "wholly wrong approach" the suggestion of some people that, though that amendment was not to their desire, they had accepted it with a view to saving his life.

41. *Ibid*.

42. *Ibid*, p. 317; in conversation with a friend on September 1.

43. *Ibid*, p. 318; to a Muslim Leaguer who waited on him.

44. *Ibid*, p. 318; *vide* 39 above.

45. *Ibid*; *vide* 34 above.

46. *Ibid*.

47. *Ibid*, p. 323; *vide* 38 above.

48. *Ibid*, p. 324.

49. *Ibid*, p. 319; to the deputation of all communities (*vide* 34 above) which requested him to break his fast.

50. *Ibid*, p. 323; *vide* 38 above.

51. *Ibid*, p. 324; *vide* 34 above.

52. *Harijan*, September 21, 1947, p. 330; Press statement, New Delhi, September 9.

53. *Harijan*, October 5, 1947, p. 356.

54. *Harijan*, January 18, 1948, p. 523; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, January 12.

55. *Harijan*, January 25, 1948, p. 529; in a dictated message at the prayer meeting, New Delhi, January 15. He was answering the question: "Why have you undertaken the fast when there was no disturbance of any kind in any part of the Indian Dominion?"

56. *Harijan*, January 18, 1947, p. 523; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, January 12, *vide* para 54, p. 238.

57. *Ibid*, p. 517; open letter 'To the People of Gujarat', New Delhi, January 14.

58. *Ibid*, p. 523.

59. *Ibid*, p. 524; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, January 13.

60. *Ibid*, p. 523.

61. *Ibid*, pp. 513, 514; a correspondent, on learning of Gandhiji's decision to go on fast, had written: "I have a lot to say against your undertaking the present fast, but I have had no previous warning... My main concern and my argument against your fast is that you have at last surrendered to impatience, whereas the mission which you have undertaken is essentially one of infinite patience. You do not seem to have realized what a tremendous success you have achieved by your inexhaustible and patient labour. It has already saved lakhs upon lakhs of lives and could save many more still. But your patience seems to have suddenly snapped. By dying you will not be able to realize what you would have realized by conserving your life. I would, therefore, beseech you to pay heed to my entreaty and give up your fast."

62. *Harijan*, January 18, 1948, p. 514; in conversation with a Sikh friend, soon after the commencement of the Delhi fast.

63. *Harijan*, January 25, 1948, p. 530; in a written message at the prayer meeting, New Delhi, January 15, answering the question put by newspapermen: "You have stated that you could not give any reply to the Muslims who came to you with their tale of fear and insecurity and who have complained that Sardar Patel, who is in charge of Home Affairs, is anti-Muslim."

64. *Harijan*, January 18, 1948, pp. 513-4; in reply to a correspondent, *vide* para 61, p. 242 and note.

65. *Harijan*, January 18, 1948, p. 530; in reply to a newspaper man's question, *vide* para 63, p. 242 and note.

66. *Ibid*, p. 523; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, January 12.

67. *Ibid*, p. 525; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, January 13.

68. *Ibid*, p. 526; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, January 14.

69. *Harijan*, January 25, 1948, p. 530; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, January 16, fourth day of the fast.

70. *Ibid*, pp. 530-1; written message at prayer meeting, New Delhi, January 16.

71. *Ibid*, p. 530-1; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, January 18.

72. *Ibid*, p. 532; on January 18, Dr. Rajendra Prasad, heading a committee of over 100 persons representing different organizations, in New Delhi, told Gandhiji of the Peace Pledge (*vide* note, para 85, p. 182) they had signed. A number of local committees were to be set up to implement the pledge. He hoped that Gandhiji would terminate his fast. Deshbandhu Gupta reported to Gandhiji touching scenes of fraternization between Hindus and Muslims in Delhi.

73. *Ibid*, pp. 534-5; written message at the prayer meeting, New, Delhi, January 18, on the occasion of the breaking of the fast.

74. *Harijan*, February 1, 1948, pp. 11-2; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, January 21.

75. *Ibid*, p. 5; Gandhiji was replying to the observations of a young man who doubted the real efficacy of his fast.

3. Desire to Live for 125 Years

76. *Harijan*, January 26, 1947, p. 518; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, December 28, 1946.

77. *Harijan*, March 23, 1947, p. 74; speech at prayer meeting, Patna, March 7.

78. *Harijan*, April 20, 1947, p. 118; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, April 1.

79. *Harijan*, June 8, 1947, p. 177; on his return to Delhi on May 25.

80. *Harijan*, June 29, 1947, p. 213; Richard Gregg, from America, wrote to Gandhiji:

"Today's New York newspaper carries a dispatch from New Delhi stating that you have given up hope of living for 125 years and that there is no place for you in India because of the deluge of violence. If this report is substantially correct, I beg you, please reconsider your attitude. As I see the matter there is far more at stake than present violence in India, even if this should last for fifteen years."

"India is the source of the deepest and strongest spiritual insight and culture in the world. It is also the most enduring. Despite the grave harm that has been done to Hindu culture by the modern loss of religion and contact with the West which so fully embodies that secularism, Hindu culture still stands supreme. Most of the world will soon be ruined by violeno and greed and godlessness, but I have hoped that there would be a remnant, no matter how small, in India which would keep its spiritual anchorage and be an island of hope and spiritual insight which may once more be the source of life and sanity for the stricken world."

"More than anyone else, you represent that Hindu culture, and the continuance of your life is of great importance to all the world. Even though for a time the number of those who agree with you and truly follow the road of Ahimsa may shrink to only a handful, the very smallness makes possible an enhancement of quality and spiritual power. Then when mankind have learned better out of their suffering, (it seems to be the only way most of them can learn), they will turn again to the spiritual sources. We may not tell God that if violence (the folly of men) does not stop within a certain time that fits our hopes, we will

stop doing our utmost including living as long as we can in order to do our utmost. I only dare say this to you because I want you so much to stay with us."

"Let me speak in a little more detail. Very careful economic studies over a long period of time have shown that there are several waves or cycles or rhythm of economic activity of various kinds. There is a 54-year rhythm of wholesale prices, an 18-year cycle of real-estate activity, a 9-year wave of another sort, and a still other variety of 3½ years. All the great depressions have been governed by these. All these cycles reach their lowest point in 1951-52. We are now entering what will probably be the severest economic depression that industrial nations have ever experienced. It will engulf the United States as well as all other nations. With the present dependence of Great Britain on economic aid from the U. S., the inevitable recession of that aid will, I believe, put an end to British interference in India. If another war, such as now seems likely between the United States and Russia, occurs, there will be the end of the present Western civilization and the dominance of the White man over the world. I think that Hindu India can then lead the world out of the holocaust. That is my hope. I beg of you, please try to live out all those 125 years so that you as God's servant may play your part in that supremely important time. India and the world will need you then even more than now. Because this is a moral world governed by God's laws, mankind must suffer by its continued violation for centuries of these laws, especially by the governments of the nations. The sufferings are terrible to contemplate, but if they did not come, it would indicate that this is not a moral universe after all. So, the very suffering is a proof of our optimism, our belief that God's laws prevail and can no more be successfully violated than man can violate the force of gravitation.

"God bless you and keep you. Please, please, reconsider your discouragement and keep on living for the rest of the world as well as India. As I wrote to you in my last letter, there is always violence during and soon after the transfer of political power between nations and groups. When the thirteen American colonies broke away from Britain in 1776, we had our riots and fighting too. It was called Shay's rebellion. All history shows similar phenomena throughout the West and enough of India has been infected by the Western ideas that it follows.

But I hope the infection will end when the next war comes and Indians see beyond any doubt where irreligious Western culture leads."

81. *Harijan*, September 28, 1947, p. 350; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, September 17.

82. *Ibid*, p. 352; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, September 20.

83. *Harijan*, October 12, 1947, p. 366; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, October 1.

84. *Ibid*, pp. 371-2; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, October. 4.

85. *Harijan*, December 28, 1947, p. 481; address to a gathering of Meos, Jesarah village, Gurgaon, near Delhi.

86. *Harijan*, January 18, 1948, p. 526; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, January 14.

87. *Harijan*, February 1, 1948, p. 14; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, January 25.

88. *Harijan*, October 12, 1947, p. 367; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, October 2.

89. *Ibid*, p. 368; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, October 5.

90. *Harijan*, November 23, 1947, p. 417; message broadcast to refugees at Kurukshetra camp, near Delhi, November 12.

91. *Harijan*, December 7, 1947, p. 458; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, November 27, commenting on reports of atrocities in Kathiawad and Junagadh.

92. *Harijan*, February 8, 1948, p. 21; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, January 29.

4. Readiness for Martyrdom

93. *Harijan*, January 26, 1947, p. 508; written prayer address January 6, referring to the presence of two Sikhs who volunteered to act as his bodyguards, unarmed, during his Noakhali tour.

94. *Harijan*, March 2, 1947, p. 45; speech at prayer meeting, Noakhali, February 5.

95. *Harijan*, April 27, 1947, p. 127; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, April 8. A friend had raised the question of police protection to him at prayer time. Later, the police were withdrawn and people proceeding to the prayer ground were not searched for secret arms. Some aver that the tragedy of January 30 would not have occurred if police protection had been continued, despite Gandhiji's not wanting it.

96. *Harijan*, October 27, 1946, p. 372; in the course of conversation with Bengali friends.

97. *Harijan*, April 27, 1947, p. 127; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, April 11.

98. *Harijan*, September 14, 1947, p. 317; to Pyarelal, on September 1; several deputations had asked Gandhiji what could be done by them to quench the communal conflagration, *vide* para 86, p. 288.

99. *Harijan*, October 12, 1947, p. 372; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, October 5.

100. *Harijan*, November 30, 1947, p. 437; commenting on a Bengali correspondent's observations regarding the exodus from East Pakistan.

101. *Harijan*, February 1, 1948, p. 14; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, January 25.

IX. Non-violent Approach to Communal Unity And Peace

1. Unity Through Non-violence

1. *Young India*, March 16, 1922, p. 161; letter to Hakim Ajmal Khan, March 12, 1922, from Sabarmati Jail.

2. *Young India*, May 29, 1924, pp. 175-6.

3. *Young India*, December 1, 1927, p. 400; the article was written as a declaration of faith in response to Dr. Ansari's suggestion.

2. Self-defence: The Violent Way

4. *Young India*, June 19, 1924, p. 205.

5. *Young India*, May 29, 1924, p. 177.

6. *Young India*, September 18, 1924, p. 311.

7. *Young India*, January 6, 1927, p. 2.
8. *Young India*, September 18, 1924, pp. 308-9. The Big Brother was Shaukat Ali.
9. *Young India*, December 18, 1924, p. 414.
10. *Young India*, October 15, 1925, p. 349; Gandhiji was reporting his speech at the public meeting in Bhagalpur. The following paras, (para 11, pp. 265-6) emphasize his preference of violence to abject cowardice.
11. *Ibid*.
12. *Harijan*, September 15, 1946, p. 312; in reply to a question, *vide* note on para 25, p. 206, also para 22, p. 268.
13. *Harijan*, January 5, 1947, p. 478; speech at prayer meeting, Shrirampur, November 26.
14. *Harijan*, December 2, 1939, p. 361, with reference to riots in Sukkur, Sindh.
15. *Harijan*, January 6, 1940, p. 403; Gandhiji was writing in the context of riots in Sindh.
16. *Harijan*, March 2, 1940, p. 21; Gandhiji had been approached by Manoranjan Babu and other friends from Noakhali for advice in the difficult situation faced there by the Hindus. Gandhiji considered their case similar to that of Hindus in Sukkur.
17. *Harijan*, February 10, 1940, p. 446.
18. *Harijan*, March 2, 1940, p. 21; *vide* 16 above.
19. *Harijan*, October 6, 1940, p. 308; in the context of terrorization of Sindh Hindus by Muslims, Gandhiji had received a letter from Shamlal Gidwani holding Gandhiji's advice of non-violence as contrary to the teachings of Lord Krishna.
20. *Harijan*, July 28, 1946, p. 244; Gandhiji was writing with reference to the riots in Ahmedabad, in the course of which people were stabbed in the darkness of night, and mostly in the back.
21. *Harijan*, September 8, 1946, p. 296; Gandhiji was discussing the "antidote" to violence in Calcutta.

22. *Harijan*, September 15, 1946, p. 312; *vide* note on para 25, p. 206; also, para 12, p. 266.

23. *Harijan*, March 30, 1947, pp. 87-8; speech at prayer meeting, Khusrupur, March 14.

24. *Harijan*, November 16, 1947, p. 413; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, November 5.

3. Self-defence: The Non-violent Way

25. *Young India*, June 16, 1927, p. 196.

26. *Harijan*, September 8, 1946, p. 296.

27. *Harijan*, March 17, 1946, p. 45; in the course of reply to the question from a correspondent: "How can a solitary Satyagrahi succeed in the midst of a huge population? ..." *vide* para 93, pp. 292-3.

28. *Harijan*, October 13, 1946, p. 346; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, October 2.

29. *Harijan*, August 31, 1947, p. 301; speech at a gathering of students, Beliaghata, Calcutta.

4. Use of The Military and The Police

30. *Young India*, June 16, 1927, p. 196.

31. *Harijan*, July 11, 1946, p. 219; speech at prayer meeting, Poona. Gandhiji was referring to the riots in Ahmedabad. He wrote: "Hindus and Muslims of Ahmedabad seem to be dehumanized." *vide*, para 44, p. 276.

32. *Harijan*, July 28, 1946, p. 244. Writing of the "butchery" that had been going on in Ahmedabad for several days past. Gandhiji wrote: "The golden path is that one of the parties to the mutual slaughter should desist. Then alone can true peace be established and madness come to an end. Is it not enough that three young men have laid down their lives in the attempt to put down the flames? Several friends have written to me about the three martyrs. If we were wise, these sacrifices would have quenched the fire. But that has not happened. It does not mean that the sacrifices have gone in vain. It only means that many are necessary to extinguish the flames."

33. *Harijan*, May 18, 1947, p. 156; in reply to the question by Doon Campbell, Reuter's special correspondent, on May 5: "Do you subscribe to the opinion that Britain will be morally obliged to stay on in India if the outstanding Hindu-Muslim differences have not been resolved by June 1948?"

34. *Gandhiji's Correspondence with Government*, 1944-47 pp. 221-2; letter to the Viceroy, June 28, 1946.

35. *Harijan*, September 8, 1946, p. 296.

36. *Ibid*, p. 307; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, September 2, on the formation of the Interim Government. Gandhiji drafted a note on similar lines for Prime Minister Nehru.

37. *Harijan*, September 15, 1946, p. 315; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, September 9. Referring to the continuing communal conflict in Bombay, Gandhiji deprecated the people's asking for police and military protection anywhere.

38. *Harijan*, November 17, 1946, p. 401; speech at prayer meeting, Calcutta, November 1.

39. *Ibid*, p. 402; written message to prayer meeting, Calcutta, November 4, commenting on riots in Bihar, *vide* note to para 59, p. 171.

5. The Way of Non-retaliation

40. *Young India*, September 29, 1921, p. 307; in the course of a reply to questions by a friend on the effects of the Moplah outbreak in Malabar on Hindu-Muslim unity.

41. *Young India*, September 18, 1924, p. 312; *vide* para 160, p. 79.

42. *Harijan*, April 30, 1938, p. 99; Press statement, April 22, on the eve of talks with Jinnah.

43. *Harijan*, April 28, 1946, p. 103; in answer to a question from a Jamia Millia student, *vide* para 63, p. 37.

44. *Harijan*, July 14, 1946, p. 219; *vide* para 31, p. 272 and note.

45. *Harijan*, October 6, 1946, p. 342; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, in reply to the question from a Bengali friend "as to how they should act at such times as Calcutta had recently gone through".

46. *Harijan*, November 17, 1946, p. 401; speech at prayer meeting, Calcutta, *vide* note 38 above.

47. *Ibid*, pp. 401, 402; in deprecating reprisals in Bihar for happenings in Noakhali.

48. *Ibid*, p. 402; commenting on the reports of awful happenings in Bihar, *vide* note 39 above.

49. *Harijan*, December 1, 1946, p. 426; speech at prayer meeting, Kazirkhil, November 14.

50. *Harijan*, April 20, 1947, p. 120; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, April 6.

51. *Harijan*, June 29, 1947, p. 214; in the course of a talk to Hindu refugees, New Delhi, June 16.

52. *Harijan*, July 27, 1947, p. 251; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, July 13. Gandhiji was speaking of the division of the Indian Army.

53. *Harijan*, September 7, 1947, p. 310; speech at prayer meeting, Calcutta, August 25, commenting on riots in Sylhet.

54. *Harijan*, September 28, 1947, p. 352; address to meeting under the auspices of the Rashtriya Swayamsevak Sangh, New Delhi, September 16.

55. *Harijan*, October 5, 1947, p. 361; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, September 25.

56. *Harijan*, December 7, 1947, pp. 456-7; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, November 24.

57. *Harijan*, December 14, 1947, p. 472; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, December 6. Gandhiji was quoting from a letter received by him which warned against the treachery of Pakistan.

58. *Harijan*, February 8, 1948, p. 20; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, January 29. Gandhiji was referring to a news report of the incident.

6. Non-violence of The Brave

59. *Young India*, May 29, 1924; pp. 176-7.

60. *Young India*, October 11, 1924, p. 341; in reply to a correspondent's questions, *vide* note to para 26, p. 8. Also para 8, p. 185 and para 23, p. 205.

61. *Young India*, January 3, 1929, p. 7; in commenting on the observations of "A Young Heart" on Hindu-Muslim unity.

62. *Harijan*, April 2, 1938, p. 65; inaugural address at the Gandhi Seva Sangh, Delang, Orissa, March 25.

63. *Harijan*, October 7, 1939, p. 296.

64. *Harijan*, January 6, 1940, p. 403.

65. *Harijan*, April 7, 1946, p. 74; speech at public meeting, Bombay, March 14.

66. *Harijan*, August 4, 1946, p. 249; discussing the growing violence all over the country, Gandhiji observed, with prophetic premonition: "I have never had the chance to test my non-violence in the face of communal riots. It might be argued that it was my cowardice which prevented me from seeking such a chance. Be that as it may, God willing, the chance will still come to me, and by throwing me in the fire, He will purify me and make the path of non-violence clear. No one should take it to mean that the sacrifice of my life will arrest all violence. Several lives like mine will have to be given if the terrible violence that has spread all over, is to stop and non-violence reign supreme in its place."

67. *Harijan*, January 5, 1947, pp. 478-9; speech at prayer meeting, Shrirampur, December 2, 1946. Gandhiji was referring to the story of *Gajendra-moksha*.

68. *Harijan*, March. 30, 1947, p. 88; speech at prayer meeting, Khusrupur, March 14.

69. *Harijan*, May 25, 1947, p. 164.

70. *Harijan*, June 29, 1947, p. 209. Sushila Nayar, reporting a prayer meeting speech, wrote in *Harijan*, on June 29:

"The Congress President in his concluding speech at the A.I.C.C. had said that Gandhiji had not been able to show the way of combating communal strife in a non-violent manner as he had done in the case of fighting the British. Gandhiji

had said that he was groping in the dark and though he said that he was solving the Hindu-Muslim problem for the whole of India by his work in Noakhali and Bihar, he (the President) had not been able to understand how the technique could be applied on a mass scale. That was why he was not standing with Gandhiji that day and had agreed to the partition of India..."

"Speaking in the prayer meeting Gandhiji said that while he admitted his impotency regarding the spread of the Ahimsa of the brave and the strong as distinguished from that of the weak, the admission was not meant to imply that he did not know how that inestimable virtue was to be cultivated. Consciousness of the living presence of God within one was undoubtedly the first requisite. Acquisition of this consciousness did not require or mean temple-going. The daily recitation, however, carried with it certain well-defined implications. Assuming that the millions of India daily recited at a given time the name of God as Rama, Allah, Khuda, Ahura Mazda and Jehovah but the recitation was not free from drunkenness, debauchery, gambling on the market or in gambling dens, black-marketing etc., the *Ramadhun* was a vain and inglorious effort. One with a wicked heart could never be conscious of the all-purifying presence of God. Therefore it was truer (if it was a fact) to say that India was not ready for the lesson of Ahimsa of the strong than that no programme had been devised for the teaching. It would be perfectly just to say that the programme just mentioned for the Ahimsa of the strong was not as attractive as that devised for the non-violence of the weak had proved to be. He hoped that at least his hearers who daily attended the prayer meetings would lead the way in expressing in their lives the Ahimsa of the strong." Ibid, pp. 209-10.

The reference to the Congress President's speech is to the observations of Acharya Kripalani at the A.I.C.C. session held at Bombay on June 14.

71. *Harijan*, July 27, 1947, p. 253; interview to some friends who expected him to lead them in opposing the partition of India (prior to July 18).

72. *Harijan*, December 7, 1947, p. 453; in replying to a letter from Madame Edmond Privat, dated August 27, 1947; *vide* para 144, p. 407.

73. *Harijan*, November 23, 1947, p. 420. Gandhiji receive from Richard Gregg the following letter and prefaced his comments by observing that "Though many

psychologists have recommended a study of psychology, I am sorry, I have not been able for want of time to study the subject. Mr. Gregg's letter does not mend matters for me. It does not fill me with any impelling enthusiasm or undertaking the study. Mr. Gregg gives an explanation which mystifies the mind instead of clearing it..."

"Though because of my ignorance I am hesitant, yet I venture to send you an idea that seems to me only to explain with perhaps less moral blame a part of the recent communal violence in India, but also to offer hope for the future."

"It seems to me probable that much of this violence is an expression not so much of intercommunal suspicion and hatred, but rather, and more deeply and originally, of the long pent-up resentments of the masses because of their oppression. The oppression was not only by foreign political rule but by foreign modern social, economic and financial ways which are contrary to the ancient habits of *dharma* which were a very part of the nature of the masses. By foreign ways I mean such things as the English land-holding system, usurious money lending, heavy taxes payable not in kind but in money, and other interferences with long established village life common to all communities."

"Psychological studies have shown clearly that severe frustrations suffered during the childhood of an individual generate resentments which are suppressed long after the person who caused the original frustration has died, but later some occasion pulls a trigger, as it were, and releases the pent-up energy of the old resentment which then pours forth in violence upon some perfectly innocent person. This explains many crimes of violence and perhaps some of the cruelties against Jews in Europe. In India the establishment of religious electorates created a channel into which it was easy for this energy to flow, but I believe the fearful energy of the explosion of wrath comes from the older cause I have mentioned. Such an idea as this would help explain why in all countries all through history a major change of political power results in more or less violence and disorder. The masses always suffer some oppression and, therefore, have resentments which flare up upon a shift of control or may be exploited by selfish leaders."

"If this surmise is true, it suggests that the suspicion and hatred of one community towards another is not so deep as now appears. It also means that as soon as the masses can be guided back into their ancient ways of life with the chief emphasis on religion and small organizations—the energy of the people will be turned from violence into creative channels. I would expect that *khadi* work among the refugees might help start such a diversion of energy into sound channels. In such a development I see hope."

"Forgive me if this seems to be presumptuous. I write it only in the hope that an humble outsider, just because he is outside, may see a gleam of encouragement that is not so easy to see in the dust and distraction of the struggle. Anyway, I love you and India." *Ibid*.

74. *Harijan*, January 11, 1948, p.504; In reply to a European friend.

75. *Ibid*, p. 501.

7. Martyrdom During Riots

76. *Young India*, September 20, 1919; speech at public meeting of Musalmans, Bombay, September 18, 1919, *vide* note on para 55, p. 35.

77. *Young India*, May 29, 1924, p. 177.

78. *Young India*, December 30, 1926, p. 458; on the assassination of Swami Shraddhanand.

79. *Young India*, January 13, 1927, p. 10; speech on the resolution of condolence regarding Swami Shraddhanand at the session of the Indian National Coagress, Gauhati, December 26, 1926.

80. *Harijan*, October 6, 1946, p. 338; *vide* note to para 36, p. 192.

81. *Harijan*, December 1, 1946, p. 424; speech at Chandpur on board *Kiwi*, November 7, to a band of workers.

82. *Harijan*, December 8, 1946, p. 442; in conversation with a friend, Chaumuhani, prior to November 17.

83. *Harijan*, February 9, 1947, p. 9; in answer to the question: "If the choice is between taking one's own life or that of the assailant, which would you advise?"

84. *Harijan*, March 2, 1947, pp. 47-8; speech at prayer meeting, Nandigram, February 8.

85. *Harijan*, April 6, 1947, p. 98; speech at prayer meeting, Patna, March 21, referring to the sufferings of Muslims in Garahwan village which he had just visited.

86. *Harijan*, September 14, 1947, p. 317; speaking to a deputation which sought his advice as to how they should act in order to restore peace.

87. *Harijan*, October 19, 1947, p. 376; in reply to a Muslim correspondent, who had complained of being treated as a quisling by fellow Muslims because of his nationalist views, but stood in peril of his life during the partition disturbances because he was a Muslim.

8. Peace Brigades

88. *Harijan*, April 2, 1938, p. 66; opening address to the Gandhi Seva Sangh, March 25, 1938.

89. *Harijan*, June 18, 1938, p. 152.

90. *Harijan*, September 15, 1940, p. 285.

91. *Harijan*, June 18, 1938, p. 152.

9. Duty of a Satyagrahi

92. *Young India*, February 27, 1930, p. 69.

93. *Harijan*, March 17, 1946, pp. 45-6; in the course of a reply to a friend; *vide* para 27, p. 270.

X. Partition and Pakistan

I. The Religious Basis of Partition

1. *Harijan*, May 4, 1940, p. 117.

2. *Harijan*, September 15, 1946, p. 316; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi.

3. *Ibid*; Gandhiji was referring to the threatened violence in the Punjab, Bengal and Sindh.

4. *Harijan*, October 6, 1946, p. 339.

2. The 'Two-Nation' Theory

5. *Harijan*, October 28, 1939, pp. 317-8.
6. *Harijan*, November 11, 1939, pp. 336-7.
7. *Harijan*, January 27, 1940, p. 9.
8. *Harijan*, March 30, 1940, p. 65; *vide* note on para 36, p. 44.
9. *Harijan*, April 6, 1940, pp. 76-7.
10. *Harijan*, April 13, 1940, p. 92.
11. *Harijan*, May 4, 1940, p. 109.
12. *Harijan*, April 21, 1946, p. 94; speech, New Delhi, April 6, *vide* para 17, p. 7 and note.
13. *Gandhiji's Correspondence with Government*, (1944-47), p. 365; interview to Norman Cliff, June 29, 1946.
14. *Harijan*, April 27, 1947, p. 127; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, April 11.
15. *Harijan*, June 22, 1947, p. 201; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, June 12.
16. *Harijan*, November 9, 1947, p. 400; with reference to a letter he had received from Raihanabehn Tyebji, advocating Hindustani in the Nagari script as the inter-provincial language.

3. The Demand for Pakistan

17. *Harijan*, November 11, 1939, p. 337.
18. *Harijan*, April 6, 1940, p. 76.
19. *Harijan*, April 13, 1940, p. 92.
20. *Harijan*, May 4, 1940, p. 115.
21. *Ibid*.
22. *Ibid*, p. 117.
23. *Harijan*, September 22, 1940, p. 294.
24. *Harijan*, January 25, 1942, p. 13. The four Muslim majority provinces were the Punjab, Bengal, Sindh and N.W.F. province.

25. *Harijan*, May 31, 1942, p, 172; deprecation hooliganism at meetings addressed by Rajaji (*vide* note on para 24, p. 22), despite his differences with him.

26. *Harijan*, June 7, 1942, p. 180; *vide* note on para 58, p. 198.

27. *Harijan*, July 12, 1942, p. 220; Gandhiji was commenting on a Muslim correspondent's question: "How can you think of a mass movement for liberation without first closing in with Muslims?"

28. *Harijan*, July 26, 1942, p. 237; Jinnah spoke in comment on an article by Gandhiji in *Harijan*, July 12, 1942, p. 220.

29. *Harijan*, May 18, 1947; p. 149; Gandhiji was replying to friends who had asked "whether Pakistan would die a natural death if conceded".

30. *Harijan*, June 8, 1947, p. 182; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, May 30.

31. *Harijan*, June 22, 1947, p. 203; in conversation with friends at Campbellpore.

32. *Harijan*, June 15, 1947, p. 195; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, June 6.

33. *Harijan*, February 2, 1947, pp. 1-2; Gandhiji was replying to a question put by a young Muslim at Bhatialpur on January 14, "what his objection was to the setting up of a separate Muslim State after the events in Bihar".

34. *Harijan*, May 18, 1947, p. 156; interview to Doon Campbell, Reuter's correspondent in New Delhi, May 5.

35. *Ibid*, p. 155; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, May 7.

36. *Harijan*, June 15, 1947, p. 201; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, June 3, after the Viceroy's broadcast.

37. *Harijan*, July 27, 1947, p. 253; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, July 13, with reference to the division of the Indian Army.

4. The Setting-up of Pakistan

38. *Harijan*, November 11, 1939, p. 337.

39. *Harijan*, September 15, 1946, p. 315; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, September 7.

40. *Harijan*, April 27, 1947, p. 127; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, April 11.

41. *Harijan*, September 15, 1946, p. 316; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, September 7.

42. *Harijan*, November 24, 1946, p. 409.

43. *Harijan*, December 1, 1946, p. 428; speech at Dattapara, November 14.

44. *Harijan*, February 9, 1947, p. 14; commenting on Jinnah's advice to Muslims, *vide* para 8, p. 8 and note.

45. *Harijan*, April 27, 1947, p. 126; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, April 9.

46. *Ibid*, p. 127; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, April 11.

47. *Harijan*, October 5, 1947; first para: p. 355, speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, September 24. Second para: p. 362, speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, September 25.

48. *Harijan*, March 30, 1947, p. 85; speech at prayer meeting, replying to a correspondent, Patna, March 11.

49. *Harijan*, April 27, 1947, p. 127; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, April 11. Citing the analogy of his South African struggle, he felt that his two visits on deputation to England, in 1906 and 1909, would have achieved little but for the strength of the Satyagraha behind him.

50. *Harijan*, July 27, 1947, p.253; interview to a group of people who had called on him (prior to July 18) to lead them in the opposition to Partition.

51. *Harijan*, February 2, 1947, p. 1; in reply to a question put by some Muslim young men at Bhatialpur, on January 14, whether he did not think it advisable to concede Pakistan since it was holding up Indian independence.

52. *Gandhiji's Correspondence with Government*, (1944-47), p. 247; letter to the Viceroy, May 8, 1947.

53. *Harijan*, May 11, 1947, p. 147; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, May 1. The reference to the joint appeal is to the statement issued under the signatures of Jinnah and Gandhiji on April 15. It read:

"We deeply deplore the recent acts of lawlessness and violence that have brought the utmost disgrace on the fair name of India and the greatest misery

to innocent people irrespective of who were the aggressors and who were the victims."

"We denounce for all time the use of force to achieve political ends, and we call upon all the communities of India, to whatever persuasion they may belong, not only to refrain from all acts of violence and disorder, but also to avoid both in speech and writing any incitement to such acts."

Referring to the violence in the Frontier Province, the Punjab and other places, Gandhiji said, "The audience might well ask... why in spite of the joint appeal by Quaid-i-Azam and myself for peace in the Country and declaration in the appeal that use of force should be eschewed for all time for gaining political ends, the appeal seemed to have been entirely defeated in practice."

54. *Harijan*, May 18, 1947, p. 153. This was in reply to a question by a friend, in Delhi, "whether Pakistan would die a natural death if conceded".

55. *Harijan*, June 8, 1947, p. 181; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, May 29.

56. *Ibid*, p. 182; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, May 30.

57. *Ibid*.

58. *Harijan*, June 22, 1947, pp. 202, 203; commenting on a correspondent's observations in the course of a letter to him.

59. *Harijan*, June 29, 1947, p. 214; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi.

60. *Harijan*, July 20, 1947, p. 241; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, July 12.

61. *Gandhiji's Correspondence with Government*, 1944-47, pp. 251-2; letter to Viceroy, June 27/28, 1947.

62. *Harijan*, October 6,1947, p. 364; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, September 28, Gandhiji was commenting on Churchill's speech, reported by Reuter in summary as follows:

"Mr. Churchill declared in speech here tonight that the fearful massacres which were occurring in India were no surprise to him."

"We are, of course, only at the beginning of these horrors and butcheries, perpetrated upon one another with the ferocity of cannibals by races gifted with capacities for the highest culture and who had for generations dwelt side

by side in general peace under the broad, tolerant and impartial rule of the British Crown and Parliament, he declared.

"I cannot but doubt that the future will witness a vast abridgement of the population throughout what has for 60 or 70 years been the most peaceful part of the world and that at the same time will come a retrogression of civilization throughout these enormous regions, constituting one of the most melancholy tragedies Asia has ever known."

Gandhiji invited Churchill "to come to India and see for himself not as a partisan with preconceived notions, but as an impartial honest Englishman who put honour before party and who was intent on making the British transaction a glorious success."

"Gandhiji was sorry to read the Reuter's summary of Mr. Churchill's speech which, he presumed, was not misinterpreted by the renowned agency. Mr. Churchill had rendered a disservice to the nation of which he was a great servant. If he knew the fate that would befall India after she became free from the British yoke, did he for a moment stop to think that the blame belonged to the builders of the Empire rather than to the 'races' in his opinion 'gifted with capacities for the highest culture'? Gandhiji suggested that Mr. Churchill was over-hasty in his sweeping generalization. India was composed of teeming millions in which a few lakhs turned savages counted for little." *(Ibid)*

5. Partition of Bengal and The Punjab

63. *Harijan*, April 27, 1947, p. 126; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, April 9.

64. *Gandhiji's Correspondence with Government*, 1944-47, p. 248; letter to Viceroy, May 8, 1947.

65. *Harijan*, May 25, 1947, p. 165; speech at prayer meeting, Calcutta. Gandhiji was replying to the question: "Could partition of Bengal be avoided in view of the rising Hindu opinion in its favour?"

66. *Harijan*, June 1, 1947, p. 172; *vide* para 13, p.157 and note.

67. *Harijan*, May 25, 1947, p. 166; speech at prayer meeting, Calcutta, May 11. Gandhiji was replying to the question: "You have advised us to work for an undivided Bengal. But can there be an undivided Bengal with a divided India?"

68. *Harijan*, June 15, 1947, pp. 193-4; commenting on the proposals embodied in the British Government announcement broadcast by the Viceroy on June 3.

69. *Ibid*, p. 196; speech at prayer meeting, Calcutta, (prior to June 10, after Viceroy's broadcast of June 3).

70. *Harijan*; June 22, 1947, p. 203.

6. Frontier Province

71. *Gandhiji's Correspondence with Government*, 1944-47, p. 248; letter to Viceroy, May 8, 1947.

72. *Ibid*, pp. 257-8; letter to Viceroy, June 10/11, 1947.

73. *Harijan*, June 22, 1947, p. 203; in conversation with friends at Campbellpore (prior to June 15).

74. *Gandhiji's Correspondence with Government*, 1944-47, p. 266; letter to Khan Abdul Ghaffar Khan.

7. Pakistan Established

75. *Harijan*, July 13, 1947, pp. 235-6; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, July 5.

76. *Harijan*, January 25, 1947, p. 531; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, January 17.

77. *Harijan*, August 3, 1947, p. 258; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, July 20. Some friends had insistently told him that his post-prayer discourses were depressing.

78. *Harijan*, August 10, 1947, p. 272.

79. *Harijan*, August 31, 1947, p. 300.

80. *Harijan*, October 5, 1947, p. 355; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, September 24.

81. *Harijan*, October 26, 1947, p. 384.

8. The Boundary Commission

82. *Harijan*, August 3, 1947, p. 258; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, July 20.

83. *Harijan*, August 31, 1947; pp. 299,303; speech at prayer meeting, Calcutta, August 21.

84. *Harijan*, September 7, 1947, pp. 315-6; speech at prayer meeting, Calcutta, August 29. Gandhiji was replying to the question: "Whether the minorities would have recognition as religious minorities have."

85. *Harijan*, November 30, 1947, p. 436.

9. The Refugee Problem

86. *Harijan*, January 6, 1940, pp. 403-4.

87. *Harijan*, February 3, 1940, pp. 435-6; Gandhiji was replying to a question challenging his advice of *hijrat* to Sindh Hindus.

88. *Harijan*, November 24, 1946, p. 413; talking to a deputation of Muslim Leaguers at Chandpur.

89. *Harijan*, April 13, 1947, pp. 107; during a meeting at a refugee camp in Bihar (reported in *The Searchlight,* Patna, March 30, 1947). Gandhiji was replying to a demand that the Muslims may be allowed to resettle in certain exclusive areas.

90. *Harijan*, August 24, 1947, p. 290; speech at prayer meeting, Wah refugee camp, near Rawalpindi, August 5.

91. *Harijan*, September 21, 1947, pp. 333-4; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, September 10.

92. *Ibid*, p. 336; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, September 14.

93. *Harijan*, September 28, 1947, p. 338; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, p. 338.

94. *Ibid*, p. 352; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, September 20.

95. *Harijan*, October 19, 1947, p. 379; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi.

96. *Harijan*, October 5, 1947, p. 354; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, September 23.

97. *Harijan*, October 26, 1947, p. 383; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, October 16. Gandhiji was speaking with reference to reported large-scale exodus of Hindus from East Bengal.

98. *Harijan*, November 16, 1947, p. 411; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, November 5. Gandhiji was replying to a critic who found fault with his advice to Muslims to stick to their homes despite hardships.

99. *Harijan*, March 9, 1947, pp. 58-9; speech at prayer meeting, Raipur, February 15. Gandhiji was referring to the threat of boycott of Hindus by Muslims in Noakhali.

100. *Harijan*, November 9, 1947, p. 399; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, October 27.

101. *Ibid*, p. 407; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, October 31.

102. *Harijan*, February 1, 1948, p. 11; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, January 21. Gandhiji had received a telegram from Sindhi Sikh refugees in Bombay.

103. *Harijan*, January 19, 1947, p. 493; in answer to a question put by Press correspondents at Shrirampur.

104. *Harijan*, September 21, 1947, p. 336; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, September 13.

105. *Harijan*, September 28, 1947, p. 338; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, September 15.

106. *Harijan*, October 19, 1947, p. 379; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, October 9.

107. *Harijan*, November 9, 1947, p. 408; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, November 2.

108. *Harijan*, January 11, 1948, p. 508; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, December 31, 1947.

109. *Harijan*, November 24, 1946, p. 411; while discussing the refugee question with Shamsuddin Saheb, Minister of Commerce, and other Muslims at Chaumuhani.

110. *Harijan*, December 8, 1946, p. 444; speech at prayer meeting, Madhupur, November 19, replying to a question from a woman as to how refugees could be advised to go back to their homes.

111. *Harijan*, January 5, 1947, p. 478; speech at prayer meeting, Shrirampur, November 27.

112. *Ibid*, p. 477; speech at prayer meeting, Shrirampur, November 20.

113. *Harijan*, February 9, 1947, p. 15; speech at prayer meeting, Paniala, January 22.

114. *Harijan*, March 16, 1947, p. 62; speech at prayer meeting, Char Dukhia, February 19.

115. *Harijan*, September 28, 1947, p. 338; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, September 15.

116. *Ibid*, p. 339; address to Muslims at Daryaganj, New Delhi, September 19.

117. *Harijan*, October 19, 1947, p. 380; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, October 12.

118. *Harijan*, November 2, 1947, p. 391; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, October 31.

119. *Harijan*, November 9, 1947, p. 406; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, October 31.

120. *Harijan*, December 7, 1947, p. 456; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, November 24.

XI India—Pakistan Relations

I. Treatment of Minorities

1. *Harijan*, July 27, 1947, p. 254; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, July 15.

2. *Harijan*, April 27, 1947, p. 123; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, April 7.

3. *Harijan*, August 3, 1947, p. 259; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, July 21.

4. *Harijan*, August 17, 1947, p. 281; in answer to a question put to him at Jammu at a prayer meeting.

5. *Harijan*, September 28, 1947, p. 349; address to RSS, Delhi, September 16.

6. *Ibid*, p. 332; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, September, 20.

7. *Harijan*, October 5, 1947, p. 354; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, September 23.

8. *Harijan*, August 31, 1947, p. 303; speech at prayer meeting, Calcutta, August 21.

9. *Harijan*, September 14, 1947, p. 323; speaking to the deputation from Central Calcutta which called on him on September 4.

10. *Harijan*, October 26, 1947, p. 383; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, October 16. Gandhiji was speaking with reference to a request from some people in East Pakistan that he should ask Mr. Suhrawardy to go to Bengal and help Khwaja Saheb in the difficult task before him.

11. *Harijan*, September 28, 1947, p. 352; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, September 20.

12. *Harijan*, January 4, 1948, p. 499; speech at prayer meeting, Sammalka village (near Delhi), December 27.

13. *Harijan*, January 11, 1948, p. 508; speech at prayer meeting, December 31, 1947.

2. Non-Muslim Minorities in Pakistan

14. *Harijan*, March 8, 1942, p. 68.

15. *Harijan*, September 15, 1946, p. 316; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, September 9.

16. *Harijan*, November 24, 1946, p. 413; in a talk to the Muslim League deputation from Tipperah district which called on him at Chandpur, on board the *Kiwi*, November 7.

17. *Harijan*, December 1, 1946, p. 426; speech at Shahpur in reference to Jinnah's statement in the day's papers.

18. *Harijan*, February 9, 1947, p. 18.

19. *Harijan*, April 27, 1947, p. 126; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, April 8, in replying to a correspondent's question.

20. *Harijan*, May 11, 1947, p. 148; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, May 5.

21. *Harijan*, July 27, 1947, p. 255; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, July 18. Gandhiji was referring to the allegations in *Dawn*.

22. *Harijan*, December 14, 1947, p. 467; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, December 3; referring to the sad plight of Harijans in Sindh.

23. *Harijan*, January 11, 1948, p. 507; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, December 30.

24. *Harijan*, January 18, 1947, p. 520; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, January 7.

25. *Harijan*, March 16, 1947, p. 61; speech at prayer meeting, February 18, Gandhiji was asked: "Do you support evacuation of the Hindus from the affected areas if the League Government or the majority community agrees to give us due compensation?"

26. *Harijan*, April 27, 1947, p. 123; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, April 7.

27. *Harijan*, September 21, 1947, p. 336; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, September 13.

28. *Harijan*, April 6, 1947, p. 101; speech at a refugee camp in Bihar, *vide* note to para 89, p. 326.

29. *Harijan*, May 11, 1947, p. 148; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, May 2.

30. *Harijan*, June 22, 1947, p. 203; in conversation with friends from Cambellpore who wanted to know whether they could live there in safety.

31. *Harijan*, July 20, 1947, p. 243; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, July 12.

32. *Harijan*, September 28, 1947, p. 351; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, September 18.

33. *Harijan*, March 9, 1947, p. 57; in reply to the question, at a prayer meeting, Vijaynagar, February 10: "Pakistan means complete independence for the

Muslims in the Muslim-majority provinces and for the Hindus in the Hindu-majority provinces. Why then does the Congress object to it?"

34. *Harijan*, April 6, 1947, p. 95; speaking to a Muslim deputation which called on Gandhiji at Shirandi, where he had gone on January 20 to be with Amtul Salaam who was on fast for 25 days. The deputation had expressed regret for the incidents and pledged mutual respect for religions, which led to the ending of the fast.

35. *Harijan*, June 22, 1947, p. 203; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi (prior to June 15), while commenting on a correspondent's observations.

36. *Harijan*, August 31, 1947, p. 297; speech to a group of students, Beliaghata, prior to August 18.

37. *Harijan*, September 21, 1947, p. 334; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, September 12. Gandhiji was referring to the N.W.F. Province where there was communal trouble.

38. *Harijan*, October 5, 1947, p. 362; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, September 26.

39. *Harijan*, August 10, 1947, p. 275; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, July 28. Gandhiji was asked: "What should be the attitude of the non-Muslims towards the Pakistan flag?"

40. *Harijan*, November 30, 1947, p. 448; in reply to a correspondent from East Bengal.

41. *Harijan*, January 4, 1948, p. 498; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, December 25, 1947.

42. *Harijan*, January 11, 1948, p. 507; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, December 30, 1947, *vide* para 23, p. 340 and note.

43. *Harijan*, May 25, 1947, p. 162; the question was put to Gandhiji by Bhai Pratap Dayaldas, Sindhi leader from Hyderabad, who met Gandhiji in New Delhi.

44. *Harijan*, July 27, 1947, p. 255; vide para 21, p. 339 and note.

45. *Harijan*, October 12, 1947, p. 365; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, September 30.

46. *Harijan*, May 11, 1947, p. 146; 'silence day' written speech at prayer meeting, Patna, April 28.

47. *Harijan*, January 18, 1948, p. 513; in conversation with a friend.

48. *Harijan*, July 27, 1947, p. 245; in discussion with a friend.

3. Muslim Minority in India

49. *Harijan*, August 10, 1947, pp. 273-4; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, July 25.

50. *Ibid*, p. 272; writing in the course of a discussion about the attitude of Gujaratis to the Urdu script.

51. *Harijan*, August 31, 1947, p. 297; speech to a group of students, Beliaghata.

52. *Harijan*, October 5, 1947, p. 361; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, September 25. Gandhiji was commenting on a question put to him: "...the Pakistan Government was driving away the Hindus from Pakistan. Gandhiji advised the Indian Union Government to let the Muslims stay in the Indian Union a equal citizens. How could the Union Government bear this double burden?"

53. *Harijan*, February 1, 1948, p. 13; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, January 23. Gandhiji was commenting on a telegram he had received from Meerut distrusting Muslim loyalty.

4. Post-partition Relations

54. *Harijan*, July 20, 1947, p. 243; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, July 13.

55. *Harijan*, October 5, 1947, p. 363; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, September 27. Gandhiji was commenting on newspaper dealing with his remarks (about the possibility of war between India and Pakistan) in such a way "that there was an enquiry from Calcutta whether he had really begun to advocate war..."

56. *Ibid*, p. 356; in reply to a letter from Kaka Kalelkar; *vide* note to para 91, p. 384.

57. *Harijan*, September 28, 1947, p. 349; address to RSS, New Delhi, September 16.

58. *Ibid*, p. 339; address to Muslims, Daryaganj, New Delhi, September 17.

59. *Harijan*, October 6, 1947, p. 356; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, September 26.

60. *Harijan*, October 12, 1947, p. 365; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, September 30.

61. *Ibid*, p. 372; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, October 5.

62. *Harijan*, October 19, 1947, p. 379; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, October 9.

63. *Harijan*, October 5, 1947, p. 356; *vide* note 56 above.

64. *Harijan*, October 26, 1947, p. 384.

65. *Harijan*, January 11, 1948, p. 509; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, January 4.

66. *Harijan*, January 18, 1948, p. 525; speech at prayer meeting, January 14.

67. *Harijan*, February 1, 1948, p. 13; prayer meeting, New Delhi, January 23. Gandhiji was speaking with reference to a letter received by him complaining "that the inter-Dominion agreement for the restoration of abducted women...was not being implemented now."

68. *Ibid*, p. 15; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, January 26, 1948.

XII Communal Relations in Free India

I. The Coming of Independence

1. *Harijan*, August 3, 1947, p. 258; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, July 20.

2. *Ibid*, p. 259; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, July 21; Gandhiji was replying to a correspondent, a non-Muslim from Pakistan, who felt 'sorrow and trepidation, in common with other minorities', at the approach of Independence.

3. *Harijan*, August 24, 1947, pp. 294-5; speech at prayer meeting, Sodepur, August 12.

4. *Ibid*, p. 295; speech at prayer meeting, Beliaghata, August 14, the eve of Independence Day.

5. *Ibid*; speech at prayer meeting, Sodepur, August 12.

6. *Harijan*, August 31, 1947, p. 303; speech at prayer meeting, Calcutta, August 21.

7. *Harijan*, February 1, 1948, pp. 14-5; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, January 26.

2. Resort to Force

8. *Harijan*, September 7, 1947, pp. 315-6; speech at prayer meeting, Calcutta, August 29.

9. *Harijan*, September 21, 1947, p. 335; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, September 12.

10. *Harijan*, October 5, 1947, p. 361; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, September 25.

11. *Harijan*, September 28, 1947, p. 350; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, September 17.

3. Equality of All

12. *Young India*, September 25, 1924, p. 312.

13. *Harijan*, November 16, 1947, p. 416; speech at prayer meeting. New Delhi, November 9. A refugee lady had written to Gandhiji suggesting celebrations for Divali, the first after Independence.

14. *Harijan*, April 27, 1940, p. 101.

15. *Harijan*, July 27, 1947, pp. 250-1; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, July 13.

16. *Harijan*, June 8, 1947, p. 180; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi (prior to May 29), *vide*, para 43, p. 367.

17. *Harijan*, January 18, 1948, p. 517; open letter "To the People of Gujarat", New Delhi, Janauary 14.

4. Socialistic Equality

18. *Harijan*, June 1, 1947, p. 172; Gandhiji was replying, in the "Question Box", to the question: "The majority of the Socialists claim that if there was a socialist revolution the economic question will come to the fore-front throwing the

communal conflict in the background. Do you agree? If such a revolution takes place, will it promote the establishment of the Kingdom of God which you call *Ramarajya*?"

5. Franchise

19. *Young India*, January 9, 1930, p. 13.

20. *Harijan*, March 2, 1947, p. 45; speech at prayer meeting, Shrinagar, February 5. Gandhiji was asked: "...What, in your opinion, should be the basis of the franchise in the free provinces of India?"

6. Use of Military in Civil Disturbances

21. *Young India*, December 26, 1924, p. 423; presidential address, to Indian National Congress in session at Belgaum, December 1924.

22. *Harijan*, September 28, 1947, p. 351; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, September 18.

23. *Harijan*, October 19, 1947, p. 378; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, October 9.

24. *Ibid*; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, October 8.

7. Conduct of the Majority

25. *Harijan*, February 2, 1947, p. 3; speech at prayer meeting, January 18.

26. *Harijan*, August 10, 1947, p. 275; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, July 28. Gandhiji was asked: "Why should we not call the Union Hindu India with an indelible stamp of Hindudom on it?"

27. *Harijan*, September 7, 1947, p. 304; speech at prayer meeting, Calcutta, August 25.

28. *Harijan*, September 14, 1947, p. 323; speaking to the deputation from Central Calcutta, which called on him on September 4.

29. *Harijan*, September 28, 1947, p. 338; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, September 15.

30. *Harijan*, September 7, 1947, p. 304; written message at prayer meeting, Calcutta, August 25.

31. *Harijan*, December 14, 1947, p. 472; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, December 6.

32. *Harijan*, June 29, 1947, p. 215; speech at prayer meeting, prior to June 18, in reply to a correspondent who had written expressing fear "with regard to the fate of the Nationalist Muslims in the Union of India".

33. *Harijan*, September 28, 1947, p. 349; address to RSS, New Delhi, September 16.

34. *Ibid*, p. 351; speaking at Kucha Tarachand, New Delhi, on September 19, in reply to a local Hindu leader's assertion that "the Hindus should do exactly as the Muslims in Pakistan were reported to be doing"

35. *Ibid*, p. 352; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, September 20.

36. *Harijan*, October 5, 1947, p. 355; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, September 24.

37. *Ibid*, p. 362; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, September 26.

38. *Ibid*, p. 363; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, September 27. Gandhiji was commenting on a letter he had received.

39. *Harijan*, October 19, 1947, p. 377; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, October 7.

40. *Ibid*; para 1. Para 2: *Harijan,* November 9, 1947, p. 393. Speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, October 27.

41. *Harijan*, February 1, 1948, p. 10; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, January 20, *vide* para 85, p. 185.

42. *Harijan*, August 9, 1942, p. 261; *vide* note to para 73, p. 139.

43. *Harijan*, June 8, 1947, p. 180; commenting on a correspondent's question.

44. *Ibid*, p. 182; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, May 30.

45. *Harijan*, July 6, 1947, p. 219; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, prior to June 29. Gandhiji was replying to a correspondent's question.

46. *Harijan*, June 22, 1947, p. 201; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, June 12.

47. *Ibid*, p. 203; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, prior to June 15, *vide* para 35, p. 344, for earlier part of the statement.

48. *Harijan*, July 6, 1947, p. 218; written message at 'silence day' prayer meeting, New Delhi, June 23.

49. *Ibid*, pp. 218-9; charging him with partiality towards Muslims.

50. *Ibid*, p. 217; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, June 28, 29.

51. *Harijan*, July 13, 1947, p. 236; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, July 5.

52. *Harijan*, August 31, 1947, p. 298; speech at prayer meeting, Beliaghata, August 19.

53. *Harijan*, September 7, 1947, p. 315; speech at prayer meeting, Calcutta, August 29, replying to a question put to him.

54. *Harijan*, April 20, 1947, pp. 119-20; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, April 5.

55. *Harijan*, September 28, 1947, p. 349; address to RSS, New Delhi, September 16.

56. *Harijan*, October 5, 1947, p. 355; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, September 24.

57. *Harijan*, January 25, 1948, p. 532; speech on the occasion of breaking the fast, New Delhi, January 18.

58. *Harijan*, September 28, 1947, p. 351; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, September 18.

59. *Ibid*; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, September 19.

60. *Harijan*, October 5, 1947, p. 354; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, September 22.

8. Status of Muslim Minority

61. *Harijan*, July 27, 1947, p. 254; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, July 15.

62. *Harijan*, September 21, 1947, p. 335; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, September 12.

63. *Ibid*; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, September 13.

64. *Harijan*, September 28, 1947, p. 352; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, September 20.

65. *Harijan*, October 5, 1947, p. 354; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, September 22.

66. *Ibid*, p. 361; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, September 25.

67. *Ibid*, p. 362; speech at prayer meeting; New Delhi, September 26.

68. *Harijan*, October 12, 1947, p. 366; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, October 1.

69. *Harijan*, March 9, 1947, p. 56; speech at prayer meeting, Vijaynagar, February 10.

70. *Harijan*, October 12, 1947, p. 368; Gandhiji was commenting on a correspondent's letter which, in English translation, read:

"This is with reference to your many and continued appeals to treat Muslims as brothers and guarantee their safety so that they do not migrate from here to Pakistan.—"A man was walking along one cold day, when he came across a snake lying frozen with the cold. Taking pity on the reptile, he picked it up and thinking to give it warmth, put it in his pocket. The warmth soon revived the snake and the first thing it did was to dig its poisonous fangs into his saviour and kill him."

Gandhiji remarked that "anger has betrayed this correspondent into an outrageous analogy."

71. *Ibid*, p. 372; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, October 4.

72. *Harijan*, January 25, 1948, p. 533; speech on the occasion of breaking his fast, January 18.

73. *Harijan*, February 1, 1948, pp. 5-6; comment on the observations of a young man who wrote about Muslims being potential fifth-columnists.

74. *Harijan*, January 25, 1948, p. 534; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, January 18.

75. *Harijan*, September 28, 1947, p. 339; address to Muslims, Daryaganj, New Delhi, September 19.

76. *Harijan*, November 30, 1947, p. 449; address to Sikhs on Guru Nanak's birthday.

77. *Harijan*, December 14, 1947, p. 482; address to a gathering of Meos in Jesarah village, Gurgaon, December 9.

78. *Harijan*, January 4, 1948, pp. 495-6; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, December 22.

79. *Ibid*, p. 496.

80. *Harijan*, January 18, 1948, p. 513; commenting on the reported eagerness of the Muslims in the Indian Union to join the Congress.

81. *Harijan*, May 25, 1947, p. 164; Gandhiji was commenting on a fear expressed to him that Nationalist Muslims might suffer at the hands of the Muslim League after the British withdrawal.

82. *Harijan*, August 31, 1947, p. 304; speech at prayer meeting, Alipore, August 23.

83. *Harijan*, September 7, 1947, pp. 313-4; speech at a prayer meeting, Calcutta, August 27. Nationalist Muslims had asked him: "You have expressed the opinion that the Nationalist Muslims should join the League. Then, does it imply that the Congress has now become a communal organization?"

84. *Harijan*, March 30, 1947, p. 88; speech at prayer meeting, Khusrupur, March 15.

85. *Harijan*, November 8, 1947, p. 399; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, October 27. Gandhiji was referring to the reported forcible evacuation of Muslims to Pakistan.

86. *Harijan*, January 11, 1948, p. 506; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, December 29, 1947.

9. The Two Scripts

87. *Harijan*, February 1, 1942, p. 27; in the "Question Box".

88. *Harijan*, February 2, 1947, p. 3.

89. *Harijan*, October 26, 1947, p. 387; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, October 18.

90. *Harijan*, June 22, 1947, p. 201; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, June 12.

91. *Harijan*, October 5, 1947, p. 356; in reply to a letter from Kaka Kalelkar asking: "If the Muslims of the Indian Union affirm their loyalty to the Union, will they accept Hindustani as the national language and learn the Urdu and Nagari scripts?"

92. *Harijan*, October 26, 1947, p. 383; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, October 15; with reference to a paragraph in the Press that henceforth the official language of the U. P. would be Hindi in the Devanagari script.

93. *Ibid*, p. 386; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, October 18.

94. *Harijan*, November 9, 1947, pp. 400-1; with reference to a letter from Raihanabehn Tyabji.

95. *Harijan*, January 11, 1948, p. 505; in the "Question Box".

96. *Ibid*.

97. *Harijan*, August 10, 1947, p. 97; Gandhiji had received from Maganbhai Desai a copy of his correspondence with Ratanlal Parikh who wrote of public opposition in Gujarat to the Urdu script.

98. *Harijan*, October 5, 1947, p. 356; in reply to a letter from Kaka Kalelkar; *vide* para 91, p. 384 and note.

99. *Harijan*, January 11, 1948, p. 505; Gandhiji was replying to a question whether the use of two scripts would not be burdensome.

100. *Harijan*, January 18, 1948, p. 516; in the course of comments on the diminishing sales of the Urdu edition of *Harijan,* which he interpreted as "a sign of resentment against its publication".

101. *Harijan*, October 26, 1947, p. 383; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, October 15, *vide* 92 above.

102. *Harijan*, November 9, 1947, p. 400.

103. *Harijan*, January 11, 1948, p. 505; in reply to a question which, *inter alia,* referred to the view often put forth that the two-script proposal was meant to appease the Muslims.

104. *Ibid*.

105. *Harijan*, October 26, 1947, p. 387; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, October 18. A friend warned him of the impending displacement of English and felt that Gandhiji's "harping on the subject might transfer the dislike of the language to the people who spoke it."

10. Political Parties

106. *Young India*, September 18, 1924, p. 310.

107. *Harijan*, August 9, 1942, p. 261.

108. *Harijan*, August 10, 1947, p. 275; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, July 28, replying to the question: "After the 15th of August, will there be two Congresses or only one...?"

109. *Harijan*, November 23, 1947, p. 423; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, November 13.

11. Secular State

110. *Young India*, September 18, 1924, p. 310.

111. *Harijan*, July 6, 1947, p. 218; in a written, 'silence day' prayer message, New Delhi, June 23.

112. *Harijan*, August 31, 1947, p. 297; speech at prayer meeting Narkeldanga, West Bengal, prior to August 19.

113. *Harijan*, October 26, 1947, p. 383; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, October 15.

114. *Harijan*, November 2, 1947, p. 392.

115. *Harijan*, November 16, 1947, p. 423; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, November 13.

116. *Ibid*, p. 411; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, November 4.

12. Religion and Nationalism

117. *Young India*, January 9, 1930, pp. 13-14.

118. *Harijan*, June 29, 1947, pp. 214-5; in conversation with Khwaja Saheb Abdul Majid, New Delhi, prior to June 18.

119. *Harijan*, December 7, 1947, p. 452.

120. *Ibid*, p. 459; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, November 28.

121. *Harijan*, March 16, 1947, p. 63; speech at Kamalpur, February 21. Gandhiji was replying to the question put to him:

"Should religious instruction form part of the school curriculum as approved by the State? Do you favour separate schools for children belonging to different denominations for facility of religious instruction? Or, should religious instruction be left in the hands of private bodies? If so, do you think it is right for the State to subsidize such bodies?"

122. Harijan, March 23, 1947, p. 76; E. W. Aryanayakam of the Hindustani Talimi Sangh had sent Gandhiji a cutting from the *Hindustan Standard* of February 19 reporting Maulana Abul Kalam Azad's interview on the subject of religious instruction. The relevant extract from the report read:

"...in India, emphasis on religion has been and is greater than in other countries. Not only the past tradition of India but also the present temper of the people tend to emphasize the importance of religious instruction. If Government decide that religious instruction should be included in education, it seems imperative that the religious instruction should be of the best type.

"Religious instruction often imparted in India in private institutions is of a kind which, instead of broadening the outlook and inculcating a spirit of toleration and goodwill to all men, produces exactly the opposite' results. It is likely that under State supervision even denominational teaching can be imparted in a more liberal spirit than under private control. The aim of all religious teaching should be to make men more tolerant and broad-minded, and it is my opinion that this can be more effectively done if the State takes charge of the question than if it is left to private initiative…"

In his letter, Gandhiji prefaced his opinion on the subject by saying categorically "that it (the above view) is inconsistent with the line followed by the Hindustani Talimi Sangh".

123. *Harijan*, December 7, 1947, p. 459; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, November 28.

13. Religious Festivals

124. *Harijan*, March 2, 1947, p. 74; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, March 6. Gandhiji was asked how *Holi*, falling on the next day, ought to be celebrated.

125. *Harijan*, November 2, 1947, p. 391; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, October 22. Gandhiji spoke with reference to the approaching Divali and Bakr-Id festivals.

126. *Harijan*, November 16, 1947, p. 416; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, November 11.

14. Minorities in Services

127. *Young India*, December 26, 1924, p. 423; presidential address at Congress session, Belgaum, December 1924.

128. *Young India*, February 26, 1925, p. 75; in the course of comments on a Bengali zamindar's letter, *vide* para 15; p. 6 and note.

129. *Young India*, May 29, 1924, p. 182.

130. *Harijan*, July 27, 1947, p. 94; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, July 13.

15. Separatism

131. *Harijan*, March 17, 1946, p. 48.

132. *Harijan*, October 20, 1946, p. 361.

133. *Harijan*, December 7, 1947, p. 459; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, November 28, referring to a letter from the Muslim Chamber of Commerce, Calcutta.

134. *Harijan*, December 14, 1947, p. 471; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, December 4, referring to a letter from the Marwadi Chamber of Commerce that, though it had a communal name, its membership was open to all.

16. Synthesis of Culture

135. *Harijan*, May 4, 1940, p. 115.

136. *Harijan*, November 2, 1947, p. 392; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, October 22, *vide* para 114, p. 395 for earlier part of statement.

17. Communal Life in Villages

137. *Harijan*, January 12, 1947, p. 490; in conversation with Dr. Amiya Chakravarty (prior to December 12, 1946).

138. *Harijan*, January 26, 1947, p. 518; speech at prayer meeting, Chandipur, December 28, 1946.

139. *Harijan*, January 4, 1948, p. 500; speech at prayer meeting, Sammalka village, New Delhi, December 27, 1947.

140. *Harijan*, February 1, 1948, p. 5; commenting on letter from a young man, *vide* para 75, p. 250.

18. "India of My Dreams"

141. *Young India*, October 6, 1920, p. 4.

142. *Harijan*, June 8, 1947, p. 177; in conversation with the Chinese Ambassador in India, Dr. Lochia Luen, at New Delhi, (after May 25).

143. *Ibid*, p. 181; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, May 29. Gandhiji was retorting to a correspondent's demand that he should retire to forest life unless he asked the Hindus to "answer sword with sword and arson with arson". Gandhiji refused to deny his whole life and advocate the law of brute force in the place of the law of man...

144. *Harijan*, December 7, 1947, p. 453; replying to Madame Edmund Privat's letter of August 27, 1947 *(ibid)*.

145. *Harijan*, June 8, 1947, p. 177; *vide* 142 above. The Chinese Ambassador had talked of the havoc caused by the war in China, and raised the question as to what line Asiatic countries would follow.

146. *Harijan*, October 5, 1947, p. 354; speech at prayer meeting, New Delhi, September 22.

147. *Harijan*, January 18, 1947, p. 526; speaking on the day of his final fast, at a prayer meeting, New Delhi, January 14. The verse under reference is inscribed on the walls of the *Dewan-i-Am* of the Red Fort in Delhi.

Glossary

Abala—woman, the 'weaker vessel'

Ahimsa—non-violence; in its positive aspect—love for all living things

Akhada—gymnasium, physical culture institute

Akhand Hindustan—undivided India, a slogah of pre-Partition days

Allah-o-Akbar—literally, 'God is great'; Muslim religious slogan

Arati—ceremonial adoration of object of veneration or worship, usually a deity, by waving round it lighted" wicks, camphor, etc.

Ashram—place of retirement or home for disciplined community living

Atishudra—one lower than even the ***shudra,*** the fourth caste, at the very bottom of Hindu social hierarchy 'untouchable'

Avatar—literally, 'a descent': incarnation of a deity, especially of Vishnu in the Hindu trinity

Azadi—political freedom, independence

Bakr-Id—Muslim festival

Bania—member of the Hindu trading class

Bhagavad-Gita—(see 'Gita')

Bhagavata—A famous Purana, Hindu religious book, which amplifies man's duty; the tenth book narrates the history of Krishna

Bhajan—song of devotion, hymn

Bhajanavali—anthology or collection of hymns

Bhangi—sweeper, scavenger

Bharat Milap—meeting of Rama, on his return from exile, with Bharat, his step-brother; an episode of the Ramayana

Brahmacharya—code of conduct involving strict observance of chastity or continence in the pursuit of learning, philosophy and God

Brahmana—member of the first of the four castes, whose chief duty is the study and teaching of the Vedas, and the performance of sacrifices and other religious ceremomies

Buddha—Gautama Buddha, the founder of Buddhism, Vishnu's ninth incarnation according to Hindu belief

Chakki—grinding stone, mill

Chandala—member of the lowest caste, with duties of disposing of carrion

Charkka—spinning wheel

Coolie—labourer, term of social disparagement loosely used against Indians in South Africa

Dargah—Muslim shrine

Darshan—inner vision; sight or audience of deity or *persona grata*

Dar-ul-Harb—battle-field

Dharma—Hindu code of religion and morals, religious and moral duty

Dhobi—washerman

Divali—Hindu festival of lights, associated with worship of Lakshmi, goddess of wealth and prosperity

Doha—couplet

Draupadi—consort of the Pandavas

Duragraha—literally, 'holding on to untruth'; opposite of Satyagraha

Durgapooja—Hindu festival of the worship of Durga, or Shakti

Dussehra—Hindu festival celebrating Rama's victory over Ravana, the demon-King; figuratively, of good over evil

Fakir—religious recluse

Ganapati—literally, 'Lord of the Ganas' or troops of inferior deities; son of Shiva and Parvati, god of wisdom and remover of obstacles, propitiated at the beginning of every important social or religious ceremony among orthodox Hindus

Gajendra Moksha—puranic legend of God rescuing the suppliant elephant king from the alligator

Ganga—sacred river Ganges

Gayatri—sacred verse of the *Rig Veda*, uttered by Brahmanas in their morning and evening devotions

Gita—The Song of the Divine One: a celebrated episode of the Mahabharata, in the form of a metrical dialogue in which Lord Krishna expounds to Arjuna his philosophical doctrines

Gomata—literally, 'Mother Cow'

Goonda—rowdy or hooligan

Gopis—milk-maids of Mathura, devotees of Krishna, the divine cow-herd

***Goseva* Sangh**—institution devoted to cattle welfare

Goshala—cattle welfare centre or farm

Gurudev—literally, 'divine or holy teacher; name by which Gandhiji used to address Poet Tagore

Gurudwara—Sikh place of worship

Harijans—literally, 'God's folk'; name given by Gandhiji to the 'untouchables'

Haveli—Vaishnava temple

Hijrat—mass migration

Himsa—violence, opposite of *Ahimsa*

Holi – Hindu festival of spring-time merriment

Jai Bharat! Jai Hind!—Victory to India! National slogan

Jains—followers of Mahavira, the ***Jina*** (conqueror of self) who preached *ahimsa*

Jamiat-ul-Ulema—association of Muslim divines, or learned men

Kaffir—unbeliever, infidel

Kalma—formula of Muslim prayer, religious incantation

Kamadhuk—same as *Kamadhenu*, the legendary cow, believed to be perennial source of plenty, fulfiller of every desire

Karmabhoomi—the land of duty, as distinguished from *bhogabhoomi*—land of enjoyment

Kauravas—descendents of Kuru and sons of Dhritarashtra, one of the two clans involved and exterminated in the epic Mahabharata War

Khilafat—the question of the suzerainty of the Caliph, (the Sultan of Turkey) once spiritual and temporal head of the Muslim countries, of the Middle East

Khoja—Muslim sect of Ismailis, followers of the Aga Khan

Khudai Khidmatgars—literally, 'servants of God'; the name of a band of Pathan volunteers in the Congress, pledged to non-violence, under the leadership of Khan Abdul Ghaffar Khan (the 'Frontier Gandhi')

Kirpan—the sword, traditional weapon of the Sikhs

Krishna—most celebrated and popular deity of Hindu mythology, eighth incarnation of Vishnu; expounder of the *Gita*

Kshatriya—member of the warrior caste, second in the Hindu social order

Lathi—wooden baton, stout stick

Lota—vessel of metal, drinking pot

Mahatma—literally, 'Great soul', saint; name given to Gandhiji

Malkana—a Hindu convert to Islam in the North

Manava Dharma Shastra—celebrated law book, variously described as the Code of Manu, or the Institutes of Manu, the foundation of Hindu law

Mandir—Hindu temple

Mantra—sacred formula or incantation addressed to a deity, considered to possess magical power

Manu—the founder of mankind according to Hindu belief

Manzil—home, residence

Masjid— mosque

Maulana—title of respect for learned Muslim

Maulvi—Muslim priest

Memons—Muslim community from Cutch, in Western India

Mohalla—locality, area

Moplah—Muslims of Kerala (once known as Malabar)

Namaz—daily ritual of Muslim prayer

Pakistan—literally, 'the land of the pure'

Panchayat—literally, the 'council of the five', basis of village democracy

Pandavas—sons of Pandu, five in number, who triumphed over the Kauravas in the Mahabharat War

Pani—water

Patanjali—founder of Yoga philosophy, author of *Mahabhashya*, a celebrated commentary on the grammar of Panini, (144-142 B.C.)

Pinjrapole—sanatorium for disabled cattle

Pir—Muslim saint

Prahlad—ardent devotee of Vishnu; son of King Hiranyakashipu, who was destroyed by Narasimha, manlion incarnation of Vishnu, for his persecution of Prahlad, and persistence in evil ways

Prayashchitta—atonement, expiation

Pujari—Hindu priest

Purdah—veil

Quaid-i-Azam—title, meaning 'the greatest of leaders', given to Jinnah

Raj—rule, kingdom

Rakshasas—demons, monsters

Rama—central figure and hero of the epic Ramayana; an incarnation of Vishnu

Ramadhun—literally, 'chanting of *Ramanama*', the Lord's names

Ramanama—literally, 'the names of Rama', the multiple names of God

Ramayana—literally, 'the adventures of Rama'; oldest of Sanskrit epic poems

Ramzan—ninth Arabic month, holy to the Muslims, during which they fast

Ravana—the demon-king of Lanka, who abducted Sita, wife of Rama, and was killed by him in battle

Rishis—ancient seers; sages

Sadhana—dedicated endeavour

Sanatana Hindu Dharma—traditional, orthodox Hinduism

Sanatani—follower of orthodox Hinduism

Sangathan—social organization

Satyagraha—literally 'clinging to Truth'; word coined by Gandhiji in South Africa for non-violent, or civil disobedience

Satyagrahi—one who resorts to or offers *Satyagraha*

Shahanshah—Shah of Shahs

Shakti—name given to feminine incarnation embodying universal force

Shariat—Muslim law

Shloka—verse

Shuddhi—ritual of conversion

Shudras—members of Hindu caste, traditionally labourers

Sthitaprajna—literally, 'one of steadfast mind'; a soul unaffected by extremes of joy and sorrow

Sufi—Muslim mystic

Sunni hanafi—Muslim sect

Sutra—aphoristic statement of principle or rule

Swadeshi—literally 'of one's own country'; the doctrine of preferential use of indigenous products

Swaraj—literally, 'self-rule'; independence

Tabligh—religious propaganda and proselytism

Tapasya—penance; rigorous ritual of Self-purification

Tejas—moral brilliance, halo

Tilak—Hindu caste-mark on the forehead

Tulasidas—celebrated 16th-17th century saint-poet, author of *Ramacharitmanas*, popular Hindi version of the *Ramayana*

Ulema—Muslim divine

'Untouchables'—lowest of the low in the Hindu social scale, treated as outcaste by orthodox Hindus

'Untouchability'— practice of social ostracism against the low-castes

Upanishads—philosophical treatises, representing the essence of the Vedas

Vaishnavas—Hindu sect worshipping Vishnu

Vaishya—member of Hindu trading—the third—caste

Varna—literally 'colour'; caste

Vedas—literally, 'divine knowledge'; ancient scriptural texts, four in number, considered fount of Hinduism

Yadavas—dynasty in which Lord Krishna was born

Yajna—ritual of religious sacrifice

Yavanas—barbarians

Yudhishthira — eldest of the Pandavas, celebrated for his right conduct

Zamindar—landlord, landowner

Zend-Avesta—scripture of the Zoroastrians or Parsees