
INDIA

:: : ON : ::

TRIAL

MAHATMAJI'S INJUNCTIONS

Remember the four pillars of Swaraj: Non-violence, Hindu - Muslem — Sikh—Parsi — Christian—Jew unity, total removal of untouchability and manufacture of hand-spun and hand-woven *Khaddar* completely displacing foreign cloth.

PUBLISHED BY

AHIMSA ASHRAM

TRIPLICANE

MADRAS.

PRICE As. 10

INDIA

:: : ON : ::

TRIAL

“AHIMSA PARAMO DHARMAHA”

PUBLISHED BY
AHIMSA ASHRAM
TRIPLICANE, : MADRAS

CONTENTS.



	PAGE
If I am Arrested (Nava Jivan) ...	1
If I am Arrested (Young India)....	5
On the Eve of my Arrest	13
Arrest	16
To the People in Bardoli	19
Message to Bombay	20
Message to Andhra	21
Message to Kerala ...	22
The Trial ...	23
Mahatmaji's Oral Statement	28
Mahatmaji's Written Statement	31
The Judgment ...	39
Mrs. Gandhi's Message ...	43
Mahatmaji's Letter to Hakimji ...	45
Non-Violence ...	52
Death Dance ...	50
Stop Ruthless Repression ...	64
Where is Swaraj (Nava Jivan) ...	77
A Divine Warning (Nava Jivan) ...	83
Beware of Ourselves ...	91
Gandhi—India's Man of the Hour ...	97
Mahatma Gandhi—The World's Greatest Man ...	109

PUBLISHERS' NOTE



This book contains some important contributions of Mahatma Gandhi to the Nava Jivan, his trial and his messages. We intend bringing out a series called 'Ahimsa mala' containing some of the best articles of Pujya Mahatmaji from the Nava Jivan. This is the first of the series. We also intend publishing some other books written by other great men which will facilitate the growth of Ahimsa—Non-Violence—in the country.

Sincere and passionate expressions of one's own heart in the language of one's own childhood have a sweetness, all its own, not only to the ears of those born and bred up in that tongue—but sounds as sweetly to others also who have learnt or known the language—though nurtured in another. This is exactly what we—who know Gujarati and Hindi—found to our joy on the receipt of every issue of the Nava Jivan. It was the pleasantest duty for us to translate them, because we thought that it would be a sin on our part if we alone selfishly enjoyed these

things without giving anything to our brothers and sisters, who have not yet learnt enough Hindi—our national language—and who cannot therefore be expected to know Gujarati.

Readers of "Young India" may find the English Translation simpler than Mahatmaji's writings in 'Young India,' though we cannot even try to imitate his inimitable style. It gives us no small pleasure, and we are sure our readers also will be glad to note it, that Mahatmaji himself had expressed his satisfaction about our translation in the columns of 'Young India'.

We are of opinion that Mahatmaji's sentence has really put India on a trial i. e., whether this movement is the movement of an individual or whether it is truly an all India national movement. Hence the title of the book. It becomes every Indian to do his or her best to push on the work chalked out by Mahatmaji.

We are grateful to Sjt. Varadachariar for the help he has rendered in the translation.

Gandhiji is in Tapas and we, his disciples, are determined in our own humble way to carry on the flaming torch of patriotism and knowledge that he has lighted, undeterred by fear or favour.

AHIMSA ASHRAM,

वैष्णव कौन है?

वैष्णव जन तो तेने कहिये जो पीड़ पराई जाणे रे
 पर दुःखे उपकार करे तो एमन अभिमान न आणे रे |वै|
 सकल लोक माँ सौने वंदे निंदा न करे केनो रे
 वाच काछ मन निश्चल राखे धन धन जननी तेनी रे |वै|
 सम दृष्टी ने तृष्णा त्यागी पर स्त्री जेने मात रे
 जिह्वा थकी असत्य न बोले परधन नव जाले हाथ रे |वै|
 मोह माया व्यापे नहिं जेने दृढ़ वैराग्य जेना मन माँ रे
 राम नाम सूँ ताली लागी सकल तीरथ तेना तन माँ रे |वै|
 जग लोभी ने कपट रहित छे काम क्रोध निवार्या रे
 भणे नरसयूँ तेनूँ दरशन करताँ कुल एकोतर तार्या रे |वै|

VAISHNAV KAUN HAI?

Vaishnava Jan to tene Kahiye jo peeda
 parayee jane re.
 Para duhkhe upakara kare to ye mana abhi-
 mana na ane re (vai).
 Sakala loka man sowne vande ninda na
 Kare keni re.
 Vacha Kaccha mana nischala rakhe dhana
 dhana janani teni re (via).
 Sama drishtee ne trishna tyagi, para stri
 jene mata re.
 Jihva thakee asatya na bole para dhana
 nava jale hath re (vai).

Moha maya vyape nahin jene dridha vai-
ragya jena man man re.
Rama nama soon tali lagi sakala teeratha
tena tan man re (vai).
Vana lobhine kapata rahita cche Kama
Krodha nivaryan re.
Bhane narasaiyoon tenu darshan kartan
Kula exholara tarya re (vai).

WHO IS A TRUE VAISHNAVA.

Vaishnava is he who feels others pains (as his own), who helps others in distress and has no vanity at all.

Whoever respects all people on earth and hates none, who is pure of thought word and deed, thrice blessed is his mother.

To whom every one on earth is of the same class, who has no desire, to whom all women are as mother, who never will speak an untruth, to whom others wealth is as mud, verily he is a true Vaishnava.

Over whom 'Maya' has not spread, who has given up all worldly desires, whoever is immersed in divinity verily all sacred places dwell in him.

A mere sight of him who has neither hypocrisy nor anger in him, can cause happiness to seventy-one generations. So says Narasee Mehta.

If I am Arrested

(*Nava Jivan*)

I have been constantly thinking of what the people would do in case I am arrested. My co-workers also have been putting this question to me. What would be the plight of India if the people took to the wrong path through love run mad? What would be my own plight in such a case?

Rivers of blood shed by the Government cannot frighten me, but I would be deeply pained even if the people did so much as abuse the Government for my sake or in my name. It would be disgracing me if the people lost their equilibrium on my arrest. The nation can achieve no progress merely by depending upon me. Progress is possible only by their understanding and following the path suggested by me. For this reason I desire that the people should maintain perfect self-control and consider the day of my arrest as a day of rejoicing. I desire that even the weakness existing to-day should disappear at that time.

What can be the motive of the Government in arresting me? The Government are

not my enemy; for I have not a grain of enmity towards them. But they believe that I am the soul of all this agitation, that if I am removed, the ruled and the rulers, would be left in peace, that the people are blindly following me. Not only the Government but some of our leaders also share this belief. How then can the Government put the people to the test? How can the Government ascertain whether the people do understand my advice or are simply dazzled by my utterances?

The only way left to them is to arrest me. Of course, there still remains an alternative for them and that lies in the removal of the causes which have led me to offer this advice. But intoxicated as they are with power, the Government will not see their own fault and even if they do, they will not admit it. The only way then that remains for them is to measure the strength of the people. They can do this by arresting me. If the people are thus terrorised into submission, they can be said to deserve the Punjab and the Khilafat wrongs.

If on the other hand the people resort to violence, they will merely be playing into the hands of the Government. Their aeroplanes will then bomb the people, their Dyers will shoot

them, and their Smiths will uncover the veils of our women. There will be other officers to make the people rub their noses against the ground, crawl on their bellies, and undergo the scourge of whipping. Both these results will be equally bad and unfortunate. They will not lead to Swaraj. In other countries governments have been overthrown by sheer brute-force, but I have often shown that India cannot attain Swaraj by that force. What then should the people do if I am arrested?

The answer now is simple. The people,

1. should preserve peace and calmness,
2. should not observe Hartal,
3. should not hold meetings, but
4. should be fully awake.

I should certainly expect

5. all the Government Schools to be vacated and shut down,
6. lawyers to withdraw from practice in greater numbers,
7. settlement by private arbitration of cases pending before the courts,
8. opening of numerous National Schools and Colleges,
9. renunciation of all foreign cloth in

favour of the exclusive use of handspun and handwoven garments by lakhs of men and women and selling or burning of any foreign cloth in stock,

10. none to enlist in the army or in any other Government Service,

11. those able to earn their livelihood by other means to give up Government Service,

12. contribution of as much as is wanted towards national funds,

13. Title holders to surrender titles in greater numbers,

14. candidates to withdraw from elections, or if already elected to resign their seats,

15. voters who have not yet made up their minds, to resolve that it is sin to send any representative to the councils.

If the people resolve and carry this out, they would not have to wait for *Swaraj* even for a year. If they exhibit this much strength we shall have attained *Swaraj*.

I shall then be set free under the nation's seal. That will please me. My freedom to-day is like a prison to me.

It will only prove the peoples' incompetence if they use violence to release me and then depend upon my help to attain *Swaraj* for them.

Neither I nor anyone else can get Swaraj for the Nation. It will be got on the Nation proving its own fitness.

In conclusion, it is useless to find fault with the Government. We get what government we deserve. When we improve, the Government is also bound to improve. Only when we improve can we attain Swaraj. Non-co-operation is the Nation's determination to improve. Will the Nation abandon the resolve and begin to co-operate after my arrest? If the people become mad and take to violence and as a result of it crawl on their bellies, rub their noses on the ground, salute the Union Jack and walk eighteen miles to do it, what else is that but co-operation? It is better to die than to submit to crawling, etc. In fine, consider it from any point of view, the course suggested by me is the right one for the people to take.

(Young India)

The rumour has been revived that my arrest is imminent. It is said to be regarded as a mistake by some officials that I was not arrested when I was to be, *i e.*, on the 11th or 12th of February and that the Bardoli decision ought not to have been allowed to affect the Govern-

ment's programme. It is said, too, that it is now no longer possible for the Government to withstand the ever-rising agitation in London for my arrest and deportation. I myself cannot see how the Government can avoid arresting me if they want a permanent abandonment of civil dis-obedience, whether individual or mass.

I advised the Working Committee to suspend mass civil dis-obedience at Bardoli, because that dis-obedience would not have been civil, and if I am now advising all provincial workers to suspend even individual civil dis-obedience, it is because I know that any dis-obedience at the present stage will be not civil but criminal. A tranquil atmosphere is an indispensable condition of civil dis-obedience. It is humiliating for me to discover that there is a spirit of violence abroad and that the Government of the United Provinces has been obliged to enlist additional police for avoiding a repetition of Chauri Chaura. I do not say that all that is claimed to have happened has happened, but it is impossible to ignore all the testimony that is given in proof of the growing spirit of violence in some parts of those provinces. In spite of my political differences with Pundit Hridayanath Kunzru, I regard him to be

above wilful perversion of truth. I consider him to be one of the most capable among public workers. He is not a man to be easily carried away. When, therefore, he gives an opinion upon anything, it immediately arrests my attention. Making due allowance for the colouring of his judgment by reason of his pro-Government attitude, I am unable to dismiss his report of the Chauri Chaura tragedy as unworthy of consideration. Nor is it possible to ignore letters received from Zemindars and others, informing me of the violent temperament and ignorant lawlessness in the United Provinces. I have before me the Bareilly report signed by the Congress Secretary. Whilst the authorities behaved like madmen and forgot themselves in their fit of anger, we are not, if that report is to be believed, without fault. The volunteer procession was not a civil demonstration. It was insisted upon in spite of a sharp division of opinion in our own ranks. Though the crowds that gathered were not violent, the spirit of the demonstration was undoubtedly violent. It was an impotent show of force, wholly unnecessary for our purpose and hardly a prelude to civil dis-obedience. That the authorities could have handled the procession in a better spirit, that

they ought not to have interfered with the Swaraj flag, that they ought not to have objected to the use of the Town Hall, which was town property, as Congress offices, in view of the fact that it had been so used for some months with the permission of the Town Council, is all very true. But we have ceased to give credit to the authorities for common or reasonable sense. On the contrary, we have set ourselves against them, because we expect nothing but unreason and violence from them, and knowing that the authorities would act no better than they did, we should have refrained from all the previous irritating demonstrations. That the U. P. Government are making a mountain out of a mole-hill that they are discounting their own provocation and the provocation given by the murdered men at Chauri Chaura is nothing new. All that I am concerned with is that it is not possible for us to claim that; we have given them no handle whatsoever. It is therefore as a penance that civil disobedience has been suspended. But if the atmosphere clears up, the people realise the full value of the adjective 'civil' and become in reality non-violent, both in spirit and in deed, and if I find that the Government still do not yield to the people's

will, I shall certainly be the first person to advocate individual or mass civil dis-obedience as the case may be. There is no escape from that duty without the people wishing to surrender their birth-right.

I doubt the sincerity of Englishmen who are born fighters when they declaim against civil dis-obedience as if it was a diabolical crime to be punished with exemplary severity. If they have glorified armed rebellions and resorted to them on due occasions, why are many of them up in arms against the very idea of civil resistance? I can understand their saying that the attainment of a non-violent atmosphere is a virtual impossibility in India. I do not believe it, but I can appreciate such an objection. What, however, is beyond my comprehension is the deadset made against the very theory of civil dis-obedience, as if it was something immoral. To expect me to give up the preaching of civil dis-obedience is to ask me to give up preaching peace, which would be tantamount to asking me to commit suicide.

I have now been told that the Government are compassing the destruction of the three Weeklies which I am conducting, viz., "Young India," Gujarati "Nava Jivan" and Hindi

“Nava Jivan.” I hope that the rumour has no foundation. I claim that these three journals are insistently preaching nothing but peace and good-will. Extraordinary care is taken to give nothing but truth, as I find it, to the readers. Every inadvertent inaccuracy is admitted and corrected. The circulation of all the Weeklies is daily growing. The conductors are voluntary workers, in some cases taking no salary whatsoever, and in the others, receiving mere maintenance money. Profits are all returned to the subscribers in some shape or other, or are utilised for some constructive public activity or other. I cannot say that I shall not feel a pang if these journals cease to exist. But it is the easiest thing for the Government to put them out. The publishers and printers are all friends and co-workers. My compact with them is that the moment Government asks for security, that moment the newspapers must stop. I am conducting them upon the assumption that whatever view the Government may take of my activities, they at least give me credit for preaching through these newspapers nothing but the purest non-violence and truth according to my lights.

I hope, however, that whether the Govern-

ment arrest me or whether they stop by direct or indirect means the publication of the three journals, the public will remain unmoved. It is a matter of no pride or pleasure to me but one of humiliation that the Government refrain from arresting me for fear of an outbreak of universal violence and awful slaughter that any such outbreak must involve. It would be a sad commentary upon my preaching of, and upon the Congress and Khilafat pledge of, non-violence, if my incarceration was to be a signal for a storm all over the country. Surely, it would be a demonstration of India's unreadiness for a peaceful rebellion. It would be a triumph for the bureaucracy and it would be almost a final proof of the correctness of the position taken up by the Moderate friends, *viz.*, that India can never be prepared for non-violent disobedience. I hope therefore that the Congress and Khilafat workers will strain every nerve and show that all the fears entertained by the Government and their supporters were totally wrong. I promise that such act of self-restraint will take us many a mile towards our triple goal.

There should therefore be no *hartals*, no noisy demonstrations, no processions. I would

regard the observance of perfect peace on my arrest as a mark of high honour paid to me by my countrymen. What I would love to see, however, is the constructive work of the Congress going on with clockwork regularity and the speed of the Punjab Express. I would love to see people who have hitherto kept back, voluntarily discarding all their foreign cloth and making a bonfire of it. Let them fulfil the whole of the constructive programme framed at Bardoli, and they will not only release me and other prisoners, but they will also inaugurate Swaraj, and secure redress of the Khilafat and the Punjab wrongs. Let them remember the four pillars of Swaraj :—Non-violence, Hindu—Moslem—Sikh—Parsi—Christian—Jew Unity, total removal of untouchability and manufacture of hand-spun and hand-woven *khaddar* completely displacing foreign cloth.

I do not know that my removal from their midst will not be a benefit to the people. In the first instance, the superstition about the possession of super-natural powers by me will be demolished. Secondly, the belief that people have accepted the non-co-operation programme only under my influence and that they have no independent faith in it will be disproved.

Thirdly, our capacity for Swaraj will be proved by our ability to conduct our activities in spite of the withdrawal even of the current programme. Fourthly and selfishly, it will give me a quiet and physical rest, which perhaps I deserve.

On the Eve of Arrest

MAHATMAJI'S MESSAGE

My dear Prakasam,

You ask me for my future programme. I have just sent to you a telegram as follows ;—

“In Ahamedabad till Saturday, Surat Sunday, Monday, Bardoli Tuesday.”

But that is “Government Willing”. For I have persistent rumours being thrust upon me that my leave is now more than overdue, and I am also told that I shall be relieved of my burdens inside of 7 days. Subject, therefore, to that happy contingency, you have the foregoing programme. If I am arrested, I look to you and all who are out to keep absolute peace. It will be the best honour that the country can do me. Nothing would pain me

more, in whatever jail I may find myself, than to be informed by my custodians that a single head has been broken by, or on behalf of, non-co-operators, a single man had been insulted or a single building damaged. If the people or the workers have at all understood my message, they will keep exemplary peace. I would certainly be delighted if in the night following my arrest, there was throughout the length and breadth of India, a bonfire of all foreign cloth voluntarily surrendered by the people without the slightest compulsion having been exercised, and a fixed determination to use nothing but khaddar, and till then, in the glorious weather of India, to wear nothing but a piece of loin-cloth, and in the case of Mussulmans, the minimum required by religious obligation. I would certainly love to be told that there was a phenomenal demand for spinning wheels and that all workers who did not know hand-spinning had commenced it in right earnest. The more I think over our future programme, and the more news I get about the spirit of violence that has silently but surely crept into our ranks, the more convinced I am that even individual civil disobedience would be wrong. It would be much better to be forsaken by everybody and to be

doing the right thing, than to be doing the wrong thing for the sake of boasting a large following. Whether we are few or whether we are many, so long as we believe in the programme of non-violence, there is no absolution from the full constructive programme. Enforce it to-day, and the whole country is ready for mass civil disobedience to-morrow. Fail in the effort, and you are not ready even for individual civil disobedience. Nor is the matter difficult. If all the members of the All-India Congress Committee and Provincial Congress Committees are convinced of the correctness of the premises I have laid down, it can be done. The pity of it is that they are not so convinced. A policy is a temporary creed liable to be changed, but while it holds good it has got to be pursued with apostolic zeal.

Arrest

On Friday night at 10-30, when those in Sabarmathi Ashram were preparing to retire, Mr. Hailey, Superintendent of Police, Ahmedabad, arrived in a motor car with a warrant of arrest under Section 124-A. Hailey waited at the gate of the Ashram sending word to Mahatmajī that he had come with a warrant for his arrest and Mahatmajī was allowed to take his own time for preparation to leave the Ashram with Mr. Hailey.

Mr. Shankerlal Banker, who was the right hand man of Mr. Gandhi and publisher of *Navajivan* and *Young India* and keeper of the press, had then just left the Ashram for the town. He was met by Mr. Hailey on the road. The latter told him that he was also to be arrested. Mr. Banker immediately gave himself up.

The news that the expected had happened went quickly round the Ashram and all collected near Mahatmajī, paid obeisance to him and asked for his blessing. Mahatmajī's favourite hymn describing the qualities of an ideal Vaishnavā was sung in chorus. The final leave-taking

was of a touching nature, but did not occupy more than a few minutes.

Mahatmajī then came out and got into Mr. Hailey's car accompanied by Mr. Banker. Mrs. Gandhi and Srimati Anusuya Bahen Sarabhai were allowed to escort the prisoners as far as the Sabarmathi jail which is in the neighbourhood of the Ashram. His parting words to the Ashram people were that all who bore patriotism and love for India should strain every nerve to propagate peace and good will all over India, among all communities.

At Saturday noon Messrs Gandhi and Banker were placed before Mr. Brown Assistant Magistrate, the Court being held in the Divisional Commissioner's Office at Sahibag. The prosecution was conducted by Rao Bahadur Girdharilal Public Prosecutor.

The Superintendent of Police, Ahmedabad, 1st witness produced the Bombay Government's authority to lodge a complaint for four articles published in *Young India* dated 15th June 1921 entitled "Disaffection a Virtue," dated 29th September, "Tamepring with Loyalty," dated 15th December, "The Puzzle and its Sloution" and dated 23rd February 1922 "Shaking the manes." He stated that the warrant was issued on the 6th

instant by the District Magistrate, Ahmedabad and the case was transferred to the file of Mr. Brown. Meanwhile warrants were also issued to the Suserintendents of Police of Surat and Ajmere as Mr. Gandhi was expected to be at those place. The original signed articles and issues of the paper in which these appeared were also produced as evidence.

Mr. Gharda, Registrar, Appellate side Bombay, High Court, second witness, produced correspondence between Mr. Gandhi as the Editor of *Young India* and Mr. Kennedy, District Judge, Ahmedabad. Mr. Chatfield, Magistrate of Ahmedabad was the next witness. He testified to the security deposited by Mr. Gandhi and the declaration of Mr. S. Banker as printer of *Young India*.

Two formal police witnesses were then prodnced.

Accused declined to cross examine the witnesses.

Mr. M. K. Gandhi, 53, farmer and weaver by profession, residing at Satyagraho Ashram, Sabarmati said :—

“I simply wish to state that, when the proper time comes, I shall plead guilty so far as disaffection towards Government is concerned. It

is quite true that I am the Editor of *Young India* and that the articles read in my presence were written by me and the proprietors and publishers had permitted me to control the whole policy of the paper."

Mr. Shankarlal Banker, landed propertioa, Bombay, second accused stated that at the proper time he would plead guilty to the charge of having published the articles complained of.

Charges were framed on three counts under Section 124-A, of accused were committed to the Sessions.

Mahatmaji asked his associates present in the Court to carry on the publication of his papers.

To the People in Bardoli

In a leaflet distributed broadcast among the people of Bardoli Taluka, Mahatma Gandhi says:—

You and I have taken upon our shoulders no small responsibilities. You have lifted the burden of the whole country. You want to stand at the top in the test. With a view to make the

greatest sacrifices. you are unsparingly devoting yourselves to self-purification. Only a short time back, I learnt the children of the untouchables were admitted into eighteen national schools. I was much delighted to hear the news. As long as there is a single national school without the children of the untouchables, the Resolutions of the Conference cannot be said to have been accomplished. I hope not a single thoughtful man of Bardoli would pay the revenue. Well may the Government confiscate the property, demand chothai or sell sway cattle. we have at least got to suffer this much.

Our very struggle is based on self-confidence, and so we should confide in God. May you all get that confidence.—(*By wire*)

Messages to Bombay

I do not want Bombay to mourn over the arrest of one of its mute secretaries and myself but to rejoice over our rest. Whilst I would like an automatic response to all the items of Non-co-operation, I would like Bombay to concentrate upon Charka and Khaddar. The

monied men of Bombay can buy all the hand-spun and hand-woven Khadder that can be manufactured throughout India. The women of Bombay, if they really mean to do their share of work should religiously spin for a certain time every day for the sake of the country. I wish that no one would think of following us to jail. It would be criminal to court imprisonment till a completely non-violent atmosphere is attained. One test of such atmosphere will be for us to put the Englishman and Moderates at ease. This can be done only if we have goodwill towards them in spite of our differences.

M. K. GANDHI.

Messages to Andra

Glad to learn Venkatappiah's arrest. Hope here will be no hartal, no demonstration, no civil disobedience, not even mental anguish, but a grim determination to pursue the constructive programme. Most effective demonstration would be for every Andhra who loves Venkatappiah to discard all foreign cloth, take to spinning and remove untouchability—GANDHI.

Messages to Kerala

SATYAGRAHASHRAM, SABARMATI, March 10.

The following message to Kerala was dictated by Mahatma an hour and a half before his arrest. It is addressed to Sjt. U. Gopala Menon, Editor of "Naveena Keralam" Madras.

I wish your venture all succes. The only message that I can send in the midst of overwhelming work is for both Hindus and Moplahs to realise their future responsibility, not to brood over the past. How to reach the Moplahs as also the class of Hindus whom you would want to reach through your newspaper is more than I can say, but I know that Hindus should cease to be cowardly. The Moplahs should cease to be cruel. In other words, each party should become truly religious. According to the Sastras Hinduism is certainly not the creed of cowards. Equally certainly, Islam is not the creed of the cruel. The only way the terrible problem before you can be solved is by a few picked Hindus and Mussalmans working away in perfect unison and with faith in their mission. They ought not to be baffled by absence of results in the initial stages, and if you can get together from among your readers a number of such men and women your paper will have served a noble purpose.

The Trial

The trial opened at 12 noon on the 18th March before Mr. C. N. Broomfield, District and Sessions Judge, Ahmedabad. Long before the hour appointed for the commencement of the trial, the hall was full with people mostly clad in Khaddar. Accomodation had also been arranged in both verandahs and in the flanks of the hall. Among those present inside the hall were Mr. V. J. Patel, Mrs. Sarojani Naidu, Saraladevi Choudhrani, Pandit Jawharlal Nehru, Mr. T. Prakasam, Ambalal Sarabhai, Anasuya Bai Sen and many others. Police and Military precaution were complete. While policemen were posted at frequent intervals all round the Court compound, the Indian Infantry was stationed inside the compound with about half a dozen European Police Officers.

Mahatmaji and Banker arrived at the Court at 11-40, accompanied by Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya who had postponed his intention of leaving Ahmedabad the previous night. All those inside the Court stood up when Mahatmaji entered the hall and remained standing

until he was shown a seat to the left side of the Judge. A little further up in the same row to the right of Mr. Gandhi, sat Mr. Banker with Malaviya on the right, while to the left of Mr. Gandhi, sat his wife with Mrs. Naidu and Saraladevi next to her.

Punctually at 12 O'clock the Judge took his seat. At the outset the Judge pointed out that the charges as framed by the Public Prosecutor contained three counts. He understood the prosecution to mean that there were three distinct offences which, being of the same kind committed within the space of a year, were charged and committed to together.

The Advocate-General agreed with the Judge.

The charges were then read out against both the accused after which the Judge explained at length the provisions of Section 124 A and said that the word "Disaffection" included disloyalty or feelings of enmity and the word as used in that section had been interpreted by the High Court of Bombay as meaning 'political alienation' or 'disrespect.'

The Judge—Do you plead guilty or claim to be tried?

Mahatmaji.—I plead guilty on all charges.

I observe that the King's name has been omitted from the charges and in my opinion very properly.

Mr. Banker also pleaded guilty.

The Advocate General then pointed out that under Section 271 Cr. P. C. the Court might convict the accused on their plea or proceed with the trial. He would ask the Judge to proceed with the case firstly because the charges were of a serious character, secondly, it was highly desirable in public interest that those charges should be fully stated and publicly investigated. A sentence could not be passed simply because the accused had pleaded guilty. The Judge could not deal with the matter unless all facts of the case were laid before him.

The Judge:—I do not agree. I have under the law full discretion to convict the accused on their own pleas and in this particular case, I cannot see what advantage can be gained by going once more through the evidence that was recorded before the Committing Magistrate. But as regards the question that charges should be investigated as fully as possible, the evidence that was recorded before the Committing Magistrate and as far as I know nothing contrary has appeared, the only evidence will be evidence to

show that Mr. Gandhi was responsible for these particular articles and in the face of this plea, it seems to me it would be futile to record any more evidence on that point. As regards the question of sentence, I would like to hear what Mr. Gandhi wishes to say. I do not think that mere recording of evidence and proceeding with trial as asked for will make any differences one way or other. I therefore propose to accept the plea of the accused. Nothing so far remains but to pass sentence. But before that I would like to hear what the Advocate General has to say on the question of sentence.

The Advocate General pointed out that the articles from 'Young India' before the Committing Magistrate and which formed the subject of the charges, formed merely a part of the campaign to spread disaffection openly and systematically to render Government impossible and so to overthrow it. The Advocate-General then read out extracts from the articles to show that to create disaffection towards the Government was the creed of Non-co-operators, Congress and Khilafat Committees. He asserted that they were not writings of an uneducated or obscure man. The Court should also consider to what results the campaign had inevitably led. He

said :—" You have examples before you in the last few months. I refer you to the occurrence in Bombay, Madras and Chauri-Chaura, leading to rioting and murder and involving people in misery and distress. It is true that in the case of these articles you find that non-violence is insisted upon as an item of the campaign and of the creed, but of what value is it, Sir, to insist on non-violence if incessantly you preach disaffection towards Government and hold it up as treacherous Government and if you openly and deliberately seek to instigate others to overthrow it ?"

In conclusion he said that those were the circumstances which he would ask the Judge to take into account in passing sentence. As regards Mr. Banker, his guilt was only of a lesser degree in that he printed the Articles. But he would ask the Court to impose a fine in addition to such term of imprisonment as he deserved.

Mahatmaji then made an oral statement followed by a written one after obtaining the permission of the Court to do so sitting.

Mahatmaji's Oral Statement

Before I read this statement I would like to state that I entirely endorse the learned Advocate General's remarks in connection with my humble self. I think that he was entirely fair to me in all the statements that he has made, because it is very true, and I have no desire whatsoever to conceal from this Court the fact that to preach disaffection towards the existing system of Government has become almost a passion with me. The learned Advocate-General is also entirely in the right when he says that my preaching of disaffection did not commence with my connection with "Young India", but that it commenced much earlier, and in the statement that I am about to read, it will be my painful duty to admit before this Court that it commenced much earlier than the period stated by the Advocate General. It is the most painful duty with me, but I have to discharge that duty, knowing the responsibility that rests upon my shoulders, and I wish to endorse all the blame that the learned Advocate-General has thrown on my shoulders in connection with the Bombay

occurrences, Madras occurrences, and the Chauri-Chaura occurrences. Thinking over these things deeply and sleeping over them night after night and examining my heart I have come to the conclusion that it is impossible for me to dissociate myself from the diabolical crimes of Chauri-Chaura or the mad outrages of Bombay. He is quite right when he says that, as a man of responsibility, a man having received a fair share of education, having had a fair share of experience of this world, I should know the consequences of every one of my acts. I knew them. I knew that I was playing with fire. I ran the risk and, if I was set free, I would still do the same. I would be failing in my duty if I do not do so. I have felt this morning that I would have failed in my duty if I did not say so—what I said here just now—I wanted to avoid violence. I want to avoid violence. Non-violence is the first article of my faith. It is the article of my faith. But I had to make my choice. I had either to submit to a system which I considered has done an irreparable harm to my country or incur the work of mad fury of my people bursting forth when they understood the truth from my lips. I know that my people have sometimes gone mad. I am deeply sorry for it and

I am therefore here to submit not to a light penalty but to the highest penalty. I do not ask for mercy. I do not plead any extenuating act. I am here therefore to invite and submit to the highest penalty that can be inflicted upon me for what in law is a deliberate crime and what appears to me to be the highest duty of a citizen. The only course open to you, the Judge is, as I am just going to say in my statement either to resign your post or inflict on me the severest penalty, if you believe that the system and law you are assisting to administer are good for the people. I do not expect that kind of conversion. But by the time I have finished with my statement, you will perhaps have a glimpse of what is raging within my breast to run this maddest risk which a sane man can run.

The written statement was then read out.

Mahatmaji's Written Statement

FROM LOYALIST TO NON-CO-OPERATOR.

I owe it perhaps to the Indian public and to the public in England, to placate which this prosecution is mainly taken up, that I should explain why from a staunch loyalist and co-operator, I have become an uncompromising disaffectionist and non-cooperator. To the Court, too I should say why I plead guilty to the charge of promoting disaffection towards Government established by law in India.

My public life began in 1893 in South Africa in troubled weather. My first contact with the British authorities in that country was not of a happy character. I discovered that as a man and an Indian, I had no rights. On the contrary, I discovered that I had no rights as a man because I was an Indian.

But I was not baffled. I thought that this treatment of Indians was an excrescence upon a system that was intrinsically and mainly good. I gave the Government my voluntary and hearty co-operation criticising it fully where I felt it was faulty, but never wishing its destruction.

MY SERVICE TO GOVERNMENT

Consequently, when the existence of the Empire was threatened in 1899 by the Boer challenge, I offered my services to it, raised a Volunteer Ambulance Corps and served at the several actions that took place for the relief of Ladysmith. Similarly, in 1906, at the time of the Zulu Revolt, I raised a Stretcher Bearer party and served till the end of the rebellion. On both these occasions, I received medals and was even mentioned in the despatches. As for my work in South Africa, I was given by Lord Hardinge a Kaisari-Hind Gold medal. When the war broke out in 1914 between England and Germany, I raised a volunteer Ambulance Corps in London consisting of the then resident Indians in London, chiefly students. Its work was acknowledged by the authorities to be valuable. Lastly in India, when a special appeal was made at the War Conference in Delhi in 1917 by Lord Chelmsford for recruits, I struggled, at the cost of my health, to raise a corps in India and the response was being made when the hostilities ceased and orders were received that no more recruits were wanted.

THE BELIEF BEHIND IT

In all these efforts at service, I was actuated by the belief that it was possible by such services to gain a status of full equality in the Empire for my countrymen. The first shock came in the shape of the Rowlatt Act, a law designed to rob the people of all real freedom. I felt called upon to lead an intensive agitation against it. Then followed the Punjab horrors beginning with the massacre of Jallianwalla Bag and culminating in crawling orders, public flogging and indescribable humiliations, I discovered too that the plighted word of the Prime Minister to the Mussalmans of India regarding the integrity of Turkey and the holy places of Islam was not likely to be fulfilled.

But in spite of the forebodings and the grave warnings of friends at the Amritsar Congress in 1919, I fought for co-operation and working the Montagu-Chelmsford reforms, hoping that the Prime Minister would redeem his promise to the Indian Mussalmans, that the Punjab wound would be healed and that the reforms, inadequate and unsatisfactory though they were, marked a new era of hope in the life of India.

CRUEL EXPLOITATION OF THE MASSES

But all that hope was shattered. The Khilafat promise was not to be redeemed. The Punjab crime was whitewashed and most culprits went not only unpunished, but remained in service and some continued to draw pensions from the Indian revenue and in some cases were even rewarded. I saw, too, that not only did the reforms not mark a change of heart but they were only a method of further draining India of her wealth and of prolonging servitude. I came reluctantly to the conclusion that the British connection had made India more helpless than she ever was before, politically and economically. A dis-armed India has no power of resistance against any aggressor if she wanted to engage in an armed conflict with him. So much is this the case that some of our best men consider that India must take generations before she can achieve the Dominion status. She has become so poor that she has little power of resistance in famine. Before the British advent, India spun and wove in her millions of cottages, just the supplement she needed for adding to her meagre agricultural resources. This cottage industry, so vital for India's existence, has

been ruined by incredibly heartless and inhuman processes as described by English witnesses. Little do town dwellers know how the semi-starved masses of India are slowly sinking to lifelessness. Little do they know that their miserable comfort represent the brokerage they get for the work they do for the foreign exploiter, that the profits and the brokerage are sucked from masses. Little do they realise that the Government established by law in British India is carried on for this exploitation of the masses. No sophistry, no jugglery in figures, can explain away the evidence the skeletons in many villages present to the wayfarers' eye. I have no doubt whatsoever that both England and the town dwellers of India will have to answer if there is a God above for this crime against humanity which is perhaps unequalled in history.

LAW—THE EXPLOITER'S HAND-MAID.

The law itself in this country has been used to serve the foreign exploiter. My unbiassed examination of the Punjab Martial Law cases has led me to believe that at least ninety-five per cent of the convictions were wholly bad ; and my experience of political cases in India leads me to the conclusion that in nine out of every ten,

the condemned men were totally innocent, their crime consisting in the love of their country. In ninety-nine cases out of hundred, justice has been denied to Indians as against Europeans in the courts of India. This is not an exaggerated picture. It is the experience of almost every Indian who has had anything to do with such cases. In my opinion the administration of the law is thus prostituted, consciously or unconsciously for the benefit of the exploiter.

A SYSTEM OF TERRORISM.

The greatest misfortune is that Englishmen and their Indian associates in the administration of the country do not know that they are engaged in the crime I have attempted to describe. I am satisfied that many English and Indian officials honestly believe that they are administering one of the best systems devised in the world and that India is making steady though slow progress. They do not know that a subtle but effective system of terrorism and an organised display of force on the one hand, and the deprivation of all powers of retaliation and of self-defence on the other, have emasculated the people and induced in them the habit of simulation. This awful habit has added to the

ignorance and the self-deception of the administrators.

SECTION 124—A.

Section 124-A under which I am happily charged is perhaps the Prince among the political sections of the Indian Penal Code designed to suppress the liberty of the citizen. Affection cannot be manufactured or regulated by law. If one has no affection for a person or a thing, one should be free to give the fullest expression to his disaffection so long as he does not contemplate to promote or incite to violence. But the section under which Mr. Banker and I are charged is one under which mere promotion is a crime. I have studied some of the cases tried under it and I know that some of the most loved of India's patriots have been convicted under it. I consider it a privilege, therefore, to be charged under it. I have endeavoured to give in their briefest outline the reasons for my disaffection. I have no personal ill-will against any single administrator. Much less can I have any disaffection towards the King's person. But I hold it to be a virtue to be disaffected towards a Government which, in its totality, has done more harm to India than any previous system.

India is less manly under the British rule than she ever was before holding such a belief. I consider it to be a sin to have affection for the system and it has been a precious privilege for me to be able to write what I have in the various articles tendered in evidence against me.

NON-CO-OPERATION—THE REMEDY.

In fact, I believe that I have rendered a service to India and England by showing, in Non-co-operation, the way out of the unnatural state in which both are living. In my humble opinion. Non-Co-operation with evil is as much a duty as is co-operation with good. But in the past, Non-co-operation has been deliberately expressed in violence to the evil-doer. I am endeavouring to show to my countrymen that violent Non-co-operation only multiplies evil and that, as evil can only be sustained by violence, the withdrawal of support of evil requires complete abstention from violence. Non-violence implies voluntary submission to the penalty for non-co-operation with evil.

APPEAL TO THE COURT

I am here, therefore, to invite and submit cheerfully to the highest penalty that can be

inflicted upon me for what in law is a deliberate crime and what appears to me to be the highest duty of a citizen. The only course open to you, the Judge and the Assessors, is either to resign your posts and thus dis-associate yourselves from evil if you feel that the law you are called upon to administer is an evil and that in reality I am innocent or to inflict on me the severest penalty if you believe that the system and the law you are assisting to administer are good for the people of this country and that my activity is therefore injurious to the public weal.

Sjt. Banker made the following statement :—

“ I only want to say that I had the privilege of printing these articles and I plead guilty to the charge. I have got nothing to say as regards the sentence.”

The Judgement

Mr. Gandhi, you have made my task in one way easy by pleading guilty to the charge. Nevertheless what remains, namely, the determi-

nation of the just sentence is perhaps as difficult a proposition as a judge in this country. Law is no respecter of persons. Nevertheless it will be impossible to ignore the fact that you are in a different category from any person I have ever tried or am ever likely to have to try. Also it would be impossible to ignore the fact that in the eyes of millions of your countrymen, you are a great patriot and great leader, for, even those who differ from you in politics look up to you as a man of high ideals and leading a noble and even saintly life. I have to deal with you in one character only. It is not my duty and I do not presume to judge or to criticise you in any other character. It is my duty to judge you as a man subject to law, who by his own admission, broke the law and committed what to ordinary men must appear to be grave offences against the State. I do not forget that you have consistently preached against violence and that you on many occasions, I am willing to believe, have done much to prevent violence. But having regard to the nature of your political teachings and the nature of many of those to whom it was addressed, how you can have continued to believe that violence would not be the inevitable consequence, I passes my capacity to understand.

There are probably few people in India who do not sincerely regret that you should have made it impossible for any Government to leave you at liberty, but it is so. I am trying to balance what is due to you against what appears to be necessary in the interests of the public and I propose in passing sentence to follow the precedent of a case, in many respects similar to this case, that was decided some twelve years ago. I mean the case against Mr. Bal Gangadhar Tilak under the same section. The sentence that was passed upon him as it finally stood, was a sentence of simple imprisonment for six years. You will not consider it unreasonable, I think, that you should be classed with Mr. Tilak; that is, a sentence of two years simple imprisonment on each count of the charge, six years in all, which I feel it my duty to pass upon you and I should like to say in doing so that if the course of events in India should make it possible to reduce the period and release you, no one will be better pleased than I.

Turning to Mr. Banker the Judge said:— You have been to a large extent under the influence of your chief. The sentence that I propose to pass upon you is simple imprisonment for six months on each of the first two counts,

that is simple imprisonment for one year and a fine of Rs. 1000 or six months simple in default.

MAHATMAJI'S REPLY

Mahatmaji then stood up and said:—

Since you have done me the honour of recalling the trial of the late Lokamanya Tilak, I should want to say that I consider it a proud privilege to be associated with him. I certainly consider that the sentence is as light as any Judge could have possibly passed. As far as the Court is concerned, I could not have expected better courtesy.

TOUCHING SCENES

Then the friends of Mahatmaji crowded round him as the Judge left the Court and fell at his feet. There was much sobbing on the part of both men and women, but all the while Mahatmaji was smiling and cool and giving encouragement to everybody who came to him.

All pressed towards him and bade him tearful farewell one after another.

Sir Thomas Strangman, Advocate General, also exchanged a smiling farewell with Mr. Gandhi.

MAHATMAJI'S MESSAGE

Mahatmaji asked Mr. Prakasam to convey to the country the following message:—

"I am delighted that heavenly peace reigned supreme throughout the country during the last six days. If it continues to the end of the chapter, it is bound to be brief and illuminating."

Mr. Banker also was smiling and taking things in a lighthearted way. After all his friends had taken leave of him, Mahatmaji was taken out of the court to the Sabarmati Jail and thus the great trial finished.

Mrs. Gandhi's Message

Shrimati Kasturibai Gandhi has issued the following appeal:—

My dear countrymen and countrywomen,

Mahatmaji has been sentenced to-day to six year's simple imprisonment. While I cannot deny that this heavy sentence has to some extent told upon me, I have consoled myself

with the thought that it is not beyond our powers to reduce that sentence and release him by our own exertions, long before his term of imprisonment is over. I have no doubt that if India wakes up and seriously undertakes to carry out the constructive programme of the Congress, we shall succeed not only in releasing him, but also in solving to our satisfaction all the three issues for which we have been fighting and suffering for the last eighteen months or more. The remedy therefore lies with us. If we fail, the fault will be ours. I therefore, appeal to all men and women, who feel for me and have regard for Mahatmaji to whole-heartedly concentrate on the constructive programme and make it a success.

Among all the items of the programme, Mahatmaji laid the greatest emphasis on the Spinning Wheel and Khaddar. Our success in this will not only solve the economic problem of India in relation to the masses, but also free us from our political bondage. India's first answer therefore to Mahatmaji's conviction should be that :—

(a) all men and women give up their foreign cloth and adopt Khaddar and persuade others also to do so,

(b) all women make it a religious duty to spin and produce yarn every day and persuade others to do so,

(c) all merchants cease trading in foreign piece-goods.

Mahatmaji's Letter to Hakim Ajmal Khan

Sabarmati jail,
12th March 1922.

My dear Hakimji,

Since my arrest this is the first letter I have commenced to write, after having ascertained that under the Jail Rules I am entitled to write as many letters as I like as an under-trial prisoner. Of course you know that Mr. Shankerlal Banker is with me. I am happy that he is with me. Every one knows how near he has come to me—naturally, therefore, both of us are glad that we have been arrested together.

I write this to you in your capacity as Chairman of the Working Committee and there-

fore Leader of both Hindus and Mussalmans, or better still, of all India.

I write to you also as one of the foremost leaders of Mussalmans, but above all, I write this to you as an esteemed friend. I have had the privilege of knowing you since 1915. Our daily growing association has enabled me to prize your friendship as a treasure. A staunch Mussalman, you have shown in your own life what Hindu-Muslim unity means.

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

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

I have been drawn so close to you chiefly

because I know that you believe in Hindu-Muslim unity in the full sense of the term.

This unity, in my opinion, is unattainable without our adopting non-violence as a firm policy. I call it a policy, because it is limited to the preservation of that unity. But it follows that thirty crores of Hindus and Mussalmans, united not for a time but for all time, can defy all the powers of the world and should consider it a cowardly act to resort to violence in their dealings with the English administrators. We have hitherto feared them and their guns in our simplicity. The moment we realise our combined strength, we shall consider it unmanly to fear them and therefore, even to think of striking them. Hence am I anxious and impatient to persuade my countrymen to feel non-violent, not out of our weakness but out of our strength. But you and I know that we have not yet evolved the non-violence of the strong. And we have not done so, because the Hindu-Muslim union has not gone much beyond the stage of policy. There is still too much mutual distrust and consequent fear. I am not disappointed. The progress we have made in that direction is indeed phenomenal. We seem to have covered in eighteen months' time the work of a generation. But

infinitely more is necessary. Neither the classes nor the masses feel instinctively that our union is necessary as the breath of our nostrils.

For this consummation, we must, it seems to me, rely more upon quality than quantity. Given a sufficient number of Hinds and Mussalmans with almost a fanatical faith in everlasting friendship between the Hindus and the Mussalmans of India, we shall not be long before the unity permeates the masses. A few of us must first clearly understand that we can make no headway without accepting non-violence in thought, word and deed, for the full realisation of our political ambition. I would, therefore, beseech you and the members of the Working Committee and the All-India Congress Committee to see that our ranks contain no workers who do not fully realise the essential truth I have endeavoured to place before you. A living faith cannot be manufactured by the rule of majority.

To me, the visible symbol of All-India-unity and, therefore, of the acceptance of non-violence, as an indispensable means for the realisation of our political ambition, is undoubtedly the *charkha* i.e., *khaddar*. Only those who believe in cultivating a non-violent spirit and eternal friendship

between Hindus and Mussalmans will daily and religiously spin. Universal hand-spinning and the universal manufacture and use of hand-spun and hand-woven *khaddar* will be a substantial, if not absolute, proof of the real unity and non-violence. And it will be a recognition of a living kinship with the dumb masses. Nothing can possibly unify and revivify India as the acceptance by all India of the *spinning wheel* as a daily sacrament and the *khaddar wear* as a privilege and a duty.

Whilst, therefore, I am anxious that more title-holders should give up their titles, lawyers law-courts, scholars the Government schools or colleges, the Councillors the Councils and the soldiers and the civilians their posts, I would urge the Nation to restrict its activity in this direction only to the consolidation of the results already achieved and to trust its strength to command further abstentions from associations with a system we are seeking to mend or end.

Moreover, the workers are too few. I would not waste a single worker to-day on destructive work when we have such an enormous amount of constructive work. But perhaps the most conclusive argument against devoting further time to destructive propaganda is the fact that

the spirit of intolerance which is a form of violence has never been so rampant as now. Co-operators are estranged from us; they fear us. They say that we are establishing a worse bureaucracy than the existing one. We must remove every cause for such anxiety. We must go out of our way to win them to our side. We must make Englishmen safe from all harm from our side. I should not have to labour the point, if it was clear to every one as it is to you and to me, that our pledge of non-violence implies utter humility and good-will even towards our bitterest opponent. This necessary spirit will be automatically realised, if only India will devote her sole attention to the work of construction suggested by me.

I flatter myself with the belief that my imprisonment is quite enough for a long time to come. I believe in all humility that I have no ill-will against any one. Some of my friends would not have to be as non-violent as I am. But we contemplated the imprisonment of the most innocent. If I may be allowed that claim, it is clear that I should not be followed to prison by any body at all. We do want to paralyse the Government considered as a system, not however by intimidation, but by the irresistible

pressure of our innocence. In my opinion it would be intimidation to fill the jails anyhow. And why should more innocent men seek imprisonment till one considered to be the most innocent has been found inadequate for the purpose.

My caution against further courting of imprisonment does not mean that we are now to shirk imprisonment. If the Government will take away every non-violent non-co-operator, I should welcome it. Only it should not be because of our civil dis-obedience, defensive or aggressive. Nor, I hope, will the country fret over those who are in jail. It will do them and the country good to serve the full term of their imprisonment. They can be fitly discharged before their time only by an act of the Swaraj Parliament. And I entertain an absolute conviction that universal adoption of *khaddar* is Swaraj.

I have refrained from mentioning untouchability. I am sure every good Hindu believes that it has got to go. Its removal is as necessary as the realisation of Hindu-Muslim unity.

I have placed before you a programme which is in my opinion the quickest and the best. No impatient Khilafatist can devise a better.

May God give you health and wisdom to guide the country to her destined goal.

I am,

Your Sincerely

M. K. GANDHI

Non-Violence

When a person claims to be non-violent, he is expected not to be angry with one who has injured him. He will not wish him harm, he will wish him well, he will not swear at him, he will not cause him any physical hurt. He will put up with all the injury to which he is subjected by the wrong-doer. Thus non-violence is complete innocence—complete non-violence is complete absence of ill-will against all that lives. It, therefore, embraces even sub-human life not excluding noxious insects or beasts. They have not been created to feed our destructive propensities. If we only knew the mind of the Creator, we should find their proper place in His creation. Non-violence is, therefore, in its active

form, good-will towards all life. It is pure Love. I read it in the Hindu scriptures, in the Bible, in the Koran.

Non-violence is a perfect state. It is a goal towards which all mankind moves naturally though unconsciously. Man does not become divine when he personifies innocence in himself. Only then does he become truly man. In our present state we are partly men and partly beasts and, in our ignorance and even arrogance, say that we truly fulfil the purpose of our species when we deliver blow for blow and develop the measure of anger required for the purpose. We pretend to believe that retaliation is the law of our being, whereas in every scripture we find that retaliation is nowhere obligatory but only permissible. It is restraint that is obligatory. Retaliation is indulgence requiring elaborate regulating. Restraint is the law of our being. For highest perfection is unattainable without highest restraint. Suffering is thus the badge of the human tribe.

The goal ever receds from us. The greater the progress, the greater the recognition of our unworthiness. Satisfaction lies in the effort not in the attainment. Full effort is full victory.

Therefore, though I realise more than ever

how far I am from that goal, for me the Law of complete love is the law of my being. Each time I fail, my effort shall be all the more determined for my failure.

But I am *not* preaching this final law through the Congress or the Khilafat organisation. I know my own limitations only too well. I know that any such attempt is foredoomed to failure. To expect a whole mass of men and women to obey that law all at once is not to know its working. But I do preach from the Congress platform the deductions of the Law. What the Congress and the Khilafat organisations have accepted is but a fragment of the implications of that law. Given true workers, the limited measure of its application can be realised in respect of vast masses of people within a short time. But the little measure of it to be true must satisfy the same test as the whole. A drop of water must yield to the analyst the same results as a lakeful. The nature of my non-violence towards my brother cannot be different from that of my non-violence to the universe. When I extend the love for my brother to the whole universe, it must still satisfy the same test. A particular practice is a policy when its application is limited to time or

space. Highest policy is, therefore, fullest practice. But honesty as policy while it lasts is not anything different from honesty as a creed. A merchant believing in honesty as a policy will sell the same measure and quality of cloth to the yard as a merchant with honesty as a creed. The difference between the two is that the political merchant will leave his honesty when it does not pay, the believing one will continue it even though he should lose his all.

The political non-violence of the non-co-operator does not stand this test in the vast majority of cases. Hence the prolongation of the struggle. Let no one blame the unbending English nature. The hardest fibre must melt in the fire of love. I cannot be dislodged from the position because I know it. When British or other nature does not respond, the fire is not strong enough, if it is there at all.

Our non-violence need not be of the strong, but it *has* to be of the truthful. We must not intend harm to the English or to our co-operating countrymen if and whilst we claim to be non-violent. But the majority of us *have* intended harm, and we have refrained from doing it because of our weakness or under the ignorant belief that mere refraining from physical hurt

amounted to a due fulfilment of our pledge. Our pledge of non-violence excludes the possibility of future retaliation. Some of us seem unfortunately to have merely postponed the date of revenge.

Let me not be misunderstood. I do not say that the policy of non-violence excludes the possibility of revenge when the policy is abandoned. But it does most emphatically exclude the possibility of future revenge after a successful termination of the struggle. Therefore, whilst we are pursuing the policy of non-violence, we are bound to be actively friendly to English administrators and their co-operators. I felt ashamed when I was told that in some parts of India it was not safe for Englishmen or well-known co-operators to move about safely. The disgraceful scenes that took place at a recent Madras meeting was a complete denial of non-violence. Those who howled down the Chairman because he was supposed to have insulted me, disgraced themselves and their policy. They wounded the heart of their friend and helper, Mr. Andrews. They injured their own cause. If the Chairman believed that I was a scoundrel he had a perfect right to say so. Ignorance is no provocation. But a Non-co-operator is pledged to put up with the gravest

provocation. Provocation there would be, when I act scoundrel—like. I grant that it will be enough to absolve every Non-co-operator from the pledge of non-violence and that any Non-co-operator will be fully justified in taking my life for misleading him.

It may be that even cultivation of such limited non-violence is impossible in the majority of cases. It may be that we must not expect people even out of self-interest not to *intend* harm to the opponent whilst he is *doing* none. We must then, to be honest, clearly give up the use of the word 'non-violence' in connection with our struggle. The alternative need not be immediate resort to violence. But the people will not then be called upon to subject themselves to any discipline in non-violence. A person like me will not then feel called upon to shoulder the responsibility for Chauri Chaura. The school of limited non-violence will then still flourish in its obscurity but without the terrible burden of responsibility it carries to day.

But if non-violence is to remain the policy of the nation, for its fair name and that of humanity, we are bound to carry it out to the letter and in the spirit.

And if we intend to follow out the policy, if we believe in it, we must then quickly make up with the Englishmen and the co-operators. We must get their certificate that they feel absolutely safe in our midst and that they may regard us as friends although we belong to a radically different school of thought and politics. We must welcome them to our political platforms as honoured guests. We must meet them on neutral platforms as comrades. We must devise methods of such meeting. Our non-violence must not breed violence, hatred and ill-will. We stand like the rest of fellow-mortals to be judged by our works. A programme of non-violence for the attainment of Swaraj necessarily means ability to conduct our affairs on non-violent lines. That means inculcation of a spirit of obedience. Mr. Churchill, who understands only the gospel of force, is quite right in saying that the Irish problem is different in character from the Indian. He means in effect that the Irish having fought their way to their Swaraj through violence, will be well able to maintain it by violence, if need be. India, on the other hand, if she wins Swaraj in reality by non-violence must be able to maintain it chiefly by non-violent means. This Mr. Churchill can

hardly believe to be possible unless India proves her ability by an ocular demonstration of the principle. Such demonstration is impossible, unless non-violence has permeated society so that people in their corporate, i.e., political life respond to non-violence ; in other words, civil instead of military authority, as at present, gains predominance.

Swaraj by non-violent means, can therefore, never mean an interval of chaos and anarchy. Swaraj by non-violence must be a progressively peaceful revolution such that the transference of power from a close corporation to the people's representatives will be as natural as the dropping of a fully ripe fruit from a well-nurtured tree. I say again that such a thing may be quite impossible of attainment. But I know that nothing less is the implication of non-violence. And if the present workers do not believe in the probability of achieving such comparatively non-violent atmosphere, they should drop the non-violent programme and frame another which is wholly different in character. If we approach our programme with the mental reservation that, after all, we shall wrest the power from the British by force of arms, then we are untrue to our profession of

non-violence. If we believe in our programme, we are bound to believe that the British people are not unamenable to the force of affection as they are undoubtedly amenable to force of arms. For the unbelievers, the Councils are undoubtedly the school of learning with their heavy programme of humiliations spread over a few generations or a rapid but bloody revolution probably never witnessed before in the world. I have no desire to take part in such a revolution. It will not be a willing instrument for promoting it. The choice in my opinion lies between honest non-violence with non-co operation as its necessary corollary or reversion to responsive co-operation, i.e. co-operation-cum-obstruction.

Death Dance

Why is there this chorus of condemnation of the doubling of the salt tax and other taxes on the necessities of life? Wonder is expressed that now there is no apology even offered for the terrific military charges of sixty-two

crores. The fact is, it is impossible to offer apology for the inevitable. The military charges must grow with the growing consciousness of the nation. The military is *not* required for the defence of India. But it is required for the forcible imposition of the English exploiters upon India. That is the naked truth. Mr. Montagu has bluntly but honestly stated it. The retiring President of the Bengal Chamber of Commerce has said it and so has the Governor of Bombay. They want to trade with us not upon our terms but upon their terms.

It is the same thing whether it is done with the kid glove on or without it. The Councils are the kid glove. We must pay for the glove. The reforms hang upon us like an incubus. They cover a multitude of defects including the blood-sucking salt tax.

They say to us, 'We propose to hold India whether you wish it or not.' We believe that all this is for our good. We think we cannot keep from fighting one another without the protecting power of the British arms. And so, being afraid to die at the hands of our brothers, we are content to live as bondmen.

It would be a thousand times better for us to be ruled by a military dictator than to have

the dictatorship concealed under sham councils and assemblies. They prolong the agony and increase the expenditure. If we are so anxious to live, it would be more honourable to face the truth and submit to unabashed dictation than to pretend that we are slowly becoming free. There is no such thing as slow freedom. Freedom is like a birth. Till we are fully free, we are slaves. All birth takes place in a moment.

What is this dread of the Congress but the dread of the coming freedom? The Congress has become a grim reality. And therefore it has to be destroyed, law or no law. If only sufficient terror can be struck into the hearts of the people, the exploitation can last another century. It is another question whether India itself can last that time under the growing strain or whether the people must, during that time, die like flies. When a man begins to eat a cocoanut, he is not called upon to be tender to the kernel. When he has carved off the last bit he throws away the shell. We do not consider it a heartless performance. No more does the trader consider what he takes from the helpless buyer. A heartless performance—there never is any heart about it. The trader takes all he can and goes his way. It is all a matter of bargain.

The Councilors want their fares and extras, the ministers their salaries, the lawyers their fees, the suitors their decrees, the parents such education for their boys as would give them status in the present life, the millionaires want facilities for multiplying their millions and the rest their unmanly peace. The whole revolves beautifully round the central corporation. It is a giddy dance from which no one cares to free himself and so, as the speed increases, the exhilaration is the greater. But it is a death-dance and the exhilaration is induced by the rapid heart-beat of a patient who is about to expire.

The expenditure is bound to grow so long as the dance continues. I should not be surprised if the increase is also laid upon the broad shoulders of non-co-operator. For them, there is only one lesson. They may look upon the increase with philosophic calmness, if they will be but true to their creed. The only way they can prevent it, the only way it will ever be prevented is the way of non-violence. For the greatest part of non-co-operation is withdrawal from the organised violence on which the Government is based. If we want to organise violence to match that of the Government, we

must be prepared to incur greater expenditure even than the latter. We may not convince all the dancers of the fatal doom awaiting them, but we must be able to convince the masses who take part in it and sell their freedom to buy so called peace. This we can only do by showing them that non-violence is the way to freedom—not the forced non-violence of the slave, but the willing non-violence of the brave and the free.

Stop Ruthless Repression

Mahatma Gandhi sent the following reply to the Government of India's communique of the 6th instant :—

I have very carefully read the Government's reply to my letter to His Excellency. I confess that I was totally unprepared for such an evasion of the realities of the case as the reply betrays. I will take the very first repudiation. The reply says :—“ They (the Government) emphatically repudiate the statement that they have embarked

on a policy of lawless repression and also the suggestion that the present campaign of Civil Dis-obedience has been forced on the Non-co-operation party in order to secure the elementary rights of free association, free speech and a free Press." Even a cursory glance at my letter would show that whilst Civil Dis-obedience was authorized by the All-India Congress Committee meeting held on the 4th November at Delhi, it had not commenced. I have made it clear in my letter that the contemplated Mass Civil Dis-obedience was indefinitely postponed on account of the regrettable events of the 17th November in Bombay. That decision was duly published and it is within the knowledge of the Government as also the public, that herculean efforts were being made to combat the still lingering violent tendency amongst the people. It is also within the knowledge of the Government and the public that a special form of pledge was devised to be signed by volunteers with the deliberate purpose of keeping out all but men of proved character. The primary object of these volunteer associations was to inculcate amongst the masses the lessons of Non-violence and to keep the peace at all Non-Co-operation functions. Unfortunately, the Govern-

ment of India lost its head completely over the Bombay events and perhaps still more over the very complete hartal on the same date at Calcutta. I do not wish to deny that there might have been some intimidation practised in Calcutta, but it was not, I venture to submit, the fact of intimidation but the irritation caused by the completeness of the *hartal* that maddened the Government of India as also the Government of Bengal. Repression there was even before that time, but nothing was said or done in connection with it. But the repression that came in the wake of the notifications proclaiming the Criminal Law Amendment Act for the purpose of dealing with volunteer associations and the Seditious Meetings Act for the purpose of dealing with public meetings held by Non-Co-operators, came upon the Non-Co-operation community as a bomb-shell. I repeat then that these notifications and the arrests of Deshbandhu Chittaranjan Das and Maulana Abdul Kalam Azad in Bengal, the arrest of Pandit Motilal Nehru and his co-workers in the U. P. and of Lala Lajpat Rai and his party in the Punjab made it absolutely necessary to take up not yet aggressive Civil Dis-obedience but only defensive Civil Dis-obedience described as Passive

Resistance. Even Sir Hormusjee Wadia was obliged to declare that if the Bombay Government followed the precedents set by the Governments of Bengal, U.P. and the Punjab, he would be bound to resist such notifications, that is, to enrol himself as a volunteer or to attend public meetings in defiance of Government orders to the contrary. It is thus clear that a case has been completely made out for Civil Dis-obedience unless the Government revises its policy which has resulted in the stopping of public associations and the Non-Co-operation Press in many parts of India.

FACTS BEYOND CHALLENGE.

Now for the statement that the Government 'have embarked on the policy of lawless repression.' Instead of an ample expression of regret and apology for the barbarous deeds that have been committed by officials in the name of law and order, I regret to find in the Government reply, a categorical denial of any lawless repression. In this connection I urge the public and Government carefully to consider the following facts whose substance is beyond challenge:—

(1) The official shooting at Entally in Calcutta and the callous treatment even of a corpse.

(2) The admitted brutality of the Civil Guards.

(3) The forcible dispersal of a meeting at Dacca, and the dragging of innocent men by their legs, although they had given no offence or cause whatsoever.

(4) Similar treatment of volunteers in Aligarh.

(5) The conclusive (in my opinion) findings of the Committee presided over by Dr. Gokul Chand Nerang about the brutal and uncalled for assaults upon volunteers and the public in Lahore.

(6) Wicked and inhuman treatment of volunteers and the public at Jullunder.

(7) The shooting of a boy at Dehra Dun and the cruelly forcible dispersal of a public meeting at that place.

(8) The looting admitted by the Bihar Government, of villages by an officer and his company without any permission whatsoever from any one, but as stated by Non-co-operators at the invitation of a planter, and the assaults upon volunteers and burning of Khaddar and papers belonging to the Congress at Sonapur.

(9) Midnight searches and arrests in Congress and Khilafat offices.

I have merely given a sample of the many "infallible proofs" of official lawlessness and barbarism. I have mentioned not even a tithe of what is happening all over the country and I wish to state without fear of successful contradiction, that the scale on which this lawlessness has gone on in so many Provinces of India, puts into shade the inhumanities that were practised in the Punjab, if we except the crawling order and the massacre at Jallianwalla Bagh. It is my certain conviction that the massacre at Jallianwalla Bagh was a clean transaction, compared to the unclean transactions described above and the pity of it is that because people are not shot or butchered, the tortures through which hundreds of inoffensive men have gone through, do not produce a shock sufficient to turn everybody's face against this Government. But as if this warfare against innocence was not enough, the reins are being tightened in the jails. We know nothing of what is happening to-day in the Karachi jail, to a solitary prisoner in the Sabarmati jail and to a batch in Benares jail, all of whom are as innocent as I claim to be myself. Their crime consists in their constituting themselves trustees of national honour and dignity. I am hoping that these proud and defiant spirits

will not be bent into submission to insolence masquerading in the official grab. I deny the right of the authorities to insist on high-souled men appearing before them almost naked or pay any obsequious respect to them by way of salaaming with open palms brought together or rising to the intonation of "Sarkar Eki hai." No God-fearing man will do the latter even if he has to be kept standing in stocks for days and nights as a Bengal schoolmaster is reported to have been.

For the sake of the dignity of human nature, I trust that Lord Reading and his draughtsmen do not know the facts that I have adduced, or being carried away by their belief in the infallibility of their employees, refuse to believe in the statements which the public regard as God's truth. If there is the slightest exaggeration in the statements that I have made, I shall as publicly withdraw them and apologize for them as I am making them now, but as it is, I undertake to prove the substance of every one of these charges if not the very letter, and much more of them before any impartial tribunal of men or women unconnected with the Government. I invite Pandit Malaviyaji and those who are performing the thankless task of securing a Round Table Con-

ference to form an impartial commission to investigate these charges by which I stand or fall.

It is the physical and brutal ill-treatment of humanity which has made many of my co-workers and myself impatient of life itself, and in the face of these things I do not wish to take public time by dealing in detail with what I mean by abuse of the common law of the country; but I cannot help correcting the misimpression which is likely to be created in connection with the Bombay disorders. Disgraceful and deplorable as they were, let it be remembered that of the 52 persons who lost their lives over; 45 were Non-Co-operators or their sympathisers, the hooligans, and of the 400 wounded, to be absolutely on the safe side, over 350 were also derived from the same class. I do not complain. The Non-Co-operators and the friendly hooligans got what they deserved. They began the violence—they reaped the reward. Let it also not be forgotten that with all deference to the Bombay Government, it was Non-Co-operators, ably assisted by Independents and Co-operators, who brought peace out of that chaos of the two days following the fateful 17th.

I must totally deny the imputation that “the application of the Criminal Law Amend

ment Act was confined to associations, the majority of the members of which had habitually indulged in violence and intimidation". The prisons of India to-day hold some of the most inoffensive men and hardly any who have either resorted to violence or intimidation and who are convicted under that law. Abundant proof can be produced in support of this statement as also of the statement of the fact that almost wherever meetings have been broken up, there was absolutely no risk of violence.

The Government of India deny that the Viceroy had laid down upon the apology of the Ali Brothers the civilised policy of non-interference with the non-violent activities of Non-Co-operators. I am extremely sorry for this repudiation. The very part of the communique reproduced in the reply is in my opinion sufficient proof that the Government did not intend to interfere with such activities. The Government did not wish it to be inferred that "speeches promoting disaffection of a less violent character were not an offence against the Law." I have never stated that breach of any law was not to be an offence against it, but I have stated, as I repeat now, that it was not the intention of the Government then to prosecute

for non-violent activities although they might amount to a technical breach of the law.

CONDITIONS OF ROUND TABLE CONFERENCE

As to conditions of the Conference, the Government's reply evidently omits to mention the two words "and otherwise" after the words "Calcutta speech," in my letter. I repeat that the terms as I could gather from "the Calcutta speech and otherwise" were nearly the same that were mentioned in the resolutions of the Malavaiya Conference. What are called unlawful activities of the N. C. O. party being a reply to the notifications of the Government, would have ceased automatically with the withdrawal of those notifications, because the formation of volunteer corps and public meetings would not be unlawful activities after the withdrawal of the offending notifications. Even while the negotiations were going on in Calcutta, the discharge of Fatwa prisoners was asked for, and I can only repeat what I have said elsewhere, that if it is disloyal to say that Military or any service under the existing system of Government is a sin against God and humanity, I fear that such disloyalty must continue.

The Government communique does me a

cruel wrong by imputing to me a desire that the proposed Round Table Conference should be called "merely to register" my "decrees". I did state in order to avoid any misunderstanding the Congress demands as I feel I was in duty bound in as clear terms as possible. No Congressman could approach any Conference without making his position clear. I expected the ordinary courtesy of not considering me or any Congressman to be impervious to reason and argument. It is open to anybody to convince me that the demands of the Congress regarding the Khilafat, the Punjab and Swaraj, are wrong or unreasonable, and I would certainly retrace my steps and so far as I am concerned, rectify the wrong. The Government of India know that such has been always my attitude.

The communique strange enough says that the demands set forth in my Manifesto are even larger than those of the Working Committee. I claim that they fall far below the demand of the Working Committee, for what I now ask against total suspension of Civil Dis-obedience of an aggressive character is merely the stoppage of ruthless repression, the release of prisoners convicted under it and a clear declaration of policy. The demands of the Working

Committee included a Round Table Conference. In my Manifesto I have not asked for a Round Table Conference at all. It is true that this vaivling of a Round Table Conference does not proceed from any expedience, but it is a confession of present weakness. I freely recognise that unless India becomes saturated with the spirit of non-violence and generates disciplined strength that can only come from non-violence, she cannot enforce her demands, and it is for that reason that I now consider that the first thing for the people to do is to secure a reversal of this mad repression and then to concentrate upon more complete organization and more construction; and here again the communique does me an injustice by merely stating that Civil Dis-obedience of an aggressive character will be postponed until the opportunity is given to the imprisoned leaders of reviewing the whole situation after their discharge, and by conveniently omitting to mention the following concluding sentences of my letter :—

“ If the Government make the requested declaration, I shall regard it as an honest desire on its part to give effect to public opinion and shall therefore have no hesitation in advising the country to be engaged in further moulding public

opinion without violent restraint from either side and trust to its working to secure the fulfilment of its unalterable demands. Aggressive Civil Dis-obedience in that case will be taken up only when the Government departs from its policy of strictest neutrality or refuses to yield to clearly expressed opinion of the vast majority of the people of India."

I venture to claim extreme reasonableness and moderation for the above presentation of the case.

THE ALTERNATIVE BEFORE PEOPLE

The alternative before the people therefore is not, as the communique concludes, "between lawlessness with all its disastrous consequences on the one hand and on the other the maintenance of those principles which lies at the root of all civilised Governments." "Mass Civil Disobedience" it adds, "is fraught with such danger to the State that it must be met with sternness and severity". The choice before the people is Mass Civil Dis-obedience with all its undoubted dangers and lawless repression of lawful activities of the people. I hold that it is impossible for any body of self-respecting men for fear of unknown dangers, to sit still and do nothing

effective whilst looting of property and assaulting of innocent men are going on all over the country in the name of law and order.

Where is Swaraj

(Nava Jivan)

Ever since Lalaji, Das, Nehru, Maulana Abdul Kalam and others were arrested, people have stopped asking me as to where Swaraj is. The anxiety that was in my mind is now no longer there and I believe that there is no one who will ask me now where Swaraj is. In fact, I have received telegrams congratulating me on the attainment of Swaraj. Paul Richard in his lecture on the 31st of December said that the new era has begun. In a letter written from Shanti Niketan, Mr. Pearson says that coming here after five years he finds that India has become free.

Swaraj is state of mind. It is an idea. This idea can take a shape only when respect for it finds a place in our hearts. Swaraj is obtained as soon as the mental resolution occurs.

I am the last man to lose the opportunity of coming to a settlement. But I have fully

understood the capabilities of India. Therefore I hesitate to come to a settlement. What will be our state if we come to a settlement before we are fully purified. Our state may be similar to that of a prematurely-born child. There was rebellion and revolution in Portugal in a very short period. Therefore there is rebellion going on there still. No sort of Government is found suitable. When in 1906. A. D., there was a sudden revolution in Turkey, congratulations poured in from all sides. But that was but a short-lived one. The revolution was something like a dream. After that Turkey had to suffer much and who knows how much more that country has yet to suffer.

Considering these circumstances I am not able to understand as to what is the best course now? My heart now is certainly shivering. Where are we to go were a settlement be effected now?

People have not yet clearly understood that the way to Swaraj lies in the charka which can be made by an unlearned village carpenter and which can be worked on by an innocent girl or boy. But still my faith, that Swaraj can be attained only by that and never without that grows stronger daily.

Do we yet believe sincerely that real mass education lies not in a knowledge of letters but of good behaviour and manly labour? Indian parents have not yet lost their false faith in the knowledge of letters. They have not yet known the place which ought to be allotted to this knowledge. They do not yet realize that boys should first be taught good behaviour, then the way to make their bodies strong, then some means of earning their daily bread and then they should be given opportunities of enlarging their will power; the knowledge of letters should but serve the purpose of decoration. I know that several parents are not yet willing to withdraw their children from Government schools. Parents are not yet willing to send their children to such schools where their minds are trained and the greatness of the freedom that is to be attained is taught.

What can I say of the Vakils? They have not yet given up the false faith in Law Courts? Do we yet settle our quarrels in our own homes? Do we yet realize that justice ought not to be too costly? Even now great religious leaders who are considered to be pillars of our religion are going to have their quarrels decided by the Privy Council. Vakils have not yet given up the

hope of earning fat fees. So justice is weighed in the scale of Gold. So if at this stage we were to come to terms, then our going to courts will still continue. The state of courts then will be the same as it now is. How can that be good Government (Rama Rajya.)? Justice can never be sold in Rama Rajya.

Is the Hindu-Moslem unity complete now? Has the disbelief in each other's heart disappeared? Has the political goal of both become the same? Both feel the necessity for friendship, but their minds have not yet become one; they are just becoming. Thus the heart may stop when a settlement is reached. So until unity is attained among the two, there will be no life in Swaraj. There is a proverb that all parctices are useless without self-realisation. The same can be true of Swaraj. The meaning will be clear by substituting Swaraj for self. We have only to understand the Principle of Swarjya. If Hindu-Moslem unity were to mean enmity with Parsees, Christians and Jews, then that will be the cause of great disaster to the whole world. Therefore all talk of a settlement will be useless unless the real significance of Hindu-Moslem unity is well understood.

The means for all these is non-violence. Are we really non-violent? Do we yet realize that

Non-co-operation is non-violent and it is a sign of our strength? Considering non-violence to be a weapon of the weak we do not realize its greatness and we put it to shame. It is no less foolish than to consider gold to be a lump of clay. Non violence is the weapon of the strong and it can shine only in their hands. Non-violence means patience and patience can be found only in brave men. If a man who has nothing to eat does not eat, he cannot claim to have fasted (religiously). It is no great thing if a man who cannot kill does not kill. No credit can be given to a thing which is done just because it cannot but be done. The brave people of Bardoli and Anand who are preparing for the peaceful war can be said to be fit soldiers in peaceful war only when they neither trouble Parsees, Christians or any co-operator nor hate them. Those who commit acts of violence under the guise of Non-violence do harm not only to themselves but to the whole world, because the whole world is eagerly watching our peaceful fight. Until India learns that Non-violence is a weapon of the strong it is no use talking of a settlement.

And what can I say about my Hindu brethren? I make bold to say until they consider Pariahs and other so-called untouchables as their

own brethren they cannot be called Hindus. I say this considering myself to be a strict orthodox Hindu. When Hindus mix with the Pariahs even as they meet their own brethren, then we will have a rain of flowers. That can be the only way of saving cows. Love and ill-treatment of men can never go together. The words of Professor Dhruva resound in my ears very often. The Pariahs that are in our minds are our enemies. They are the real untouchables. Those human beings in considering whom to be untouchables we commit a serious mistake, are our dear brothers. By mixing with them and doing them service, we will be doing a good deed. That time will be considered to be sacred when we go into our houses without bathing after having mixed with them. Our entering our houses then will be like Kuchela or Vidura entering the house of Sri Krishna. It is vain to think of a settlement until we root out untouchability or understand the question of untouchability rightly as Professor Dhruva has understood.

This great task, this self-purification, can be done only by our undergoing difficulties. Only he has a right to 'Mukti' who knows how to die for its sake. He who dies without wishing

for death is enabled only to learn. But he who dies out of his free will becomes fit for Mukti that very moment. So we can attain freedom—Swaraj—only when we stand steadily on the means referred to above and lose the fear of death. Deshabandhu Das, Lalaj, Nehruji, Abdul Kalam and others have taught us the way to die. It appears as if we have also learnt it. That is why no one asks ‘Where is Swaraj.’ Every one says that when we have learnt to die of our own free will we have attained Swaraj. Every thing else is like mirage.

A Divine Warning

(Nava Jivan)

INDIA CANNOT CHANGE HER NATURE

If a person commits a mistake for the first time he is excused; only the generous public forgives in him the repetition of the error. But if he is responsible even on a third occasion for the same mistake, the public leaves him severely

alone. If a man is deceived once or twice, he is thought a simpleton, but he if is ever being deceived, he is rightly condemned a fool. Mass Civil Disobedience at Bardoli has passed off as a dream. God thought it fit in His supreme wisdom to dispose off my plans just at the moment when I thought that Mass Civil Disobedience could be commenced. There is nothing strange in this. In the Ramayana we see that Rama was banished to the wild forests when all was ready for his coronation. That has a lesson for us. We understand the true meaning of Swaraj only when we readily recognise the unreality of things which we had all along thought to be too true. It seems to me that the attempt made to win Swaraj is Swaraj itself. The faster we run to-wards it, the longer seems to be the distance to be traversed. The same is the case with all ideals. When one goes in pursuit of truth, he finds that it is always eluding his grasp, because he sees now and then that what he once thought too true is no more than a fond illusion. The righteous man is always humble. He recognises his shortcomings day by day. A Brahmachari who seeks true Brhahmacharyam, feels too often that the longing after wordly pleasures is still in him, making the attainment of his ideal

almost impossible. He who seeks "Moksha" or deliverance experiences a similar feeling. All this explains the great "Nathi." The sages who retired for *tapas* to the mountains and forests found themselves confronted with the "Nathi." Some of the Maharishis had probably a glimpse of the truth.

SWARAJ IS THE ATTEMPT TO WIN IT

I am now convinced more firmly than ever that Swaraj lies in our efforts to win it. Ahmedabad and Viramgaum committed excesses. So too did Amritsar and Kasur. Satyagraha was then postponed because of these mob excesses. Last November I was eye-witness to the horrid outbreak at Bombay. Then too Mass Civil Dis-obedience was postponed. But the bitterest cup of humiliation was yet to come. Chauri Chaura taught me the most valuable lesson. I do not know how much more is still in store for me. Now if people grow impatient and consider me a fool, it will not be their fault. Why should I meddle in their affairs, if I had not the capacity to understand their true nature? I could not sit with folded arms allowing things to drift. I could not but make open confession of error when any occurred. I would prefer

being deposed from leadership, to paying lip-homage to truth and allowing the spirit within me to get corrupt by the overpowering weakness of the flesh. "If the Rana gets angry the people will give me shelter, but no one can protect me from God's wrath" is the strain of Mirabai's song and this has a moral for the world. We shall not court God's disfavour. We must pay heed to His warnings. If we had persisted in Mass Civil Disobedience at Bardoli, in spite of Gorakhpur, there would have resulted immense harm to the public cause. We would have thrown aside truth and peace. The first condition to Mass Civil Disobedience at Bardoli was perfect peace in the other parts of the country. Bardoli would have sinned if it had proceeded with the campaign in violation of our solemn pledge.

KEEP ABOVE REPROACH

We need not feel impatient if some people ask whether such perfect peace is at all attainable. Those who argue in this strain, wish the abandonment of Satyagraha and civility. We have to keep above the *reproach of uncivility*. We should constitute ourselves the trustees of India's honour and it is incumbent on us to see that no

unrighteous or uncivil action is done under cover of righteous or civil pretences. Bardoli kept peace and I maintained it. Both Bardoli and myself have done some service to the people. I think that by recanting my error, I have proved the fitness of a true servant. I am sure that the people will not lose strength but rise all the better for this confession. It is very true that God alone has rescued us from shame. I must have learnt a lesson from Madras but I did not. If a favourite of God does not take note of his warning by means of ordinary indications, the All-Merciful warns him by flare of trumpets and beat of drums and if he does not wake up even then, He makes him realise the truth by thunder storm. We have by doing the right thing put an end to imminent danger. We had to retrace our steps and we did it in all humility.

A man who strays from his path has to retrace his steps and arrive at the same place from where he missed the way. We were taking the downward path after the Working Committee passed the resolution on Civil Dis-obedience but now we are climbing up.

HOW LOVE PUNISHES

But a mere recantation was not enough for me. More severe penance had to be undergone.

I was seized with an immense mental pain, the moment I heard of the Gorakpur tragedy. Bodily punishment was indispensable to me. A fast of five days will not suffice to make up for all my errors. I wished a fast of fourteen days, but friends persuaded me to limit it to five. The debtor who pays his full debt in time saves himself from future ruin. There must be no advertising of these prayaschittas. But there is a reason for my making it public. The fast is a penance for me and a punishment for the culprits of Chauri Chaura. Love can only punish by suffering. I warn the public by making my fast known to them. I have no other option. If any Non-Co-operator deceives me—I take the whole of India to be a non-co-operating body—let him take away my body. I still believe that India wants my bodily existence. I warn the people by torturing my physical frame not to cheat me. If India wills it let her get rid of me by abandoning Non-violence. But as long as she accepts my services she must remain non-violent and truthful. If the people will not heed this warning, I am determined to prolong this fast of five days into one of fifty and thus put an end to my life at the end of it.

INDIA IS AND MUST BE NON-VIOLENT

I am writing this on the third day of my fast. My heart tells me that Hindus, Mussalmans, Sikhs, Jews, Christians, Parsis and others can attain Swaraj, serve the Khilafat and redress the Punjab wrong only by truth and non-violence. If we abandon them we cannot help others, not even Ghazi Mustapha Kemal Pasha. If two unequals compete the weaker must either be killed or subdued. Even a *gnani* cannot change his nature at once. If the world were to act according to its true nature what can Force do? I am repeating the same old truth that India cannot attain Swaraj by physical force. Even to entertain a hope that physical force will succeed amounts to violence. India is by Nature non-violent. Knowingly or unknowingly she is intent on Non-co-operation by means wholly Non-violent and Truthful. Nobody imitated the people of Ahmedabad and Virumgaum and none will imitate the mad people of Chauri Chaura. Though violence is not in India's nature it has become a disease. Mustapha Kemal Pasha is using the sword, because the Turks are trained to violence and have been fighting for the last so many centuries. But India has been non-violent for thousands of

years. We need not here discuss which nation adopted the right course. There is room for both violence and non-violence in this wide world even as the soul and body find room in life.

Now we must get Swaraj by the easiest and the shortest method. India cannot change her nature in a moment. I am firmly of opinion that it will take some *yugas* to make India free by the Sword. If the Indian Mussalmans will adopt Mustapha Kemal Pasha's methods, I am sure they will corrupt Islam. There is more room for non-violence in Islam. Self-restraint occupies a higher position than anger and violence. India has been adhering to Truth and Ahimsa for centuries. India's slavery should be preferred to her attaining freedom by abandoning Truth and Non-violence. Man cannot run to both the poles at the same time. We now see that western methods are violent, whereas it is proved beyond the shadow of a doubt that the Eastern method is non-violent and righteous. England has now become the central point of Europe. India has been the centre of all civilisations for centuries. Yet the world believes that England wields power and that India is still only a slave. Our attempt to day is to get rid of slave mentality. If India

succeeds in the attempt, it can only be by means of her ancient truth and non-violence. There is no country in the world which is inferior to India in physical prowess. Even little Afghanistan can subdue her. With whose help then does India wish to fight against England? Is it with the help of Japan or Afghanistan? India will then have to accept serfdom under any one who will help her in the fight. Therefore, if India wants to become free, she can only do so with God's help. God loves those who are truthful and non-violent. Hence the divine warning from Gorakhpur. It teaches us to get back, and to be more firm in non-violence if we wish to have our cherished desires accomplished.

Beware of Ourselves

I gladly publish, though not without sorrow, a letter from a Madras correspondent on the recent occurrences in that city. Evidently the hooliganism was far more serious than described in the first impressions given by Dr. Rajan. Mr. Rajagopalan is justified in blaming the non-co-operators.

It is difficult to distinguish between hooligans and non-co-operators when hundreds or thousands take part in smashing cars, swearing at innocent passengers or threatening a cinema keeper. Non-co-operators cannot 'have the cake and eat it too.' They claim to be millions. They claim to have almost the whole of India at their back. We must either regulate our procedure in accordance with our creed or dissociate ourselves entirely from all mass activity, even if it involves self-ostracism. We have still many *hartals* to go through. Let Delhi, Nagpur and other places beware. I would advise them not to have any *hartals* at all, if they cannot, with certainty, avoid the disgraceful scenes enacted in Bombay and unfortunately repeated in Madras. I hope that the Madras Congress Committee will sift the matter thoroughly and take all the blame that attaches to it. After the frightful experience of Bombay, Madras should have been fully insured against all risk of mob violence. Mr. Rajagopalan's letter is fortified with another from an active non-co-operator. As he makes detailed charges giving names, I simply content myself with giving a few extracts. The writer says:—

“An eye-witness to the mad excesses of

that day, I shall be false to my creed of non-violence, if I do not deplore the *hartal* as a miserable failure. The racial bitterness of the Pulianthope days has revived. You have probably read the bitter speeches of the 'Non-Brahmin' leaders in their confederation. At a time when you are straining your every nerve to bring the Moderates round to your point of view, we in Madras have succeeded in widening the gulf between us and the Non-Brahmins on the one hand, and the Adi Dravidas on the other. The least that we can do by way of reparation is a frank confession of our weakness, and a religious endeavour from now to promote inter-communal unity, especially between the Panchamas and others."

I do not hesitate to criticise the Government for sparing neither man, woman nor child. But the Government have no creed of Non-violence to letter their discretion. Their creed is terrorism in the last resort. But non-co-operators have to be above suspicion. Madras leaves much to be desired if the two letters referred to by me at all tell a true story. I have little doubt that it is in the main true. Then non-co-operators and their friends have certainly

not left man, woman or child free from their unholy attention. It was a bad augury of Swaraj to have interfered with women, to have molested the poor scout boys, and otherwise played havoc with the liberty of the people, no matter how provoking their participation in the welcome to the Prince was.

We have more to fear from ourselves than from the violence or mistakes of the Government. The letter, if we use them aright, will do us good, as they have done already. Our own violence or untruth will be veritable death for us. If we are not able to set our own house in order, we shall certainly destroy ourselves. Non-co-operation will be a by—word of execration and reproach.

In this connection I cannot help noticing a cutting given to me from the *Rangoon Daily News*. It runs:—

“We are credibly informed that the wife of Nizamuddin, hackney carriage owner, East Rangoon, got a divorce from her husband on Thursday last on the ground that he disobeyed the Fatwa in taking his gharries and persuading others to ply at the time of the Prince’s visit.”

I make bold to say that whoever granted the divorce (assuming the truth of the statement) grievously erred against the law of Islam and decency. Divorces are not so lightly granted in Islam. If *hartals* can be brought about by means such as the foregoing statement suggests, they can do no good whatsoever. They are no free expression of public opinion. But I am less concerned with the expedience of *hartals* than with the good name of Islam and Non-co-operation. The law of Non-co-operation demands perfect toleration and respect for the opposite opinion and action. The law of Islam, in so far as a non-Muslim can speak of it, requires equally strict toleration. Nothing could have so deeply hurt the Prophet as the intolerance of the people of Mecca during the early period of this ministry towards the new Faith he was preaching. He could not possibly therefore at any time have been a 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.

Whether we are Hindus or Musalmans or what, does not matter. The spirit of democraoy

which we want to spread throughout India cannot be spread by violence whether verbal or physical, whether direct, indirect or threatened.

Gandhi—India's Man of the Hour

(By W. E. Johnson.)

There is a man sent of God, who is called Mahatma Gandhi. He comes to the surface out of that great sea of human beings that compose the Empire of India—one fifth of the people in all the world. As this is written, in October, he is going about with no clothing except a homespun cloth wound around the lower part of his body and partly covering his legs. If all the Indian people had only this much for each, there would be none left, and it would be "stealing" for him to take more than his share. He rides third class in the railway carriages set apart for coolies and eats the food on which the meanest of human beings exist.

Much is said regarding this man to his disadvantage. His name is anathema to many wedded to the existing order of things—especially alcoholic things. Those who attack him, and there are many such, never attack his sincerity, his character or his ability. To them

he is of the devil, because he attacks British Rule in his country. And yet, after all has been said that can be said against him, this fact remains silhouetted against the sky—in two years, by pure personal influence, he has caused a greater diminution of the use of intoxicating liquors than has been accomplished by any other man in the history of the world during his life time.

The excise year in all British India ends in April. The decrease in liquor revenue has become so enormous as to throw into a panic alcoholic officials who seem to think that the liquor traffic must continue so as to provide revenue for the Government and provide facilities for the thirsty to get their supplies of intoxicants.

I have been all over India and have discussed the subject with many of the excise ministers and with scores of excise officials. They all tell the same story—the story of an astonishing decrease in the consumption of drink and of the frightful inroads that the decrease is making on the excise revenues. In the district of Nellore, Madras Presidency, the excise revenues last year amounted to 168,000 Rupees. This year it is officially estimated at

Rs. 228. Scarcely a district in all India fails to show a heavy decrease.

The only district that I have been able to learn of where there has been no decrease is in the Malabar district of Madras where martial law prevails and where the troublesome "non-co-operators" are not allowed. The best information that I can obtain from a multitude of official sources is that if the present conditions exist until April, the close of the excise year, fully one half of the entire liquor revenue of India will be wiped out. Hundreds of villages have gone dry and hundreds more are practically dry through the supreme moral influence of this half-naked man.

Scores of liquor contractors have been ruined and most of those remaining are on the brink of ruin. For these liquor shops are licensed to the highest bidder and the annual license fees for selling alone usually run from five to ten thousand dollars in American money. The liquor shopkeepers must, therefore, sell enormous quantities in order to pay for their liquors and the Government exactions. And the Government ruthlessly holds each of them to his bargain.

I have visited dozens of liquor shops in

many parts of the country where the dealers ruefully told me that they had had only one or two customers during the day. When I asked why, they invariably replied, "Mr. Gandhi has told the people not to drink any more". At Cuttack, I visited the district jail and was surprised to find it in convenience and sanitation, the equal of the best of American jails. It can accommodate 400 prisoners and was usually well up to its capacity. But the jailer told me that during the late months the number of prisoners had been dwindling until only 138 remained. On my asking the cause he replied: "It is because of Mr. Gandhi's non-co-operation" movement.

Who is this Mighty man who has wrought such things? Mohandas Karamchand Gandhi was born not far from his present home, Ahmedabad, on October 2, 1869.

The term "Mahatma," literally means "great soul" and nothing more. A Mahatma is not a god but an object of great reverence. He was born of wealthy devout parents in the heart of that part of India where religious ideas are carried to the extreme and where there is such a great horror of taking life of any sort, that many people, after sundown, wear sloths

over their mouths so that they will not inadvertently swallow living insects. A philosopher of that section solemnly explained to me how lofty was the spirit of a man who would lie in bed and allow the bugs full play over his body, and how the very highest sacrifice known was for a man deliberately to permit a tiger to eat him alive, and thus enjoy itself. One of the high officials of Ahmedabad told me of the troubles that they had had in destroying mad dogs, the killing of one, when known, would cause a riot.

Young Gandhi was in constant rebellion against restraint, and often would eat the forbidden meat in secret, much as the American boy smokes cigarettes behind the barn. He was given permission by his mother to go to college at London, on condition that he go with her to the priest and take three vows—one not to drink, one not to eat meat, and one to be chaste. And in London he lived as fast a life as possible keeping with his vows. And he came back to India to practice law in Bombay.

An important piece of litigation sent him to South Africa, where he was refused permission to practice under his London degree, because he was a "nigger." Then and there began Mr. Gandhi's long struggle for the rights of his Race,

which has become a part of the history of South Africa, and in which Gandhi was frequently locked in jail for months at a time. But he won, and books of entrancing interest have been written to tell the story.

It was during this period of his life that he came under the influence of the Sermon in the Mount, the writings of Tolstoi, and the Bhagavat Gita, which moulded his future life and made him probably the greatest man of the age. It was the lofty ethics of the Sermon that was the dominant factor in making the man what he is. Out of this came his Satyagraha (Aggressive following of Truth) movement which developed into the non-co-operation project that is now the concern of the whole British Empire. And in the quest of Truth, Gandhi thinks and acts in straight lines. He follows the lead to the end.

Until two years of the Great war, Mr. Gandhi was as loyal to the British crown as the most incorrigible of the King's English-born subjects. He served in the Boer war, was once invalided and mentioned in despatches. The outbreak of the European war found him in London. There he at once organized 250 Indian students in English Universities into a volunteer corps who wanted to serve wholly without pay. He return-

ed to India because of ill-health, and recovered.

In a critical moment in 1918, in response to the appeal of Premier, David Lloyd George, for a million Indian recruits, Gandhi threw himself into the recruiting movement with such energy that the quota of recruits called for nine months was accomplished in seven months. Then the armistice put a stop to the proceedings. During this period, Mr. Gandhi opposed Indian objections to numerous humiliating army discriminations against Indian soldiers and succeeded in defeating a proposal in the Indian National Congress Committee to extort promise from Downing Street that, after the war, India should be granted dominion Home rule.

During the war, the Viceroy's Council enacted the "Defence of India Act," modelled after the British Defence of the Realm Act, under which most of the liberties held dear by British subjects generally were suspended. This act, ostensibly designed against the King's enemies, was used so diligently by British officials in India against various internal political movements, that India became aroused against it. Even so loyal a subject as Mrs. Annie Besant was interned for three months under this Act by Madras British officials, who did not agree with

her in internal politics which had nothing to do with the war. After the war was ended, the so-called Rowlat Act was passed continuing the troublesome repressive act for three years, and the Viceroy tried to get the hated law continued permanently. This act set India afire, led to one "Punjab massacre," and Mr. Gandhi went out on his campaign of passive resistance.

Being a good strategist, Mr. Gandhi naturally attacked the British Indian Government in its most vulnerable spot—the liquor traffic. The British did not introduce liquor into India. The liquor was there always in more or less social and ceremonial customs. What the British did was to organize and commercialize the drink traffic into a business and individual profit and for revenue. Under the theory of a minimum of consumption and a maximum of revenue, the traffic was organised and grew until it reached huge proportions. For that, the British must stand convicted by friend and foe alike. Mr. Gandhi simply hung this piece of dirty linen so that all the world could see.

The storm centre of the prohibition propaganda centred around the practice of "picketing" the drink shops by non-co-operation hostes. Companies of men would be stationed around

the drink shop to plead with the people to keep out and to leave drink alone. The plan spread all over India and while it developed some abuses on both sides, it proved to be tremendously effective.

It had its grotesque features as well. Devout non-co-operators would fall on their knees and implore the thirsty to keep out of the drink shops. In many cases, "sweepers," untouchables and the lowest classes would be employed as "picketers" with curious results. The sight of an untouchable on his knees before a proud high caste aristocrat beseeching him to behave himself and to leave drink alone, had about the same effect as that which would be produced by an ignorant Kentucky negro in his knees before a haughty Kentucky Colonel pleading with him to be decent and to leave mint Julep alone. The high casteman could not kick the "untouchable" into the gutter, because hereby he would contaminate himself. And so he had to stay away in order to save his "honour."

At Lucknow, a Nawab, a Mussalman, had taken to drink against the precept of his religion. So his whole menial staff of servants waited on him, bowed their heads to the floor and notified

him that they could not serve him any more unless he quits the drink and also notified him that their castes had decided that he could have no more servants unless he cut out the booze. The horrified Nawab saw no alternative except to cook his own food, make up his own bed, and carry out his own slops. The country is well filled with stories of such absurdities and the most absurd thing about them is that they were astonishingly effective.

On the whole, the picketting has been carried on along strictly peaceful lines according to the Mahatma's wishes. But in a few cases, the picketers became over-enthusiastic and would drag customers away from the drink shops by force. In some places, the violators of the caste rules against drink were handled roughly, their heads were half shaven and some were escorted through the streets with old boots hung about their necks—the most deadly humiliation possible to imagine. This would lead to rioting, the intervention of the police and a government order to stop picketting in that locality. In some places, the local government officials and police would themselves stir up a row in order to provide an excuse to stop the picketting. This sort of thing attracts undue attention for

the reason that it is the exceptional rows that are read in the newspapers and not the usual peaceful picketting.

In the various provincial legislatures, the admirers of Mr. Gandhi have struck again with proposed bills for local option or for complete prohibition. In each case, such a proposal has been met with the solid opposition of the British members and the solid support of the Indian members except in three or four cases where the Indian member happened to be also a member of the Government itself. This policy has given the Gandhi people the chance to claim that the liquor traffic is being crammed down the throats of the Indian people against their wishes. The British section reports that the Indian people really don't want prohibition and are pushing the matter in order to embarrass the British administration and raise taxes. But the Indian people who pay the taxes practically unanimously vote for prohibition just the same.

While a very small minority of British people are said to be willing to grant the prohibition demanded by the people, not a single British member or any of the legislatures has been found who would vote for such a measure or even for local option.

Many city councils have passed resolutions appealing to the British authorities to close the drink shops in their cities but none of these have been acceded to though in a few cases certain shops have been closed and in a few instances some have been removed to positions just outside the city limits. The British officials generally have fought against any such moves. In one case prohibition resolution was defeated by the British health officer who declared that it was necessary for the people to drink in order to preserve their health. In many cases, where the liquor shop contractors had refused to bid and thus renew their privileges, political and other pressure has been brought upon contractors to bid and thus continue the drink traffic.

Mahatma Gandhi—

The World's Greatest Man

(*Mr. J. H. HOLMES*)

The following is the full text of the sermon in which Mr. John Haynes Holmes, Minister of the Community Church, New York, claimed Mr. Gandhi as the greatest man in the world today:—

I am going to speak to you this morning upon what I hope will be the interesting question as to who is the greatest man in the world to-day. In seeking answer to this inquiry, I imagine that all of our minds instinctively go back to the days of the great war, and run over the names of the men who held positions of vast responsibility, and power in that stupendous conflict. Especially do we think of the great gathering of the war-leaders in Paris in the opening months of the year 1919. Two years ago, at this time we would all of us have agreed that if the greatest man in the world was anywhere to be found, it was in this council of the premiers and statesmen of the Allied Governments. These were the men who had been

tested by the most awful peril which had ever threatened the civilisation of the world, and who had brought out of the peril a victory which was as complete as it was sudden. Now they were being tested by the challenge of peace—by the great problem as to how to use a victory after it has been won. And it is just here, in this most rigorous of all tests, that these leaders of the nations failed. Who can say in view of what happened at Versailles and especially in view of what has happened since the signing of the treaty, that any one of these men responsible for the great disaster of the Peace, has any substantial or permanent claims to greatness, in the true sense of the word? Of all the men who sat in the peace Conference two years ago, there is only one, it seems to me, who still preserves a reputation that is without a serious question. I refer, of course, to General Smuts, the premier of South Africa the name of whom Mr. Walter Lippman said so vividly that of all in the peace conference who signed the treaty in the famous Hotel of Mirrors at Versailles, he was the only one who saw mankind and not himself in the glass. If you would know how great a man was General Smuts at the Conference, I ask you to read three immortal documents—first, his public

apologia for the signing of the treaty; secondly, his "Farewell to the people of Europe" published on the eve of his departure from London for Johannesburg; and thirdly, his noble and generous tribute to President Wilson on the latter's retirement from office on March 4 last. General Smuts fought the war with consummate ability and unflinching idealism; in the moment of triumph on the battle-field, he sought forgiveness of the enemy, and healing of the bleeding wounds of men; in the moment of defeat in the Council Chamber he confessed his failure in honesty of spirit, and sought at once to repair the damage, which he had been unable to prevent. General Smuts is a great man—the only great man who is left to us to-day out of wreckage of the war. All the rest of those leaders who filled the world for a little time with the noise of their fame, have faded or are fading, into oblivion, never again to be restored, I believe, to the reverence of men. Ours to-day must be the cry of David, after the battle of Mt. Gilboa—"How are the mighty fallen and the weapons of war perished."

I turn away, therefore, from the storm of the great war, and from the men who rode that storm to power and place; and I look elsewhere for that man who impresses me as the greatest

man who is living in the world to-day. And immediately I hit upon three men very different from one another in origin and character, who I believe may not unworthily qualify for this position.

The first man whom I name is the Frenchman, Romain Rolland, author of that immortal novel, *Jean Christophe*, pacifist exile from his native land during the Great War, the leading internationalist in this perplexing period of the aftermath of the war. Rolland is supremely great in the field not so much of achievement as of ideals. I can best indicate my estimate of him by stating that I always think of him as the true successor, in character and influence, though not of course in personality, of Leo Tolstoi, who was himself the greatest single moral influence produced during the whole course of the nineteenth century. Like Tolstoi, Romain Rolland lives a life of rigorous simplicity. Like Tolstoi, he unites a gigantic intellect with a soul of ineffable beauty and power. Like Tolstoi again, he lives and moves and has his being in that sublime realm of moral and spiritual idealism, where love is recognized as the perfect law of life, and the brotherhood of man as the fulfilment of this law upon the earth.

Before the war, Rolland was one of the few men in Europe who saw the coming of the great catastrophe, and did his utmost to prevent it. He sent out his call to poets, musicians and artists of the continent; gathered about him, as a master his students, the young and ardent souls of all countries: and strove to lead them to those heights of pure idealism in the atmosphere of which he knew it would be impossible for the prejudices and hostilities of contemporary nationalism to survive. 'Jean Christophe' was written in answer not so much to artistic passion as to a desire to interpret Germany to France, and France to Germany, and thus make clear the essential kinship between the two. With the outbreak of the War, he conceived it his unique privilege and duty to keep alive those higher instincts of the soul, which are the first to suffer in the strife of arms. Never for a moment did he deceive himself into believing that the war would purge the heart of man, or quicken it permanently to nobler impulses of emotion; on the contrary, he knew that this war, like every war, was a dirty and ugly thing, subversive of all that is pure and good in human life. Therefore did he deliberately set himself, as a priest at the altar of humanity, to guard from extinction the

spirit's flame, that when the conflict was at an end, the race might not wander as one lost for ever in impenetrable dark. And now, with the close of the disastrous struggle, Rolland is building anew his international fraternity, to the end of persuading men to sheath their swords to cleanse their hearts of the poison of patriotism and to toil for the coming of that great kingdom of the living God which shall mean wars and rumours of wars no more.

If there is any civilization in Europe to-day, any light shining through the gross darkness of the present chaos, hope for the ultimate realization of the dreams and visions which beset us of a better world, I believe this is due more truly to Romain Rolland than to Foch or Clemenceau Lloyd George or Woodrow Wilson, or any other of the men who struggled vainly to bring good out of the evil of the war. Rolland remained true to his ideal, served it with a flawless courage and there-with did a work which marks him as a spiritual genius of the first order. If he falls short, as I think he does, it is in what we may term the realm of practical affairs. In this he does not fail; he simply does not enter at all. For Rolland is an artist, an intellectual man of the utmost sensitiveness and delicacy. It is diffi-

cult to conceive of him as dwelling among the trodden ways of men. He could never be the leader of a revolution, the moulder of great masses of the common people to a world-upheaval, the builder of the structure or the writer of the constitution of a new political and social state. Rolland, by the very necessities of his nature, as Tolstoi by the deliberate plan of his life, must move "above the battle," and not in the midst of its bloodshed and affright. For Rolland is an idealist, and not a realist. I think of him as a silver star shining resplendant above the murk and mist of earth, a light to steer by and to worship. Others must serve as the smoky touches which shew terribly the pathways of man's climbing.

The mention of the contract between the idealist and the realist, brings me to the second name which I desire to present this morning in this discussion. I refer to the Russian, Nicolai Lenin, Premier of the Soviet republic, a man who wields a greater degree of personal power than any other man in the world to-day. In making an estimate of the position of Lenin among the great men of his time, it is necessary for us to disregard entirely such unfavourable ideas as we may chance to have of the work

that he is attempting to do among his people. We may think that his principles are bad, his policies dangerous, his whole influence destructive of the best interests of civilization; but these opinions should not, and indeed cannot, affect in any way the facts as to his ability. Many people, for example, regard Napoleon Bonaparte as one of the most immoral personages that ever lived, and describe his achievements as among the most disastrous in the whole range of human history, but I have never met anybody, except Mr. H. G. Wells in his "The Outline of History," who carried his consummate greatness as a man. So also with Nicolai Lenin! We may think him the vilest monster alive upon the earth to-day, if we so choose, but there stands the fact of his greatness all the same. This man moves among his contemporaries as a gaint among pygmies. He is at the moment the centre of the world's life. The affairs of race move round his central figure like the rim and spokes of a wheel about its axle. I am not at all sure, but what in future ages, this present period, which has followed upon the close of the Great War is destined to be described by historians as the age of Lenin, just as we speak to-day of the age of Elizabeth or of Louis XIV.

If we would seek for evidence of the surpassing greatness of Lenin, we have only to cite the testimony of those who have seen him and studied him at close range. At first he seems to make little impression upon those who meet him, for his personal presence is evidently one of utter insignificance. He does not look like a hero. Mr. Wells, who was as little impressed as anybody, speaks of him simply as a little man sitting behind a big desk. Bertrand Russell describes him as "very friendly and apparently simple, entirely without a trace of hauteur. If one met him without knowing who he was, he would not guess that he was possessed of great power, and never that he was in any way eminent. I have never met a personage so destitute of self importance." The only thing impressive about Lenin's appearance, so far as I can judge, is his head which is that of a stupendous intellectual genius. To see the great dome of his brow, as depicted, for example, in Mrs. Clare Sheridan's bust, is to think at once of the head of Shakespeare. Aside from this single feature, however, Lenin's presence is apparently as unimpressive as his bearing is modest.

That Lenin is a great man, however, is

admitted by every body who has seen him. Arthur Ransome, who is favourably inclined towards the Bolshevik, regime, declares that he is "one of the greatest personalities of his time." Bertrand Russel, who is now opposed to Bolshevism, refers to Lenin without qualification as "a great man." Raymond Robbins, who stands midway between the position of friend and foe, asserts his belief that the Bolshevik premier is "the greatest living statesman in Europe." Even those who view him at a distance, cannot disguise their admiration. Mr. Frank Vanderlip, for example has said that Lenin impresses him as "a man of most extraordinary ability." Nor can I refrain from quoting the opinion of the "New York Times," which can hardly be described as friendly to the Bolsheviks. Speaking at an unguarded moment, on one of the numerous occasions of Lenin's reported death, the "Times" referred to him as "the most remarkable personality brought by the world war into prominence."

What moves all these persons who have seen or studied Nicholai Lenin, to speak of him in these laudatory terms, is undoubtedly the consciousness of the stupendous things which this man has accomplished during the last three

years. His deed are almost unparalleled in history. In the first place, he has beaten back upon every front, the attacks brought against him by the enemies of Russia at home and abroad. Army after army has been organized and led against Moscow, only to be destroyed by the "red" armies fighting without resources, in a distracted country, and amid a starving population. It is the fashion these days to compare Lenin with Robespierre, Danton, and Marat, the leaders of France in the bloody days of the "Reign of Terror." The true comparison, however, is with Carnot, the great war minister, who raised the levies of the Revolution, and hurled back triumphantly the invading armies of autocratic Europe.

Secondly, Lenin and his commissares have saved the civilisation of Russia from the utter collapse which was threatened, and is still being threatened, as a result of the catastrophe of the Great War. This is just the opposite of what is ordinarily assumed, for most people believe that it is the advent of Bolshevism which has caused the human misery and social disintegration which are everywhere prevailing in Russia at the present time. Nothing, however, could be farther from the truth! The empire of the Czar

collapsed of its own rottenness and decay nine months before the Bolsheviks found their way into the seat of power. This collapse was the immediate result of the impact of the Great War, which in its end, if not in its conscious purpose, was a struggle for the destruction, and not at all for the preservation of civilization. What happened in Russia in 1917, was only what would have happened in France had the War continued another year, and in Great Britain had it continued another four or five years. Russia simply went to pieces, because she was the least developed and most corrupt of modern capitalistic countries, and therefore the least able to bear the strain. The first revolutionary government which succeeded the Czar, tried to control the situation, but ignominiously failed. Then came Kerensky, who likewise failed. Then came Lenin, who put his mighty shoulders beneath the toppling fabric of the state, and has thus far prevented it from falling. That Russia is not to-day a realm of utter chaos—that its cities are not empty, its railroads streaks of rust running across vast wastes of desert country, its peoples swarming hordes of wanderers trooping madly to the west in search of food—all this is due more to Nicolai Lenin than to any other single

force in the world to-day. If H. G. Wells is right in his surmise that the fate of Europe is identical with the fate of Russia, I venture to prophesy that the time will come when this man will be remembered not as a destroyer, but as the saviour of the social structure of civilization.

Lastly, as we survey the achievements of Lenin, we see his great constructive undertakings in the field of statesmanship. Amid unexampled confusion and difficulties, he has worked out a new formula of economic relation—communism; he has built a new structure of social order—the soviet; he has visioned a new type of social idealism—a democracy of the workers; he has created out of abstract theory a new technique of practical achievement—the dictatorship of the proletariat.

These are the deeds of a man of the first order of practical genius. If Lenin falls short anywhere, and I am certain that he does, it is in the field of moral idealism. He seems to be absolutely devoid, not in character but in thought, of every thing that we mean by ethical or spiritual principle. He boasts of the fact that he has no religion but lives contentedly in the realm of materialism. He denies that there is any such reality as a moral law to which it is proper or

necessary for him to give acknowledgement. What we ordinarily describe and recognize as a system of ethics, calling for the allegiance of all right-minded people, he regards as an artificial code created by the strong, and imposed by them upon the weak for the better protection of their property and privileges. To Lenin's way of thinking anything is right that serves the class interest of the workers; by the same token, anything is wrong that delays or hinders the emancipation of the workers. In his activities as leader of the proletariat and chief executive of the Soviet Republic, Lenin acts upon exactly the same law of necessity which holds sway upon the field of battle. Like the soldier, in other words, he does anything which it is necessary to do in order to defeat the enemy and thus clinch victory for his cause. "The end justifies the means!" Lenin is seeking a great end of human redemption and social liberation; any means which are necessary for the attainment of this end, are justifiable in the period which must intervene before men are ready and able to reach the goal. It is this realist point of view of life which explains the extraordinary contradictions in Lenin's career. Thus Lenin is a democrat; but he sustains one of the most absolute tyrannies

that man kind has ever known. He is not a terrorist, and yet he carried through the six weeks of the "red terror" with ruthless severity. He is not a militarist, and yet he has built on the foundation of universal conscription, the most powerful and successful military machine in the world to-day. What we have in Lenin is a phenomenon which has never before appeared in history, so far as I know—a reformer of unquestioned personal integrity, rigorously pure in private character, simple and unpretentious in his ways of life, devoted to the ideal of a better world, seeking nothing for himself and everything for his fellow-men, and yet a man arrogant, autocratic, stern, hard in outline, untouched by any softness save a love for children. At bottom, there is nothing gentle or lovely about this man; he suggests only the strength of granite, and the coldness of steel. This is the reason, I take it, why Mr. Wells, when he thinks of Lenin, finds himself recalling the figure of Mohammed. Bertrand Russel, when he saw Lenin and his regime, was put in mind of Cromwell and the Puritans. I have to confess that I always think, in this connection, of Napoleon Bonaparte. All these parallels are detective—the last outrageously so; but they serve at least to reveal the

realistic patterns of the man, and the stupendous order of his genius.

It is obvious that we have not yet found our greatest man. Rolland, the idealist is defective on the side of practicality ; Lenin, the realist, falls short on the side of ideality. What we need is a universal man—a man who combines in perfect balance the supreme qualities of the Frenchman and the Russian—a man who is at once an idealist and realist, a dreamer and a doer, a prophet who sees “the heavenly vision” and not unfaithful to that (vision) makes it to come true. Is there any such person living in the world ?

I believe that there is—unquestionably the greatest man living in the world to-day, and one of the greatest men who have ever-lived. I heard of him first in 1917 through an article by Professor Gilbert Murray in the “Hibbert Journal.” I did not learn anything of him again until a few months ago when there came to my desk a little paper-covered pamphlet containing extracts from his speeches and writing. This is meagre information ; but when I read it, I felt as did John Keats when he first read Chapman’s translation of, “Iliad.”

“Then felt I like some watcher of the skies,
When a new planet swims into his ken ;

Or like stout Cortez when with eagle eyes,
He stared at the Pacific—and all his men,
Looked at each other with a mild surmise—
Silent, upon a peak in Darien.”

The man whom I have in mind is **Mohandas Karamchand Gandhi**, the Indian leader of the present great revolutionary movement against British rule in India, known and revered by his countrymen as *Mahatma*, “the Saint.” I wonder how many of you have ever heard of him, or know the story of his life. Listen while I tell this story, and see if I am not right in calling its hero the greatest man in the world to-day!

Gandhi was born some fifty odd years ago in India, of a rich, clever and cultivated family. He was reared as the sons of such families are always reared, possessed of everything that money can buy and the imagination of devoted parents can conceive. In 1889, he came to England to study law. He took his degree in regular course, returned to India, and became a successful lawyer in Bombay. Already, however, he had found that religion was coming to have a dominant place within his life. Even before his journey to England, he had taken the Jain vow to abstain from wine, flesh, and sexual intercourse. 2 On his return to India, his asceti-

cism increased. Finding that money was inconsistent with his ideal of spirituality, he gave away his fortune to good causes, keeping only the barest pittance for himself. Later on, he took the vow of poverty, and thus became, what he is still to-day, a beggar. Later still he became converted to the doctrine of non-resistance, which he calls "the root of Hinduism," and therefore abandoned the practice of the law as "a system which tried to do right by violence." When Gilbert Murray saw him in England in 1914, he ate only rice, drank only water, and slept on the bare boards of a wooden floor. "His conversation," says Professor Murray, "was that of a cultivated and well-read man, with a certain indefinable suggestion of saintliness." Gandhi was indeed a saint. He had deliberately swept out of his life every last vestige of self-indulgence, that no slightest desire of the flesh might stand in the way of devotion to his ideals. From early in his life, he was a man apart, with every last energy of soul and body dedicated to the service of humankind.

His public career divides itself into two distinct periods. The first extends from 1893, to 1913, and is identified with South Africa.

The second, which belongs to India itself, runs from 1913 to the present day.

In South Africa, in the early nineties of the last century, there were located some 1,50,000 Indians, chiefly in the province of Natal. The presence of these aliens had lead to a situation very similar to that now prevailing in California as a result of the influx of the Japanese. The color question, in other words, had become acute, and the South African government determined to meet it, first by for-bidding the immigration of any more natives from India, and secondly by expelling the Indians who were already there. This last it was found, could not legally be done—it violated a treaty, was opposed by Natal where industry depended upon cheap “coolie” labour, and was objected to by the Indian Government. The first proposal of course could easily be met by the passage of an exclusion act. At once began a long and bitter struggle. The whites of South Africa baffled in their desires, did what the whites in all parts of the world have always done under such circumstances—namely persecuted and outraged those whom they detested as so-called inferiors. Systematically they undertook to make life in South Africa as miserable an affair for all

Indians, especially those above the labour class as malice and cruelty could provide. Thus these Indians were burdened with special taxes; they were forced to register in degrading ways, their thumb-prints were taken as though they were criminals; they were publicly insulted and discriminated against. In cases where the law could not be conveniently utilized, the South African Whites did what we do so proudly here in America—organized patriotic mobs to loot, burn, and lynch. Nothing was left undone to harry these unhappy Indians, and drive them into wretchedness and horror from the land.

It was in 1893, that the Indians in South Africa appealed to Gandhi, and asked him to come and help them. At once he responded to their call, for it was his conviction that, if his countrymen were anywhere suffering, it was his duty and privilege alike to suffer with them. He came, therefore, to Natal in 1893, and there he remained, with the exception of one short interval of time, until 1913. As he was still a lawyer at this time, he began his fight against the Asiatic Exclusion Act, and won it, in the face of the most bitter and unfair opposition on grounds of constitutionality. Then came the terrific battle for equitable political and social

recognition—a struggle fought from beginning to end with the weapon of passive or non-resistance. Not once in all the years of the protracted struggle, was there resort to violence or yielding to the temptation of retaliation and revenge.

Acting as the leader and counsellor of his people, Gandhi founded a settlement in the open country, just outside the city of Durban. Here he gathered the Indians, placed them on the land for self support, and bound them by the solemn vow of poverty. Here, for years these organized thousands of resisters, suffering constant deprivation and frequent outrage, carried on their struggle against the Government. It was in essence, I suppose, a strike—a withdrawal of the Indians from labour in the towns and villages, and a paralysis, therefore, of the industrial and social life of the republic. It was such a strike as Moses declared in ancient Egypt, when he led the Israelites out of the land of Pharaoh into the vast reaches of the wilderness. But this strike, if it may so be called, was in one thing different from any previous strike in human history! Universal in movements of this kind, the resisters make it their business to take quick and sharp advantage of any difficulty into which

their opponents may fall, and press their claim the harder for this advantage. Gandhi, however, took the opposite course. Whenever, in these years of struggle, the Government became embarrassed by unexpected troubles, Gandhi, instead of pushing the fight ruthlessly to victory, would call a truce and come to the succour of his enemy. In 1899, for instance, the Boer war broke out. Gandhi immediately called off his strike, and organized an Indian Red Cross unit which served throughout the war, was twice mentioned in Dispatches, and was publicly thanked for bravery under fire. In 1904, there came a visitation of the plague in Johannesburg. Instantly, the strike was off, and Gandhi was busying himself in organizing a hospital in the pest-ridden city. In 1906, there was a native rebellion in Natal. Again the strike was suspended; while Gandhi raised and personally led a corps of stretcher-bearers, whose work was dangerous and painful. On this occasion he was publicly thanked by the Governor of Natal and shortly afterwards, on the resumption of the resistant movement, was thrown into a common jail in Johannesburg. It would be impossible for me to tell this morning the indignities and cruelties which were visited upon Gandhi during

these years of intermittent resistance and forgiveness. He was thrown into prison countless times, placed in solitary confinement, lashed hand and foot to the bars of his cage. He was again and again set upon by raging mobs, beaten into insensibility and left for dead by the side of the road. When not outraged in this fashion, he was insulted in public, mortified and humiliated with the most exquisite pains. But nothing shook his courage, disturbed his equanimity, exhausted his patience, or poisoned his love and forgiveness of his foes. And at last, after twenty years of trial and suffering, he won the victory. In 1913 the Indian case was taken up by Lord Hardinge, an Imperial Commission reported in Gandhi's favour on nearly all the points at issue, and an act was passed giving official recognition to his claims. I know of no more astonishing illustration of a battle won by doing no wrong, committing no violence, but simply enduring without resentment all the punishment the enemy can inflict, until at last he becomes weary and ashamed of punishment.

The second period of Gandhi's life began in 1913, and is at this moment in the full tide of its career. This period, of course, has to do with the great revolutionary movement in India,

which had been slowly developing during the years of his absence in South Africa. Immediately upon his return he took the leadership of this movement; but in 1914, with the outbreak of the war with Germany, suspended all operations against English rule. To strike at England at such a moment, he contended, was to strike her in the back; and it was as reprehensible to strike a nation in this cowardly fashion, as to strike a man. Throughout the war, therefore, Gandhi gave enthusiastic support to the Empire in every way not inconsistent with his religious ideals.

Immediately the war was closed, however, quickened by the outrages visited upon the Indians during this period by the oppression of English tyranny, Gandhi lifted again his banner of revolt, and organized that stupendous Non-Co-operation movement which is shaking the British Empire at this moment to its foundations. What we have here, under Gandhi's leadership, is a revolution—but a revolution different from any other of which history has knowledge. It is characterized by four distinctive features.

In the first place, it is a movement directed straight and hard against England's rule in India.

There is no concealment of Gandhi's determination to free his people from the injustice and cruelty implicit in alien domination. "So long" he says, "as the Government spells injustice, it may regard me as its enemy—implacable enemy." Again, he declares "I seek to paralyze this Government, until we have wrung justice from unwilling hands,—that is what I stand for." Still again he asserts, "I deliberately oppose the Government to the extent of trying to put its very existence in jeopardy." That this is sedition, Gandhi sees as clearly as any one. If he were charged under the sedition section of the Indian Penal Code, he says that he could not plead 'not guilty' . . . "For my speeches are intended to create disaffection such that the people might consider it shameful to assist or co-operate with a Government that had forfeited all title to confidence, respect or support."

With all this unbending opposition to English rule, however, there is mingled no hatred against the English people. Gandhi has never at any time been guilty of the sin to which most of us were tempted during the war with Germany, of confusing a Government with its people. "I tell the British people," says Gandhi, "that I love them, and that I want their association; but this

must be on conditions not inconsistent with self-respect and....absolute equality."

Secondly, Gandhi's movement is a revolution which has no place for force or violence of any kind. "Non-violence" is his most conspicuous motto and slogan. For Gandhi, as we have seen, is a non-resistant; and in India, as in South Africa, will win his victory by peaceful means, or not at all! "Violence," he says "what ever end it may serve in Europe, will never serve us in India." We must fight our battles with cleaner weapons, on a nobler plane of combat. Thus we (must) meet their ungodliness, by godliness, we (must) meet their untruth by truth; we (must) meet their cunning and their craft by openness and simplicity; we (must) meet their terrorism and frightfulness by bravery and patient suffering" Further he says, "We must bring no violence against those who do not join our ranks"—how well were it, if Lenin practised this rule of conduct! And he abjures his followers to hold "every English life, and the life of every officer serving the Government as sacred as those of our own dear ones"—think of what it would mean to Ireland if Sinn Fein observes this precept! "As soon as India," says Gandhi "accepts the doctrine of the sword, my

life as an Indian is finished. Then India will cease to be the pride of my heart."

In advocating thus the policy of non-violence, Gandhi takes pains to emphasise that he is not doing this because Indians are weak. On the contrary, he commends non-violence just because India is so strong and thus so well able to meet the hazards involved. "I believe in the doctrine of non-violence," says Gandhi, "as a weapon not of the weak but of the strong. I believe that that man is the strongest soldier who dies unarmed with his breast bare before the enemies. Again, he says, ".....I want India to practice non-violence because of her strength and power. No arms are required for her. We seem to need it because we seem to think that we are, but a lump of flesh. I want India to recognize that she has a soul that cannot perish, and that can rise triumphant above every physical weakness and defy the physical combination of the world.

At bottom, of course, Gandhi advocates and practises non-resistance because he thinks it right. "The true thing," he declares, "for any human being on earth, is not justice based on violence but justice based on sacrifice of self." Again he says, "Non-violence is noble and right forgiveness is more manly than

punishment. Forgiveness adores a soldier." It is from this point of view, I take it, that Gandhi refers to his movement as "this religious battle". He is insistent however, that non resistance is not only right but expedient. It is the one sure way of attaining a triumph that will endure. "The condition of success," he says, "is to ensure entire absence of violence." Again, "India might resort to destruction of life and property, but it could serve no purpose. You need but the one weapon of suffering." Such truth is obvious to any one, says Gandhi, who understands the law of universe which is spiritual. "If we would realise the secret of this peaceful and infallible doctrine, we will know and find that we will not want even to lift a little finger."

Non-violence, however, is not enough. Non-resistance means something more than mere acquiescence in suffering. It must have a positive or aggressive policy—and it is this which Gandhi provides in what he calls 'Non-Cooperation.' To all his followers, Gandhi recommends refusal to co-operate in any of the political or social functions which are essential to the continuance of British rule in India. He urges that the Indians boycott everything English: that his countrymen refuse to sit on the local Councils : that

native lawyers refuse to practise in the courts; that parents withdraw their children from the schools; that title-holders give up their titles. On the occasion of the recent tour of the Prince of Wales, he urged all Indians to refuse welcome or recognition to the Royal visitor. Even a boycott of English goods is under consideration, but of this Gandhi voices his disapproval. Such policy, of course, if effectively carried out on a large scale, would destroy English rule in India; it would little by little bring paralysis to the Government as the hemlock brought inch by inch the chill of death to the limbs of Socrates. "The peaceablest revolution the world has ever seen" would be triumphant.

Lastly, at the crown of his great movement, Gandhi seeks the moral and spiritual regeneration of India on the lines of Indian thought, Indian custom, and Indian idealism. This means the exclusion, so far as possible of the influence of the West, with its industrial slavery, its materialism, its money worship and its wars. The first step in his endeavour is to wipe out the barriers which divide the Indians from one another, and make them one great united brotherhood. Thus, he seeks the obliteration of caste distinction and religious differences: Mohammedan must live peaceably with Hindu, and Hindu with Mohammedan. Then must come a leadership of mankind in ways of peace and amity. "I believe absolutely," says Gandhi, "that India has a mission for the world." His idealism, therefore, transcends the

boundaries of race and country, and seeks to make itself one with the highest hopes of humanity. "My religion," he cries, "has no geographical limits. If I have a living faith in it, it will transcend my love for India herself."

Such is Mahatma Gandhi! In this great spirit, he lives among the people. As he moves from city to city, crowds of thirty and even fifty thousand people assemble to hear his words. As he pauses for the night in a village, or in the open countryside, great throngs come to him as to a holy shrine. He would seem to be what the Indians regard him—the perfect and universal man. In his personal character, he is simple and undefiled. In his political endeavours, he is as stern a realist as Lenin, working steadfastly toward a goal of liberation which must be won. At the same time, however, he is an idealist, like Romain Rolland, living ever in the pure radiance of the spirit. When I think of Rolland, as I have said, I think of Tolstoi. When I think of Lenin, I think of Napoleon. But when I think of Gandhi, I think of Jesus Christ. He lives his life; he speaks his word; he suffers, strives, and will some day nobly die, for His kingdom upon earth.

Do you recall how it is told of Jesus, that one day, as he was journeying, he heard his disciples quarrelling? And he said, "What were ye reasoning on the way?" And they said they had disputed who was the greatest. And Jesus said, "If any man would be first among you let him be the servant of all."

List of Important Hindi Books.

Indispensable to Every Indian.

Rashtra Bhasha Bodhini (Telugu)	0	5	0
Rashtra Bhasha Manjari (Telugu)	0	2	0
Hindi Bala Bodhini (Tamil)	0	2	0
Do do (Telugu)	0	2	0
Hindi 1st Reader (with meaning)	0	4	6
„ 2nd „ (with Notes)	0	5	0
Hindi-Ka-Heer (Hindi Eng. Voca- bulary)	0	2	0
Swadesha Geeta (with meaning)	0	3	0
Bala Ramayan	0	11	0
Arogya Sadhan (by Mahatma) Hindi.	0	6	0
„ (Tamil) do	0	10	0
Hindi Swaraj do. ...	0	5	6
Bala Katha Kahani do.	0	4	6
Divyavani do.	0	2	6
Hindi and English Dictionary	3	0	0
English and Hindi „	3	0	0
Saptasaroja ...	0	8	0
Hindi—English Self-Instructor	0	10	0
„ Tamil ...	0	10	0
„ Telugu ...	0	10	0

HINDI PRACHAR OFFICE,

Triplicane, Madras.