

The Gandhian Confusion

V D Savarkar

© Himani Savarkar,
Savarkar Bhavan,
Raja Thakur Path,
Shanivar Peth,
Pune.

Tele: +912025544751

Internet Rights are with
Swatantryaveer Savarkar Rashtriya
Smarak Trust,
Dadar, Mumbai

1. The Way to Freedom

(11-8-1927)

*"True to his original self,
He would stick to the clamour".*

-- **Sant Tukaram**

When, about a year and a half ago, Mahatmaji announced that, renouncing politics, he would devote himself to the constructive programme of *Khadi*, every patriot - fed-up with his crazy and wasteful politics and disappointed at the loss caused by that politics in the past six years and at the misdirection our country suffered due to the confusion- had indeed felt a bit relieved. It was believed that, at least now onwards, Gandhiji would cease to meddle unduly in politics that is beyond the ken of his knowledge, intelligence and power; stay away from the antinational agenda of dampening the spirit of our youth with the useless quibbling over '*ahimsa*', '*asahakarita*', '*vidhayak karyakram*' etc. and just stick to his *Charkha*. But you see him attending the National Congress, upholding that old crazy programme and dispatching utterly trash letters with reference to the Nagpur Satyagraha and thus continuing to dabble in politics in spite of his declaration - '*I won't be in active politics.*'

This is because he had said- '*I won't be in active politics*' - only out of compulsion. When the members of the Swaraj Party walked out of the meeting of the working committee of the AICC, Gandhiji had said with pretty conceit, "*No problem, what is the use of a useless crowd? Just two followers are enough.*" But his legs teetered when he found it hard to enlist even the two followers with the help of whom he could turn the Congress into a Khadi Propagating Party and thereby enable the opposition party in the legislature to rule as it

pleased. Those who remember the hue and cry of Gandhiji and Mohammad Ali in that meeting, the tears of exasperated disappointment and the final surrender will realize that Gandhiji announced his resolve not to be in active politics only when he found himself uprooted from politics. With full government backing, this noble soul set out to Bengal with a mighty vow to crush the revolutionaries there. But even with the best of efforts for three months, the underground movements for subverting the government in Bengal could not be throttled. On the other hand, the legislature was overwhelmed by the non-cooperationists. The rise of huge Hindu organizations led to the liquidation of the ominous Khilafat movement. Hence, with no sympathizers left, whether in legislature or the revolutionaries, in Hindus or Muslims - Gandhiji had to fake a voluntary renunciation of politics which, anyway, was inevitable.

But Gandhiji faced the fate of all those forced into retirement. It was obvious on past so many occasions that, though he seemed outwardly preoccupied with the Khadi movement, mentally he was eager to dabble in politics at the slightest possible chance. But when expressly he said that he won't be active in politics for some time to come, I was indeed happy for not having to criticize his politics detrimental to national interests, although it was my duty howsoever painful. Hence, I kept on ignoring Gandhiji's sporadic epileptic attacks at the very mention of words like non-cooperation, non-violent Satyagraha. But some utterly repugnant statements that he has recently made in the letters and articles of "Young India" make it imperative that their due cognizance must be taken lest this poisoning philosophy raises its hood again.

But what kind of philosophy is it? Is it philosophy at all? The only thing that distinguishes it is gross ignorance of principles. Commenting on "Satyagraha", this monk of

Sabarmati says, "Why would a Satyagrahi wield a weapon at all? He will prefer to be a martyr without offering any resistance in the cause of Truth. Only such a satyagraha can be called non-violent satyagraha." Oh, is it so? But recently, your honourable self has given a definition of 'nonviolence' that is so fresh that, even though you have mastered the art of forgetting conveniently what you have said or of admitting your folly of committing a blunder, you can't disown it. In reply to a query -as to whether one should kill rabid dogs or maintain them, feed them, thereby letting them bite more passersby and thus earn 'merit' by observing non-violence- you had said that some minor violence that is inevitable to avoid major violence is justified. As a result, many rabid dogs were shot dead. Thousands of Jains held a congregation to condemn you and even refused to call you a 'Mahatma'. Yet you neither withdrew that definition nor condemned the act of shooting down the rabid dogs.

But now when you say in a letter, "*A Satyagrahi won't wield a weapon as such. He just can die practicing truth*", it follows that a Satyagrahi won't take up a gun or any other weapon even to kill a rabid dog. Perhaps when the Satyagrahi bitten by a rabid dog himself goes rabid, his use of teeth may fall under the holy ken of Satyagraha. To resist rabid dogs without using a weapon means nothing but to face the dogs and say, "O honourable dogs! It is not right to bite. So please don't bite! Now if you are still bent on biting, here I am, a Satyagrahi. I will neither wince when you bite me nor resist you with a weapon, but will let you roam freely biting others!" Some pure Satyagraha!

When, in the context of rabid dogs, Gandhiji admitted that some minor violence that is inevitable to avoid major violence is justified, I felt that at least now after life-long track record of follies, he has come to have some grasp of true non-violence. These utterances of his are amongst the few that Gandhiji has uttered in his entire political career in

his sobriety, I thought. But, the truth is, Gandhiji's sobriety too is just a passing phase in his stupor. Just as a novice boy happens to hit the ball in a perfect manner, Gandhiji happens to say or do something correctly, albeit by mistake, in the political game. Because, the next moment he commits another mistake of regarding that correct deed as a mistake. If a Satyagrahi is so non-violent a person as to regard wielding a weapon as immoral or sinful, isn't one who organizes a mass massacre of dogs by cornering and shooting them himself a wicked killer? And what about the leader of the government agents crying hoarse during the world war, "Join the army! Go to war as an unconditional help to the British." And that crazy lunatic who went about, till he himself took ill, for enlisting unconditional support of the British for the unconditional massacre of the Germans - he was a staunch advocate of nonviolence indeed ! Mowing down the Germans who are not the enemies of Hindusthan and are interested in making friendship with us is not violence. But wielding a weapon in self defense against our sworn enemies for generations is violence! If just holding a weapon is an act of shame for a Satyagrahi, why did you call a weapon wielding surgeon and get yourself operated on when your life was threateaned? Didn't you just wipe out with the surgical scalpel a whole nation of germs inhabiting your stomach and flourishing like an Australian colony? How was that violence justified? Why didn't you practice what you preach to the Satyagrahi heroes and just stand up before the germs or the Germans and embrace death protesting against their actions?

But, notwithstanding his sublime and broad heart, the Mahatma has a very narrow and immature head. His heart gets carried away by enchanting words like ahimsa, compassion, forgiveness. But, being incapable of grasping the true core of these principles, and having no ability left to realize this, he happens to babble incoherently. In fact, the

definition of non-violence quoted above is etched in various Hindu religious texts. But Gandhiji started studying these after he turned fifty and forgot what he learnt in less than a year. This explains how he writes, "A true Satyagrahi won't even think of touching a weapon. Even wielding a staff is against the spirit of Satyagraha. (*And in the same breath*) But killing the Germans intending to help us get freedom with weapons in order to support the British who have enslaved us is consistent with the spirit of Satyagraha." Till date, Gandhiji has made so many of such conflicting comments and deeds that they would make up a compendium. His utterances and acts are full of meaningless words and incomprehensible meanings. At least this Maharashtra is sick of the chaos that Gandhiji has wrought in the entire Hindusthan with his terms such as *swaraj*, *khadi*, *shuddha swadeshi*, *asahayoga*, *Satyagraha*, *ahimsa* or *asahakar*. And of each one of such terms, Gandhiji has given so many conflicting meanings and definitions that, if all of them were to be put together, they would make even an idiot burst out laughing. But the chaos has done so much harm to the national cause and has made this country so lethargic and lackluster that, instead of humour, a disgusted mind is filled with deep grief and anger.

Quibbling over the armed resistance in Nagpur, Gandhi says that the topic of resistance is release of the political detainees in Bengal and not the Arms Act, and therefore, contravention of the act is beside the point. But when a Satyagraha against the Rowlett Act was started, Gandhiji himself went on a selling spree of the confiscated books against the Press Act in retaliation of the Rowlett act. People had then raised the same objection. "If you are against Rowlett Act, break it. Breaking some other act amounts to digression." Now, if violating an unjust act in any situation was justifiable then, why is violating a humiliating Arms Act

now not justifiable? But the ego hell-bent on calling a wrong right is hardened enough to again call it wrong.

He adds further that a movement to break basic moral laws can't isn't entitled to be called Satyagraha. Just as it is against the spirit of Satyagraha to break the law against stealing, so it to break the law against arms. And the man who regards holding a weapon in self-defense - mind you, just holding - as sinful as stealing, doesn't have any qualms about joining the British army to butcher the Germans. You are just dumbfounded.

And yet, so long as there is a new born class of dimwit naives in this country - which regards this babel of hollow words as some kind of mysterious philosophy and is incapable of perceiving even the most obvious things - it becomes imperative to treat this childish hairsplitting as if it were a matter of importance.

After branding the Satyagraha launched by Patriot Awari as futile, immoral, torturous and unbecoming of a Satyagrahi; Mahatmaji has mercifully condescended to recommend in the same article an alternative remedy for the release of the detainees in Bengal. A remedy that is sure-shot, moral, non-violent and becoming a true Satyagrahi. It is really worth noting and preserving in a museum next to a Paleolithic skull. He says, 'Everyone should go to Calcutta on foot. *If that is not possible, then one may travel by train.*' And do what? Attack a jail by millions, break it open and set the political detainees free - the way the French did with Bastille? God forbid! Nothing of the sort. Look at what Gandhiji says. 'Everyone should set out from Nagpur on foot, reach Calcutta, climb up the compound-wall of the Governor's bungalow and cry out, "Release the political detainees!" That's all! And then on should get oneself shut in the prison. Perhaps suspecting that there may still be something lacking in this sure-fire remedy, Gandhiji further adds, "But a Satyagrahi must be utterly harmless and

disarmed.” Oh, what a remedy! Everybody, including youngsters, going from Nagpur to Calcutta on foot so that half the energy is lost in the journey alone; or travel by train so that the tickets of the satyagrahis alone will add thousands of rupees to the exchequer of the imperial railways. And what is the gain at the cost of either the thousands of rupees of the blistered, bleeding feet? Just a cry at the Governor’s door- if allowed- “Release the political detainees!” Just a cry! As if the Governor is born deaf. As if the Governor, who keeps a track of people’s talks with their wives in their kitchens, is going to learn something more if we give a cry at his bungalow. As if the slogans for releasing the political detainees in the meetings and on the roads of Nagpur hasn’t reached the governor and hence needs a ruckus at his bungalow! But, I say, why confine the use of such a sure-fire elixir on a specific trouble of the political detainees? Why not strike at the root of all these evils – servitude- with this unfailing weapon (sorry, with a khadi thread)? Why stop with the governor of Calcutta? Here is our suggestion to every Gahdhianized (*read* confused) Satyagrahi fighter – first of all each one should reach Kashmir and climb up the Himalayas. Then crossing the Gobi desert one should swim across the Dead Sea and reach England. Then, after a thorough bath and purification of body, mind and speech, one should get dressed in immaculately clean attire. Thus, when the soul is utterly disarmed and harmless, one should reach- (as far as one is allowed) - the precincts of the Buckingham Imperial Palace, the abode of the King of British Empire, and cry out, “Give us freedom!”

Right! If just sloganeering helps, why ask only for the release of the political detainees of Bengal? Why not prostrate before His Highness King George’s Palace and come back with the alms of freedom in your begging bowl? Some time back, Gandhiji had sprung up the remedy of

khadi thread for getting freedom in six months. But even that loses its luster before this new remedy of sloganeering. Poor Mahatma is coming up with remedy after remedy to gain freedom! But to no avail! *'These irreverent Maharashtrians! They have no faith at all!'*

One may, at times, ignore with half a smile these 'remedies' as childish. But when Gandhiji starts speaking of his crazy philosophy to explain the heart of these remedies, it causes nausea instead of smile. Because, his remedies don't mislead the gullible people as much as does his crazy philosophy! About these remedies, he says, "Perhaps, this kind of march to Calcutta and slogans there may not yield quick results! But you should remember that ultimately, Self-sacrifice wins! Three cheers for 'Self-sacrifice'! You know, the sacrifice one has to do for the means that results in the maximum gain at the minimum loss is called true self-sacrifice. But one who knowingly follows a path that is most gruelling *and futile* is treading the path of self-destruction, not self-sacrifice! To reach Madras (Chennai) from Mumbai, if a quirky idiot turns first to the Himalayas and then landing in Japan reaches Madras (Chennai) via United States, he is after self-destruction and not self-sacrifice. Turn your back to your fertile land and do farming in the Saharan desert! Why? Because self-sacrifice is never in vain! If self-sacrifice alone were so important, why squander your money over the railways to reach Calcutta? Tie a heavy stone securely to your neck, hoist yourself on the brink of a well in Nagpur, cry "Release the political detainees!" and commit suicide!

Well, enough of this demoralization of the nation, becoming only of a sworn enemy of the nation, under the glib garb of self-sacrifice, atma-bala, Satyagraha, ahimsa, satya et al. enough of this mockery of politics. Enough of this Gandhian confusion! "Go to Calcutta on foot and give slogans!" Yes, if you really want do something worthy for

your country, trample on this childish philosophy and this effete science! And don't ask like a granny, "Does this fit into 'Satyagraha'?" Ask, like Shivaji, "Does it result in the maximum damage to the wicked enemy with minimum loss to us?" Don't care a dime whether it is called *Satyagraha* (passive resistance) or *Shastragraha* (Active armed resistance.) by the naïve or the shrewd populace.

Look at Mussolini planning to cover the whole of Italy with a roof of fighter planes blocking sunshine. Look at Lenin and Trotsky subverting the Czarist rule and raising a whole nation of red guards capable of combating the European rulers. Look at China; it's driving away the foreign invaders with its millions of well equipped soldiers. And look at England! Even without tanks, submarines, planes and bombs it is silently running the empire as effectively as a clock. Every British citizen is virtually a Mussolini. Look at those Japanese dwarfs, that clean-shaven, sword brandishing Kemal Pasha, that teeny-weeny Amir of Afghanistan moving from door to door giving a cry of the forthcoming Jihad. And in this huge tumultuous battlefield, look at these lousy *Chakravartis* in whose hands you have entrusted the fate of India! They are indeed going to make India *Chakravarti* by turning the spinning wheel (chakra). Yes, they will go on foot from Nagpur to the governor's lodge at Calcutta and get all the political detainees released just by shouting slogans. If you want to spin khadi, live just on fruits and vegetables, wear only a loincloth and undertake fasts, you are welcome to follow them. Because in these virtues they are the most competent preachers. But if you want freedom, if the urge to be free is making you restless, if your faces lose their luster with shame at the very sight of the foreign flag parading nonchalantly on the soil of Hindusthan then my dear young brothers, get up and go consult the Russians, the Italians, the Irish; ask that Shivaji, that Chandragupta, that Yashodharman. Ask them, "What

are the ways and means to freedom?" because they themselves have trodden the path and have got concrete results. You can choose from amongst those paths the one that is just and suits your circumstances. Notwithstanding the extent of his scholarship and mastery over Sanskrit, Mr. Bhandarkar can't be appointed a royal physician. We acknowledge that Gandhiji is a Mahatma and as such and so far as he does not dabble in matters outside his proper territory, he is venerable. Yet persons like him who shudder and are appalled at the very first bang in the freedom struggle and who are totally politically immature can't be our political mentors. Here you need a Chanakya, a Samarth Ramdas. It is just not Gandhiji's cup of tea.

- 11-8-1927

2. Gandhiji and these Naïve Hindus!

How natural it is that when Gandhiji called Abdul Rashid 'bhai' (brother) and infuriated the whole Hindu world, he spoke in his defense! Every actor has to act in such a way to give the best justice to his role. We all know that the whole world is a stage and we all are the actors. As Gandhiji is playing the role of a *Mahatma* (a noble soul) it is but natural that his dialogues should be such as to lend colour to that role and not like a petty mortal like Samartha Ramdas who says, "To be proud of what is just is not to be proud at all. Because justice and injustice can never be equal." and defends the caste into which he is born.

We all Hindus sincerely believe that even the worst criminal must get someone to defend his case. So, what is wrong if Gandhiji goes to the rescue of Abdul Rashid? Perhaps none other that Gandhiji would have been better suited to back him!

But look at these credulous Hindus! When Gandhiji volunteered to defend 'Bhai' Abdul Rashid, they asked, "If Abdul Rashid is 'bhai', why didn't Gandhiji also call Gopinath Saha a 'Bhai'? If defending Abdul Rashid's case is just and consistent with his position as a Mahatma, how come he didn't choke with emotion and come forward with the same spontaneity to support Gopinath Saha's case? Not only that, why did he spew fire against Deshbandhu Chittaranjan Das when the latter was a bit lenient to Gopinath?"

You naïve Hindus! Don't you know why? Because Gopinath Saha was a *Hindu*! Would it become a Mahatma if he took the side of a Hindu like Gopinath and called him a 'Bhai' with tears in the eyes? Similarly, it was but natural that Gandhiji would take Das to task when Deshbandhu Chittaranjan Das and his All Bengal Provincial Council dared support a murderer and a *Hindu* at that. What right did Das have to defend a Hindu murderer? Nobody else but a Mahatma *can* have the right to defend a murderer!

Perhaps, in spite of Gopinath Saha's crime of being a Hindu, Mahatmaji would have uttered a few soft word for him. He would have prayed to God for the peace of Gopinath's soul the way he did for Abdul Rashid's. But had Gopinath murdered a Hindu monk? He had murdered an innocent gentleman. Let alone a Deshbandhu, not even a Mahatma has the right to take sides with one killing an English gentleman and to call him a 'Bhai' with tearful eyes. All holy codes, from Indian Penal Code to Special Ordinance Act, agree on this. But these poor naïve Hindu's will never grasp these subtle nuances!

Speaking in the same context, **Gandhiji said, "I am a friend of the Muslims. I have a blood relationship with them. They are my brothers."** Now what is wrong with this? The Muslims are truly our blood brothers. A majority of them were forcibly converted to Islam; hence Hindu blood still runs through

their blood vessels. On a still higher level, Muslims too are humans, therefore, by virtue of being human we share the same blood. So, didn't Mahatmaji tell the truth when he called the Muslims his blood brothers?

But these naïve Hindus! They immediately point out - Last year, when a revolutionary had said that the blood of Pratap and Shivaji courses through our veins, Gandhiji had responded with righteous indignation, *"No! Our veins can't have blood of Shivaji or Pratap! Hindus have different castes; therefore you can't say that a Brahmin or a Bania has the blood of a Maratha or a Rajput"*.

And don't you see, wherein lies the magnanimity in one Hindu admitting that he has the blood of a Shivaji, Pratap or Govindsingh; that they are his brothers? A common man may honestly say this. But to say that Muslims are one's friends, that they are one's blood brothers, and that too on the very day when the Hindu blood of Shraddhananda was shed by the Muslim blood, adds to the glory of a Mahatma.

Now, if you can't say that you have the blood of Shivaji, Vasishtha or Shraddhananda because the castes prevent Hindus from intermarriages, then to say that the blood of a Muslim, who was forcibly converted from one of these castes, courses through your veins appears inconsistent. To the naïve Hindus this will appear as inconsistent. But they should know that such logical rules are not binding on the Mahatmas. Otherwise, how could the Mahatmaji, who firmly held that it is wrong to wield a weapon against a rascal raping your very sister as it amounts to violence, take sides with the British and obstinately go about till he was ill asking Indian youth to join British army in order to massacre the Germans?

- 10-2-1927

3. Which is the Religion of Peace?

The other day, Gandhiji has written an article in 'Young India' in response to a letter by 'A Candid Critic'. There are many things in this article which are utterly misleading. **Even someone with a casual acquaintance with the history of Islam will realize the rashness of Gandhiji's statement that Islam is a religion of peace.** At the end of this article, Gandhiji says, "*The seat of Religion is in the heart.*" Oh really? Then if you have a look at the Islamic heart, then you can perceive what Islam as a religion is. How do you perceive Islam right from the days its propagation began? What happened when it first trounced Syria? The Christians there suffered horrible torture and poor people had to leave their motherland. Where did they go and who gave them asylum? It was the holy Hindus who gave them asylum in south India. Next, these Mohammedans made an incursion into the once world-famous Persian Empire of Darius. What happened? The whole of Iran-Persia was devastated, and the Parsis along with their reforms were on the verge of extinction. Just a boatful of patriotic and religious Parsis escaped the holocaust and set sails on the frightful ocean with their holy fire and Zendavesta. Who gave them refuge? It was the Hindus again who accorded these helpless souls a warm welcome in the loving lap of their motherland; and to this day Mother India has cared for them just like her own children. Then this proselytizing tsunami of Islam spread all over Hindusthan and, beginning with the attacks on Sorati Somanath, Hindusthan was full of furore with bloodshed, arson and pillage. Gandhiji! Is this a religion of peace? Till date, many countries have been conquered. Many conquerors are driven to conquests by the fame they give. But this kind of carnage was unique, unforeseen. It was with the onslaught of Islam alone that began the wretched

tradition of treating a non-Muslim as a 'Kafir', confiscating his property, abducting and defiling his family and converting them forcibly to Islam. Just a mention of Muhammad Ghorī of Ghazni, Mahammad Tughlaq, Aurangzeb or Tipu Sultan is enough to bring to our mind the whole history of Islam. Of course, the three Johars of Chittod consuming innumerable kids and ladies are in a class by themselves. And yet Gandhiji says, "Islam is a religion of peace." True, there are exceptions to the aforesaid episodes. Some part of Islam does preach compassion; but the 'heart' is different. **Gandhiji further says in defense of Islam, "It is true that Islam is a little bit intimate with the sword, but that is the result of circumstances." What these circumstances are is something over which Mahatmaji is tightlipped!** And if the circumstances are to be blamed, then the advantage must be given to all those suffering in the holocaust of Muslim carnage - Marathas, Rajputs and Sikhs. But does Mahatmaji have any historical record as to how many mosques did the Marathas demolish or how many Muslims did they convert forcibly while founding and expanding their rule? The Marathas or the Sikhs didn't demolish a single mosque nor convert a single Muslim forcibly. So, which one is the religion of peace -Hinduism or Islam?

In fact, there is no point in this kind of hairsplitting and digging up the past doesn't have any hidden motive. But, when the diagnosis is wrong, the best of the medicine won't succeed or rather would be counterproductive. I have to dwell on the past at length precisely to show how Mahatmaji's diagnosis is baseless and anti-historical.

The fact is that the majority of the Muslims don't regard Hindusthan as their own country and look upon the Hindus here as thorn in their side. It is this feeling that is at the root of all this strife. Barring a few reasonable Muslims, the rest have a longing that - like Turkey, Iran or Afghanistan - India

too should be exclusively an Islamic country, and if that happens, they will love it as their motherland. The other day, Barrister Amin said in a meeting in Delhi in clear words, *"In the forthcoming decade, every Muslim should convert at least three Hindus to Islam so that when Independence comes, it will be unequivocally Islamic"*. It is this mentality that uproots all unity, but no Muslim leader protests against this nor attempts to do so. This is the root cause of the problem, the right diagnosis.

Gandhiji must have read Barrister Amin's highly defiant speech in Delhi. But he, along with his Muslim companions, has conveniently kept mum over it. Even on such occasions, Gandhiji doesn't have the courage to give the Muslims a stern admonition, but when a spirited Arya Samajist reacts to this kind of cheap bragging of the Muslims, he takes great pride in attacking him like a peevish cane-wielding teacher. This is what irks the Hindus. We know that Gandhiji is a Mahatma and therefore beyond all favouritism. But according to dictionary, favouritism is leaning towards any party- the other one as well as your own.

All will be well if this is rectified. Through 'Young India', Gandhiji should teach the Muslims all the Islamic teachings of peace, tolerance and compassion that he knows. He should also arrange lectures on the hymns of peace in Islam on the lines of the lectures of his disciples - the Ali brothers on the Khilafat movement. If necessary, the Muslims must be made to swallow a bitter but ultimately beneficial pill to instill nationalism in them.

But, instead of this when he talks indecisively and treats Hindus as criminals and keeps mum even when the responsibility is nailed down on the Muslims in the case of Kohat, it is my duty to assert in a no-nonsense manner that his diagnosis is wrong and the real cause of the strife is somewhere else. - 27 - 1 - 1927

4. The Sympathizer of the British

The 'Pioneer' and other periodicals are extremely happy over the Mahatma Gandhi's defense of colonial independence and civil disobedience. Says 'Pioneer', "There can be little doubt but that the wide spread conservative elements in the land will once more rally round the Government and among them the foremost would be Mahatmaji. The revolutionary movement in the country would be isolated and left in the air and there would still be a chance of preserving India for the British Commonwealth of Nations. If no such step is taken, the futures would be black indeed."

Nowadays, 'Pioneer' makes it a point to call Gandhiji 'Mahatmaji'. About Gandhiji's arrest in Calcutta, the 'Manchester Guardian' of England says, "what is wrong with the Government of Bengal? If anyone deserves to be set free in the interest of the British rule, it is Mahatmaji. What do you say of the folly of the government which arrests this man and gives the revolutionaries an unimpeded path?"

Thus, 'Rally round the Gandhites, is the sole incantation of all the British diplomats are reciting. It was the same incantation that the Sage Morley had invoked to crush the revolutionaries in the past. Morley said, "Rally round the moderates.", 'Pioneer' and 'Guardian' say, "Rally round the Gandhites".

They are right in a way. If Hindusthan and the British rule are to be saved from the clutches of these nasty revolutionaries - to 'save' Hindusthan amounts to keep it subjugated under the British Empire - it is but imperative that we all should uphold the Gandhian programme. Because in the last five- six years since the moderates were replaced by the nonviolent non-cooperationists, the extremist revolutionary movement could not be as

effectively obstructed by the government backed O'dwyer or the Rowlett Act as it was by the ways of the Mahatma. To ignore his political contribution is to be disloyal to the benefactor. We, the non-extremists, nonviolent sympathizers of the British Empire will never forget the favours of Mahatmaji's party, nor should the government. We agree with the 'Pioneer' and its kin and make a humble suggestion that, instead of obstructing his path, the government should bear his rail travel expenses and let him roam across the length and breadth of Hindusthan. Because he can convince the people of certain things that the government can't. He alone can dissuade the people from the path of the revolutionaries, which the government fears like a deadly poison, and protect the British Empire socially, religiously, industrially, and educationally in a way of relatively minimum loss and maximum convenience. In the interest of the British Empire and in the interest of Hindusthan - because both are synonymous- the government should never again hinder the Mahatmaji.

In a way, there need not be any more fear of such hindrance. It is obvious from the tea party in Delhi that the government has accepted the recommendations of the 'Guardian' and its kin. Mahatma Gandhiji himself too has accepted the strategy of ensuring release if arrested. This is obvious from the fact that he himself arranged for his recognizance. Poor noncooperation! Died in a cup of tea!

The 'Manchester Guardian' should, however, clarify one thing. Since when has 'Mr. Gandhi' become a venerable Mahatmaji to the British press? Did he become 'one of the greatest men of the world' just now, or was he already so when he was imprisoned for six years as a 'swollen headed'? Another friendly suggestion: the British newspapers should not hasten to praise Mahatma Gandhi's political, religious or social precepts and programmes. That may give the revolutionaries a chance to criticize Gandhiji. Secondly, if at

all he is to be praised openly, the British should not at least overtly assert that the revolutionary movement is hacking at the very roots of the British rule and that Mahatmaji's teachings and actions are a cheap and convenient protection against it and hence should be used as such. Thereby, the revolutionaries can easily prove how Gandhiji's programme will never strike at the nerve-centre of the British rule and the youth otherwise passive will be instigated to attack that nerve-centre. If necessary, the government should pass a new press act to make such proclamations of the press punishable. Because, the candid expression of the press is more detrimental to Gandhiji's policy and conducive to the revolutionary movement, than the writings of the revolutionaries themselves. - 30 - 3 -1929

5. Non-cooperation at Lunch with the Viceroy

The youth conference at Calcutta has declared 10th of May 1957 as the Independence Day to be observed all over India. Because what is described by the wise but shrewd British and the naïve slavish Hindi people as "Sepoy Mutiny" was in fact a National Revolutionary War, a War of Indian Independence which broke out on 10th of May 1957. Hence, the All India Youth Conference has decided to celebrate that day as a national festival.

The spirit of the leaders of the Maharashtrians including Mr. Bhat, who passed the resolutions to this effect at Pune, Sholapur etc. and revived the memory of the National war of Revolution in the All India Youth Conference at Calcutta, is indeed commendable. I hope that our youth from Maharashtra will display the same spirit in celebrating the day all over Maharashtra and thus take lead in implementing the resolution all over India.

In any case, the awareness that the *mutiny* of 1957 was a national revolutionary war is here to stay. This truth, amongst others, that 'Abhinav Bharat' saw in the lonely darkness in 1908 is now vividly seen by the whole of India.

And that same has happened to the divine vision of the Swatantryalakshmi (Goddess of Freedom) that 'Abhinav Bharat' alone had 25 years ago. In spite of the constant and express opposition of Motilal Nehru and Gandhiji, the resolution for complete independence got a thousand votes in its favour in the National Congress! The Youth Conference went a step ahead and decided that the question "Freedom or Colonial Rule?" didn't even merit consideration. It honoured those stalwarts of the National Congress who openly advocated the goal of complete independence and asserted that, as Freedom is the birthright of the Indians, there is nothing to be discussed about it. The conference gave a unanimous, unequivocal call, "Freedom is my birthright!"

Even young children grasped this self-evident truth. But Mahatma Gandhi says, "I will have to study this matter at least for one year. Then perhaps I may understand it. Quite natural! Poet Bhavabhuti has said, "The effect varies with the material. A pure crystal can reflect the sun but a lump of clay can't."

The historical experience of the whole mankind for the past four ages isn't sufficient for Gandhi. The specific experience of the British rule since the battle of Plassey too is not enough for him. 'I will wait for one more year.' he says! He has vowed not to learn this truth for one whole year, not to let himself be convinced of this wisdom. The Indian politicians for the last three generations are convinced that the key to politics is this language of habitual shamelessness- "We will oppose vehemently if you do this, if you do that." The government is carrying on repression for the last eighty years and we are just saying, "Let bygones be bygones, but

no more in future or else.....” Then the government perpetrates newer atrocities and we stick to our usual ultimatums, “.....but no more in future, or else....”

That is what a sissy kid in a school does when it engages in a brawl with a rough guy. “Don’t you dare me slap again!” it says. And when it gets another slap, it once again cries out, “Another slap, and....” Just ultimatum after ultimatum! The wars of ordinary people end with an ultimatum. Ultimatum is the first blow of the mighty, for the weaklings it is the last. After being at the receiving end for the last 150 years, we have the cheek to warn the British – “Let bygones be bygones, but if you don’t grant us independence even this year then....”

What *then*? Mahatmaji says, “Nothing else, I will just be a staunch advocate of complete independence!” And Gandhiji gives this frightening ultimatum not just quoting the date but also the hour. “I am going to trust the benign motives and actions of England till 12 of the night of 31st December of 1929.” Could there be a more threatening ultimatum? But, instead of stopping at ‘12 of the night of 31st December of 1929’, if he also had added some minutes and a few seconds as well, would the government have the guts to defy the ultimatum? Because, if the government doesn’t prove to be worthy of the trust till 12 at the night of 31st Dec. 1929 then – “I will just be a staunch advocate of complete independence!” What a miraculous, cataclysmic, disastrous event will that be! God knows what may befall the British Empire!

Because, if Gandhiji had said what he would do once he becomes a staunch advocate of complete independence, one could have guessed what would befall the British Empire. But right now the world knows only that Gandhiji will just be a staunch advocate of complete independence. That is why, there is a bit of worry over the future of the British Empire. Probably, what will happen will be essentially the

same that happened to this day since Gandhiji ceased to call the British Empire 'Godsend' and started to move about as an advocate of colonial independence!

We kept on saying for the last ten years, "Give us colonial freedom or we will spin the spinning wheel." What difference will it make if we say for the next ten years, "Give us freedom or we will wear Khadi."? The British won't care a damn for what you *say*. Yes, if it were a matter of *doing* something, doing something *worth their attention*, perhaps the mighty British would take cognizance of it. They would only be amused with the present ultimatum, not frightened a bit. They will say tongue in cheek, "OK, so Gandhiji is going to take one more year to realize the simple truth that a nation is just not possible without freedom! One more year and he gets hang of this gross truth! But instead of appreciation of the wisdom that he is going to acquire after one year, we British feel repulsion for his slavish dim wit that didn't let him realize this truth that even a child can grasp!"

This is, of course, what they will say to themselves. Publicly, they will praise Gandhiji's wit, his vision and political acumen as never before - nay, they have already started this.

Look at what the 'Pioneer' has said with the 'Times' in tow, 'In all the childish pranks in the National Congress, Gandhiji's maturity added some seriousness and foresight. If the National Congress and the national movement are to be prevented from being hijacked by the nonchalant revolutionaries, the Viceroy should immediately invite Gandhiji and his kin and hold discussions!' And accordingly, you have not just meetings but rounds of luncheons of Gandhiji and the Governor General. Long live non-cooperation! It was this Gandhiji who was unhappy when the advocates of independence rejected the humiliating suggestion to send the resolution to the

governor and got it deleted. Isn't this a consistent and natural, non-violent non-cooperation meeting the governor, talking to him, dining with him? Look at those violent, cooperationists - hypocrites all!

Gandhiji may well condemn these violent and cooperationist revolutionaries as sinners and fools for their advocacy of freedom and their justification of violent revolution even as the last resort. But he should thank them at least for one thing and that is - the recent lunch.

The 'Pioneer' has expressly said that the tyrannical British polity is backing non-violent Gandhiji to repress the tyrannical revolutionaries. So, the tyrannical revolutionaries are of use at least once: Gandhiji and his men had the honour of dining with the Governor. If these revolutionaries supporting the cause of freedom were not so keen on their goal, this luncheon at Mr. Patel's residence won't have materialized so soon. The present relations of Hindusthan and England are especially cordial. That is what adds colour to the recent luncheon. That is why, at least for that purpose, Gandhiji and his kin should thank the revolutionaries saying "God bless them."

Poor Shrinivas Iyengar! Why did he give the call for independence? If he too, had decided to rely on the kind-heartedness of the British for one whole year would he have missed that luncheon? He was sure to get a place at the table - near it, next to it, below it, anywhere! How could a pucca Brahmin like him forget the art of ensuring a seat at the lunch?

10 - 3 - 1929

6. The Monk of Sabarmati

(1)

Some thoughtful and main journalists are wondering as to why Gandhiji has not so much as even mentioned the

martyrdom of Yatindra in his 'Young India'. Many of them are in fact dejected. For example, 'Swatantrya', the famous Hindi daily of Calcutta. It says, "The faraway Ireland felt sorry about the self-sacrifice of Martyr Yatindra, even the government felt some impact, the whole of India was charged. But Gandhiji is silent as if this event carries no significance. 'Young India' just doesn't mention Yatindra." Even the smallest affairs in Sabarmati are cabled across the country. 'Young India' carries columns after columns over them, but it didn't have a place even to announce Yatindra's death. The latest issue of 'Young India' dwells at length over the hurdles in Muhammad Ali's Africa tour, but Yatindra is not even mentioned. Does he think that Yatindra is violent? Maybe! His definition of violence is different from the definition given by Hinduism. And nobody in India today agrees with him. Gandhiji seems to hold that Yatindra tried to spite the government by slicing off his own nose. Is he silent because he hurt the government or because he was violent? Or didn't he have the time due to his hectic tours or due to the hustle of managing his citations of honour and the bagfuls of donations? But those who are surprised at Gandhiji's oversight of mentioning Martyr Yatindra themselves forget that expecting this kind of prompt appropriate action from Gandhiji- who has just completed 60 years of his life- is doing injustice to his age. How could these people not understand this?

And again, what kind of noble deed has Martyr Yatindra done, over which a great, truth-loving, pacifist, non-violent soul like Mahatma Gandhiji should waste his time praising it, waste his words?

Was Yatindra a Muslim? Had he killed a Hindu recluse? Gandhiji could be blamed if he had not shed tears even after Yatindra had performed some such 'worthy' job. Didn't he cry out in the public meeting, 'O my brother Abdul!' when Abdul Rashid shot Swami Shraddhananda down? In the

same breath that he announced Swami Shraddhananda's murder did he add compassion for 'Bhai' Abdul. He even went ahead to write articles in 'Young India' asking his don to make a mercy petition when 'Bhai' Abdul was sentenced to death. Yatin was a Hindu, so is Gandhi! What is so peculiar if on Hindu tries to save the life of another Hindu? It is just natural.

If he had indulged in such natural, routine, ordained matters, he won't have ever earned himself the title of 'Mahatma'. Idiosyncrasy is the soul of a Mahatma; at least that is what the Indians believe. That is not the fault of the Mahatma. You assigned him the role of a Mahatma. Can he help it if he has to play it up to your expectations?

Mind you, he is not just a Mahatma but a non-violent Mahatma! And Yatin? A petty violent armed martyr bent on bloodshed in support of freedom! How do you expect Gandhiji to praise him? When the armed Indian youngsters had gone to Europe thirsting for the blood of the Germans, who had done no harm whatsoever to India, had not this very Mahatma, committed to the cause of utter non-violence, patted the backs of these utterly non-violent heroes? Nay, he himself admits, "I came down with fever due to exertion"-enlisting mercenary Indians and asking them to butcher the Germans in support of Britain in accordance with his nonviolent philosophy of peace. But did Yatin do anything of this sort? Not at all! The wretched soul, taking up arms for freeing once own country! You murderer, anyone fights for one own land. What is so special about it? It is natural, routine. Yes, if had called a rash enemy of your country your friend, if you had attempted to kill someone in order that someone else's land could be usurped by a third party - you would have displayed the marks of eccentricity, abnormality or oddity which I could openly support in this country in contravention of the Indian Penal Code and defend my Mahatmahood.

Some of his opponents claim that Gandhiji should have accorded Yatindra, not the sympathy he showed for 'Bhai' Abdul or the cooperation he gave to the butchers of Germans, but at least praise for his perseverance for goal – the way it was done even by the lawyer for prosecution. But they are wrong. Gandhiji never backs out on praise of bravery or perseverance for a goal. Didn't he time and again pat the back of the Moplas for their rebellion, saying in 'Young India'- 'The Moplas are brave people.'? But what kind of bravery or commitment to a goal have Bhagatsingh, Dutta or Yatindra displayed? The best that they can be accused for is murder of Saunders in retaliation of Lalaji's death. They are indeed guilty of a 'Dastardly' act of timidity; unlike the 'Brave Moplas' who didn't spare not only Hindu men but also women (wives and daughters alike) whom they attacked, raped, proselytized and killed. Can the Bhagatsinghs, Duttas or Yatindras boast of any macho acts like these? Dastardly indeed!

And the people are angry with Mahatma Gandhiji for not praising such 'Dastardly' guys through his 'Young India! If Gandhiji had condemned the Moplas, called Abdul an ass and had not called the revolutionaries 'Dastardly', these very people would look upon him as an ordinary mortal and not call him a 'Mahatma'. These people are just crazy. They first regard idiosyncrasy as the hallmark of a 'Mahatma', confer 'Mahatmahood' on someone for manifesting it and, when the Mahatma tries to live up to that image blame him for the same! That is why, Gandhiji made it clear at Bhopal the other day, "I don't have much of an affinity for this democracy. This monarchy is much better. Look at this Nawab of Bhopal, for example! Simple living incarnate! And how happy and contented are his subjects!"

People are upset over 'Young India's inability to publish the news of Yatin's death. But they should ask themselves as to what importance or surprise it has so that it deserves a

place in Young India or Tarun Bharat or Navajeevan. At the Sabarmati Ashram there are so many important issues, crises! The monkeys are ravaging the banana plants can they be killed with a minimum violence or should they just be threatened and shooed away? How should the ashramites consume the grains? Just eat them raw or after half-boiling or full boiling? Or should one soak them instead? Should one add spices to the vegetables? If yes, how much and in what way? What should be the amount of chili or salt? Here is a sick cow. Can we kill her? How? With an injection, or a pill? Or, do we just leave her to her fate? In the face of these problems of cosmic importance, should one devote the columns for them or for printing the news of the lives of those petty revolutionaries who are in the least concerned with the interests of India and their dastardly death? Its not for nothing that we have named our news letter 'Young India'. Same is true of 'Navjeevan'. It is 'new life' of young India, and food is life. Hence, when the great movements in the kitchens of Sabarmati are being discussed, who cares if a dastardly vagabond in the Lahore jail survives or dies?

The foregoing discussion will make it amply clear how the critics of Gandhiji over his silence regarding Yatindra are wrong. How do these people don't realize that Mahatmaji is past his sixty even after his sixtieth birthday was celebrated all over the nation? Had they done so, they won't have indulged in quibbling over why he didn't say this or that. Have the revolutionaries ever harassed Mahatmaji over such issues? Because, the day they came to know the forty year old Gandhiji, the revolutionaries saw that he must be already past his sixty as per the Tilak Panchang (Calendar). And ever since, they haven't bothered to ask what he says or doesn't say. Nor have they bothered to listen to his voluntary, uninvited counsel.

- 12-10-1929

(2)

What a surprise! At last, Mahatma Gandhiji's 'Young India' found the idle space to print 'To Yatindranath'! But just that much! It couldn't find the space to print the three and a half letters viz. 'Hutatma' (Martyr) which the whole of India prefixes that name!

In the past, in the heyday of Gandhian age of gaining freedom by spinning yarn just for one year, if somebody referred to him as just Shri. Gandhi or Mr. Gandhi, there would be loud protests asking the speaker to address him as 'Mahatma'. And Yatindra, whom the entire nation is paying respects as 'Hutatma' is mentioned by Gandhiji as just Das, Yatindra Das! And where? In his 'Young India' - the journal named '*Young India*'! The real young India is hailing Hutatma Yatindra with sky shattering slogans. Millions of young boys and girls are following his funeral procession, showering him with billions of flowers of worship, smearing their foreheads with his holy ashes. Look at the thousands of schools and colleges staging closure in protest and the Indian youth from Kashmir to Kanyakumari shouting 'Jay Yatindra, Jay Hutatma!' in unison. And now look at 'Young India', from the tiny universe of Sabarmati, selling itself in the name of young India referring to him as plain Yatindra Das. Hutatma Yatindra, causing a surge in the ocean that is young India, is reflected in the muddy pond of 'Young India' as just 'Yatin'.

Mind you, just 'Yatin'! Neither 'Brother Yatin' like the murderer of Shradhananda - Abdulla, nor even 'Brave Yatin' like the devout Moplas. Displaying utmost generosity, Gandhiji says, "Yatindra Das was not a criminal!" Wow! What a certificate did Yatindra get from Gandhiji! But Yatindra is indeed fortunate in getting a certificate that even an ordinary shopkeeper or a tram-driver could get! Poor Gopinath Saha could not get even that! When the whole Bengal was commending his patriotism and selfsacrificing

courage in the provincial congress by a special resolution, Mahatma Gandhiji wrote in this very 'Young India', "Violent revolutionaries like Gopinath Saha are basically criminals. It is a sin to praise even their motives." But the nationwide criticism that these comments invited prevented Mahatmaji this time from the cowardly daring act of calling Yatindra a 'criminal'. Yatindra is fortunate indeed!

And writing this is no small generosity for Mahatma Gandhi. Because a Mahatma like him can naturally sense competition from a Hutatma. Because, the more these people praise a revolutionary martyr, the more they are indirectly censuring that Mahatma who labeled them 'sinners', 'criminals', 'violent' etc. questioning their nationalist motives. It is but natural that when the whole nation is hailing the martyrs, this indirect censure eats at the heart of such Mahatmas. And yet Mahatmaji didn't confer those selected epithets for Yatindra. It would have been appropriate that the revolutionaries thank him for this.

It gives me great pleasure to announce that this is what has actually happened. Recently, we received a letter signed 'A thankful revolutionary.' This 'thankful revolutionary writes- Mahatma Gandhi felt like writing one thing about Yatindra (that is what his writing amounts to), " The best thing that I can presently say about Yatindra is that, " Yatindra is not a criminal!"

As a token of gratitude for this extremely generous statement, we, on behalf Yatindra would like to honour him with an equally generous statement as a return gift and that is, "The only thing that I can presently say is "Gandhi is not a criminal!"

If Gandhiji doesn't believe that Yatindra is not a martyr, he has the right to believe so. Nobody has a right to say that he should speak against his beliefs. What is expected is that he should express his views publicly in an honest and

rational manner. But while talking, writing or commenting about the revolutionaries, his language and arguments are so shaky that they smack of dishonesty. Shouldn't one be accused of partiality and dishonesty when one is unable to praise even the motives of Gopinath Saha who died for his country or utter a word against his capital punishment, but who spontaneously calls the killer of Shradhananda 'Bhai' and goes on lecturing and writing articles for petitioning against his capital punishment?

When the entire youth is honouring Yatindra as 'Hutatma', the 'Young India' contemptuously refers to him as Yatin. For sake of honesty, Gandhiji should avoid at least this distortion. The present 'Young India' of Gandhiji is indeed not young but a sixty year old issue of 'Old India'.

The true young India is honouring Gopinath Saha as a national hero. Last month, with Dr. Bhupendranath Dutta in the chair, this young India publicly observed in Albert Hall, Calcutta the death anniversary of two national heroes - Anant Hari and Pramodranjan- who were sentenced to death last year in the Dakshineswar bomb case. Why should even the name of this young India in rage tarnish the image of Gandhiji's detached, immovable bulletin? Call it what you please, this latest news of this young India causes worry and is upsetting. How can it be found in Mahatmaji's newsletter, how can he even print it? In such a situation, it is but apt that he should change the name of his bulletin from 'Young India' to 'Old India', so that people won't get carried away by a misleading name and buy a wrong newspaper. It is not 'Young India' but a back number of 'Old India'. A decrepit sixty year old issue of 'Old India'!

Young Hindusthan! The young Hindusthan that has announced the goal of a free India twenty years ago, that has wholeheartedly dedicated itself to any means - whether fair or foul, is a different issue- for obtaining freedom, going to gallows, rotting in the Andamans, bearing horrible tortures,

facing wild beasts while being pursued by the enemy and yet giving the clarion call of 'Swatantrya-Lakshmi ki Jay!' That is the true young India! How can you call that herbivorous decrepit old Hindusthan 'Young' when it doesn't have the goal of a free India, which is happy not only with colonial independence but just with a Suraj (Good rule), happy like a horse with any rider so long as it isn't reined? May be, it was young years ago, but now it is not just sixty but over a hundred years old. A decrepit hundred year old issue of Old Hindusthan!

Therefore, if an honest person like Mahatma Gandhi doesn't like this incongruous situation, he should change the name of his 'Young India' and rename it 'Old India'. If Gandhiji expresses his views honestly, you don't feel bad even if some of them are laughing stock. But many a times, Gandhiji keeps on trading falsehood for truth in his multifarious political affairs. When it becomes impossible to prove that his view is right even to himself, and when he doesn't have the courage to admit that his so-called philosophy was in fact gross ignorance, he goes on babbling whatever suits the occasion - and that is facetious. A case in point is his recent meeting with the accused of the Meerut bomb case.

The case of the revolutionaries of Meerut is of international importance. One and all prominent leaders raised a fund in their defense. Even a petty thief has the right to defense and that is provided free of cost by the government if necessary. As such, even the prosecution, the British government didn't find it odd to raise such a fund. But not only did Gandhiji not help to raise the Meerut Case Fund, he also positively opposed it. Now when people did raise the fund in spite of his queer views, out of guilty feeling or some other ulterior motive, Gandhiji visited the Meerut case accused. And do you know his baffled reply when asked as to why he opposed the fund?

Gandhiji said, "I opposed the public fund for the Meerut case so that some senior advocate should come forward voluntarily." Isn't anything but rationalization? Any sensible person will be fed up with this kind of quibbling, except those dimwits who may trust such crazy remarks as if it were some kind of mystical philosophy.

If Gandhiji intended to have a free advocate for the patriots in the Meerut case, he should have covertly requested one of them or should have made his desire public. And after the chance to get a free advocate was lost, why didn't he contribute to the fund thereafter? Secondly, was Gandhiji ignorant of the fact that no senior advocate will volunteer to plead free of cost? He keeps on auctioning the gifts or scrolls of honour he receives for his Khadi fund. Why doesn't he then wait for single rich trader to donate that amount lump sum? These Khadi beggars, who don't shrink from compelling their agents to collect a huge amount from a particular district, are opposing the Meerut-fund, claiming that a volunteer advocate would be better than this kind of begging. Why didn't this gentleman wait till the brave youngsters voluntarily joined the British platoons to kill the Germans? Why did he act as an unpaid recruiting agent of the British till he came down with fever? Because that was a fight *on behalf of* the British and here, the Meerut people are accused of fighting *against* the British! If so, why don't you admit it publicly? One can accept that. But your chronic obsession with forwarding imbecile arguments to conceal your hidden agenda is really condemnable!

It will be much more honest on Gandhiji's part if he plainly admits this, "I don't call Yatindra a martyr because he was an armed revolutionary, and when the nation glorifies him and his ferocious kin such as Bhagat, Dutta and Saha, it indicates a loss of trust of the people on my bland, meaningless path of non-violence and that adversely affects my status- may be not as a person, but as the head of a cult."

In the same way, when the nation raises a fund for those accused of the Meerut armed revolution, it stands for their national honour. Voluntary support of a single lawyer won't lend it a national image. That is why this fund was deliberately raised.

Now, if Gandhiji expressly says, - "I am irritated when I find this country unduly creating a fuss over these revolutionaries. (People who have opposed Gandhiji know well how easily he gets irritated.) Their glorification as a cult is condemnation of my importance. I firmly believe that the funds in support of such revolutionaries are nothing but national slander of the supporters of non-violence. That is why, I opposed the fund for the Meerut case!" - he won't have to offer lame excuses. At least hence onwards, he should give up this kind of insincere and only self-deceiving vindication so that even though his views are disagreeable nobody will be sick of them. And, as a beginning of this self-purgatory exercise for his cult, he should replace the misleading title of his journal 'Young India' by something else, say 'Back Number'. Because the aspirations of his sixty year old 'Young India' or the lifeless 'Navajeevan' have neither any ideological nor practical affinity with the young Indian generation. The real young India has moved a hundred years ahead of Gandhiji with a disdainful look at his fickle, shallow and feeble polity. For them, Yatin is a 'Martyr', for him he is just 'Yatin'. Saha, Madanlal, Kanhere, Bhagat of Dutta who are criminals in his eyes are national heroes for them. Pretty 'bad' situation, but that is it. Nobody cares for you in this young India. In their awful 'in' language, they call your current issues 'Back Numbers'; 'Young India' 'Dying India'!

7. Opposition to Freedom

The Madras session of the Indian National Congress was no doubt fairly successful, but Gandhiji says, "This session of the Indian National Congress was quite childish!" Yes, this session where septuagenarian children like Malaviya, Beasant prominently participated in the debates was bound to be childish! Thank God, Lajpatray was absent, or that Pujabi lad would have turned the whole Congress into kid's stuff!

Most of the leaders in the Madras Indian National Congress, including Mohammad Ali, Shaukat Ali, Shrinivas Iyengar, Ansari et al were Gandhiji's companions from Calcutta to Ahmedabad sessions of the 'childish' Indian National Congress. Some of them even presided over these sessions. In the first week of December, Gandhiji had said, "My political vote is one with Iyengar!" and then, "It is included in Ansari's!" but all these gentlemen who were so great till the last week became 'irresponsible' and 'childish'! Why? They passed the resolution that 'Complete freedom is the only goal of India'!

The government is very averse to the resolution of complete freedom, so it is natural that a benevolent, composed Gandhiji too, would be upset by it. He says, "We make a laughing stock of ourselves by talking of such childish goals beyond our capacity!" True! The goal of colonial independence that he had set before us was as easy as plucking a flower on a bent twig! And from the fact that, in spite of all these seven years of the non-violent, cooperating Gandhian confusion, not a single Indian member has been appointed on Simon Commission, it is quite obvious how close we were to the colonial independence!

Ok, childishness about goal and programme is understandable. But the Madras Congress should at least have clearly set the limit for the success of this programme! Look at what our Mahatmaji did! A simple programme: Leave all government jobs and spin yarn! And a clear cut deadline for the resultant Independence: One year. He had even published the minutest detail: One rotation of the spinning wheel and the freedom is one day closer. Had the others offered such a simple single-thread programme with similar mathematical accuracy, they too would have achieved Gandhian success!

All right, let bygones be bygones! I hope that, at least in future, the members of the Madras National Congress indulging in childish and irresponsible wrangles and resolutions will perk up due to Gandhiji's biting criticism. Gandhiji is angry; you can't disrespect his views, because he is the very fountainhead of a ceaseless flow of 'Himalayan Blunders'!! One important reason that Gandhiji offers against 'Absolute Political Independence' is that the word 'Independence' doesn't have a native, Indian counterpart! Some linguistics! This 'invention' of Gandhiji surpasses his earlier historic 'invention' that the Gita is just a metaphor and teaches nothing but unconditional violence and that there was no such thing as the Mahabharata War! He is indeed a veteran historian as much as a linguist!

Would a lanky student from some high school in Mahatashtra care to tell Mahatmaji that 'Swatantrya' is the Indian equivalent of 'Independence'? And suppose, 'Independence' doesn't have an Indian equivalent, should a country never become independent on that ground? How did Gandhiji approve the parliamentary system even though there was no equivalent of 'Parliament'? He himself keeps bragging for the invention of the term 'Satyagraha'. This means that 'Satyagraha' didn't have an Indian equivalent. Why didn't he then give up the idea of Satyagraha?

But if one sentence is consistent with another, one act with another or one utterance with another, would that become a Gandhi? If this great writer, who rejects the goal of independence because there is no equivalent term in our language, labels the Madras Congress 'childish' it is really creditable to it.

Better be a member of the British Empire! Why? Because independence doesn't have an Indian equivalent! Let a whole nation rot in the hell of slavery! Why? Because the language lacks a word! Why, if 'Independence' doesn't have an equivalent, we will invent one. Not just one single word, this India will fashion another universe, wage another Mahabharata, independence will it win!

To say that a counter-word for 'Independence' doesn't exist! Gandhiji says, "People don't understand the meaning of 'Swatantrya'. Which people is he talking about? People of Sabarmati ashram? Because, outside Sabarmati ashram, the temples on the banks of Godavari, the valleys and the markets are so resounding with the din of 'Swantrya' that it has echoes on the banks of the Thames. The word 'Swatantrya' is painted in blood, so clearly even a blind man could read it, on the gallows and the prison walls on the banks of Mula-Mutha, Hughly and Ravi-Sutlej in the last couple of decades. The word reverberates through the dungeons of Andaman. And these are not old wives tales; we are talking about the events of the last three weeks, events as fresh as the bloods of the martyrs. You may confirm this with the still dripping-wet gallows where the revolutionaries of Kakori were hanged! Mahatmaji, they didn't die for the illusory independence within British Empire. They didn't understand what it meant. They died for 'Swantrya'. They didn't forget the meaning of 'Swantrya' in your seven year spell of confusion!

Remember, the thunderous slogans chanting which literally thousands of young men sacrificed themselves on

the feet of Bharatmata and threw their personal lives to winds, was not a slogan for Khadi but 'Swatantrya-lakshmi ki Jay!' alone!!

If there is anyone in Hindusthan who doesn't understand the meaning of 'Swatantrya', it is not the people. It is the National Congress. The word resounded in the blood of thousands of people; millions were outwardly scared at the very acclaim of Swatantrya, but in their minds they adored it.

But these people didn't display that selfish cowardice of disrespecting the goal to cover-up one's timidity which was displayed by the National Congress! During the world war, even the whole platoons of illiterate soldiers readily understood the meaning of 'Swatantrya', but not the National Congress!

If there is anyone who doesn't understand the meaning of 'Swatantrya', it is not the people; it is the National Congress. And if there is anyone in National Congress who doesn't still understand the word at all, it is *you*, Gandhiji!

It was you who sang with pride 'God save the King', the anthem of the British Empire. It is you who writes in your autobiography, "The Zulus were mercilessly killing the Indians, yet when the British declared a war against them and asked for volunteers for the same, I deemed it necessary to volunteer and play some role in the war; because I regarded the British Empire as a benefactor of the whole world. It was my sincere desire that it shouldn't perish!"

Even today, that is what you desire. Perhaps, you may not realize it but the government does. It is not for nothing that you were jailed for six years and released in just two years, whereas Tilak was detained for a couple of days more, not less. It is not for nothing that the government lets you roam all over Hindusthan unbridled, issues specific instructions to the railways for your comfortable journey,

reserve special bogeys. In contrast, Tilak won't get a bogey booked at his own expenses. If someone had his photo at home, he was sure to be harassed by the police. Look at you! You enjoy the hospitality of the princes, but the government doesn't pull the prince up. Instead, if the government had found someone hailing Tilak or freedom in those palaces, the Viceroy would have dethroned the princes. With airs writes Gandhiji, "I don't understand the meaning of "Swantrya!" if this is true, what else does it indicate but a dim wit? 'I have a thirst not for Independence but for Freedom!' He has a thirst not for *marriage* but for *tying the nuptial knot*, that is what he writes not in a *newspaper* but a *daily*!!!

'I want freedom from the yoke of the British; I will pay any price for that.' Price in terms of armed revolution as well? Oh no! God forbid! Next he says, "Even turmoil and chaos is preferable to slavery! Because the peace of the British in the cemetery. Any other condition is better than the living death of a whole nation. This satanic government has destroyed this beautiful land morally and physically."

Quite good! But while this acting of bravado may impress the yarnspinning novices of Sabarmati, there is nothing new for us. You might not have forgotten that, ever since you were oblivious of the meaning of these sentences, just like the meaning of 'Independence', we, the youngsters, have taught it to you and other 'biggies' of your generation! If you have, we can prove it with your own certificates. Please don't teach these lessons to the protagonists of freedom, because you yourself are yet to master them well. We have been forcing down your ears each one of these sentences for the last twenty-five years.

And if that is your definition of Freedom, then that is the definition of Independence as well. Independence and freedom are the same. What is not free can't be independent. What is not independent can't be free as well.

Why is the resolution 'childish'? Because, right now it is not feasible! But Gandhiji himself has said, "My goal is to liberate all the weaker nations of the world from the clutches of the mighty tyrants, the foremost of whom is England!" that is some consistent argument! Does the wisecrack, who thinks that the goal of independence is unfeasible for the time being and therefore childish, believe that the goal of liberating the weaklings of the whole world is easily achievable? If not, doesn't it follow that because it is a thousand-fold unfeasible, it is a thousand times childish as well?

They say, don't just talk of freedom, act for it! If at all there is anyone who has acted valiantly in accordance with the pledge of bravery, it is the protagonists of independence. They alone have fought tooth and nail the war of Indian independence from 1857 to this day. They didn't escape by the back doors of Chaurichura.

And what have the advocates of a feasible goal, setting 'liberation of the weaklings of the whole world, as their own goal, themselves done to achieve it? Anything other than sending the poor Indian farmers for the defense of the British Empire, the leading tyrant by his own reckoning, for slaughtering the Germans?

It is indeed wastage of time to deal with a master of Himalyan Mistakes but an ignoramus of Logic. But several yarn-spinning naïve, slovenly creatures erroneously regard this incoherent verbosity as the mark of intelligence. That is why we had to waste so much of ink to take cognizance of Mahatmaji's random babble, born out of his angry reaction to 'Swatantrya', in 'Young India'.

This acclamation of independence which could not be muffled by special tribunals, deportations, gallows, air-raids, or slaughter in Jallianwala is not here to be silenced by the lifeless criticism of 'Young India'! Irrespective of a restless

Gandhiji or a seething bureaucracy, the whole India is going to thunder, 'Swatantrya-lakshmi ki Jay!!!'

26-1-1928

8. The Eclipse will be Over!

The Indian National Congress at Madras concluded with so many important resolutions that, after a long time, Maharashtra can happily congratulate the Congress!

Twenty-five years ago, 'Abhinav Bharat' vowed to achieve the goal of absolute political independence as its political goal. The clear and irrepressible call of independence resonated across the villages. At that time, they were 'a handful of lunatics'. The lunatic wisdom all over the country laughed at them, abhorred them and yet was also afraid of them.

Today, that very vow of those handful lunatics has become the motto of an entire nation. That vow of absolute political independence, which those handful lunatics took in distant corners, valleys and jungles is now being taken by the entire National Congress! So, it seems that at least a handful of lunatics had their heads in place!

When the National Congress was under the spell of the delirium of doing anything that is favourable to the British with the conviction that it is something extremely ingenuous, the revolutionaries were its sworn enemies. Let alone the revolutionaries, where carrying a staff is a sin and violence; one carrying a pistol is bound to be regarded as the most devilish. Everybody knows how some esteemed sissies in the National Congress received a moral shock of their life with the bare mention of Gopinath Saha by Deshbandhu Das. This 'Non-violence' is not averse to rushing to Shimla to shake hands with the Governors and Governor Generals,

possessing machine-guns and bombers, at their beck and call. But a Gopinath Saha carrying a rusted pistol is not just physically but also mentally untouchable to him. Why? Because, if that is a crime according to sections 121, 121A etc of the Indian Penal Code, these pseudo-non-violence protagonists declared that even mentioning the name of the 'criminal' is ten times criminal. But Abdul Rashid who carried a pistol just like Gopinath is 'Bhai Abdul'! Because he murdered a Hindu monk. That was a display of bravery similar to the Moplas! Who was Gopinath? Just another lesser Hindu! And he killed an Englishman! That indicates neither bravery nor sanctity of purpose; neither patriotism nor devoutness! What kind of patriot was he! If the 'Bhai' British don't like him - we too won't! But the Madras National Congress condemned this naïve self-deception. They gratefully acknowledged the martyrdom of the revolutionaries of Kakori in words becoming honest and diplomatic patriots. Similarly, the Congress also honoured Senapati (General) Awari as 'Senapati' and showed intense sympathy towards his suffering in defiance of the holy diktat that a Satyagraha against an English ban on weapons is as immoral as one against a law against theft and, therefore, Satyagraha and weapons can't go together. Better still, none of them recommended Senapati Awari anything on the lines of the idiosyncratic mantra, - "Go from Nagpur to Calcutta afoot, reach the Viceroy's lodge- if the police permits-, shout, 'Allow us to carry weapons!', get arrested and cool heels in the jail!" the congress has also congratulated the courageous Mr. Saklatwala for his efforts towards absolute independence of India!

With all such excellent resolutions, the Indian National Congress at Madras has as if announced that the eclipse of irrationality plaguing Indian politics is at last over and the national spirit has taken a valiant turn. The bad patch of unfortunate illusion (1920-1927) attempting to reach

independence via home-spun yarn is over. The Republican Congress held parallel to the Indian National Congress went a step ahead to announce that 'Absolute freedom is the only goal of Hindusthan', and asserted that its constitution will be republican in nature. Its congratulatory resolution about the 'rebellious' revolutionary Mr. Raju implied that the slovenly pest of ahimsa eating at the bravery of Hindusthan is finally wiped out. By indulging precisely in what the British would hate, the new spirited gathering at Madras has voiced just one promise, 'The eclipse will be over!' There were meetings of protest all over Madras against the 'Union Jack' unfurled in the exhibition in Indian National Congress. Naturally the British flag was removed from the 'independent' exhibition of 'independent' India and, in its place, the Indian flag was hoisted. These people have felt like fighting with at least a rag-doll - the 'Union Jack'! Not bad! 'The eclipse will be over!'

People have seen Gandhiji reciting wholeheartedly, with affection and pride, 'God Save the King', in the shadow of this 'Union Jack'! Hundreds of people would talk of 'Our British Empire'. And, should a young guy disrespect it, some reputed leader would intervene, "Oh no! The King is the very Lord of this land!" It was this Union Jack that was thus *honoured* in Madras! The eclipse will be over!

Speaking on the resolution of independence, Mr. Iyengar said, 'Tell the British in clear terms, 'India doesn't want you!'' whereupon Dr. Pattabhi cut in, 'Tell them? Knock them down!' Iyengar responded with a cool smile, 'When Pattabhi sets out to knock the British down, I will assist him!' Now, such matters are not to be taken lightly. But instead of the unfettered laughter of the pain in the neck maintaining - 'You get freedom by spinning yarn. The spinning wheel gives you courage; nay it earns you spiritual purity. Breaking a stone statue is violence, but sling mud at it is ok! The British are compassionate; they will leave the empire

and retreat! So keep on just dying quietly; just die dying, till the British are overwhelmed with compassion! That is the true height of bravery!' - This kind of humour is no doubt much better.

Sensing this difference in laughter, Shaukat Ali too, naturally played a different tune. He said, 'I was an advocate of independence in 1920 as well. But I didn't push it hard in deference to Mahatma Gandhi. But if Mahatma Gandhi is stuck up with peace for ever, I will have to part company with him.'

This year too, Mahatmaji was opposing the resolution for independence and would have continued doing so. But sensing that the non-cooperative new spirit of the whole Congress, he could not grace the dais to oppose the resolution due to inclement health.

The National Congress also passed the resolution proposed by our Burmese brothers to oppose the segregation of Burma from India and strengthened the foundation of Burma-India friendship. Without hairsplitting over whether 'Boycott' smacks of hatred or love, it also declared boycott on the English goods.

Thus, it seems that the National Congress had got rid of the irrational domination of the past seven and a half years. The gloomy spell seems to be over. The spinning wheel is relegated to its proper place. The office of the National Congress has swept clean the verbal cobwebs of non-violence, compassion, vegetarianism, 'whether drinking cow milk is violence or drinking the goat milk?' and so on. The eclipse of irrationality that occluded Indian politics is almost over.

The talks at the National Congress were all right. The point however is to implement them. That is the true test. The chapter of verbal vows was up to the mark. The real action packed chapters are yet to be written. - 19 - 1 - 1928

9. The Meaning Violence

'Resistance to aggression is not only justifiable but imperative: Nonresistance hurts both altruism and egoism'.

- Herbert Spencer's *'Ethics'*

'Violence' (*Atyachar*) is one of those few words which have played a havoc of meaningless pomp in the politics in the last 7-8 years and hoodwinked people's sensibility. Even now the word is being misused due to lack of analysis of its meaning and has resulted in the blindfolded national polity groping in irrational confusion.

That the very word 'Atyachar' is indicative bad, condemnable behaviour is clear from its etymology. The behaviour that is extreme, improper, injurious is 'atyachar.' Any act that is called 'atyachari' creates a feeling of rejection, condemnation. Same is true of the word 'violence'. As this word is used to indicate an action that may cause unjustified pain or harm to others, the very mention of this word naturally creates a feeling of abhorrence in the mind of a gentleman. Whether it is 'Atyachar' or 'Violence', both suggest a torturous use of force or power. This suggested meaning has its limits. But those extremists ignorant of the limits have started misusing these words for other words with wider meanings while creating a bogey of 'ahimsa' in Indian politics. Hence, these words have wreaked an antinational distortion of politics.

The basis of the meaning of 'Atyachar' or 'Violence' is force or power; hence these words came to be used initially to talk about acts in which force or power were used. This resulted in disgust or contempt about those acts in the people's minds. If someone says 'Don't do this bad deed', we naturally tend to agree with him, because what is 'bad' is

associated with 'condemnable'. Similarly, when it is said that 'We should not indulge in violence.', everyone, particularly the public tends to regard approval to it as our duty. This is how everyone in the Madras session of the National Congress, without any fuss, took the oath to shun violence. To object to the oath amounted to admitting that one will indulge in violence. And since 'violence' per se is regarded as condemnable, nobody was naturally prepared to object. Just as no one would say, 'I will do something bad.', no good-natured person would say, 'I will indulge in violence.' But when, under this label of 'good nature', when any act involving force or power came consistently to be labeled 'violent', the masses were misled. From 'Violence involves force.'; they wrongly inferred that 'Whatever involves force is an act of violence', a distorted and too wide a conclusion. Thus the terms 'ahimsa', 'anatyachar', non-violence created a mess in politics. All those deeds that were since ages being extolled all over the world suddenly were blacklisted. Bravery, valour, martial skills, command over arms or the prowess capable of snubbing the enemy - all these, just because they require the use of force, came to be listed under 'Violence', condemned as vices. That was inevitable when the nation blindly accepted 'Any action that involves the use of force is violent.' as the definition of violence.

Matters came to such a stage that even smashing the leg of a statue with a stone also was counted as violence, and carrying a stick too was regarded as a deed violence-prone and therefore inconsistent with non-violence. What was left was a diktat to uproot the arm which makes such deeds possible! Human emotions are associated with the meanings of the words.

Therefore, the moment a word is uttered, the emotion associated with it influences our mind even before we realize it and thence affects human actions. If, just before a

stranger's entry, someone tells us that he is a pucca scoundrel, the emotions connected with the word 'scoundrel' affect our mind adversely and hinder our objective assessment of the person. To highlight this point, the Vedas and Puranas contain stories about how a slight variation in accent led to distortion of meaning and led to disaster for Gods. That is what happened in the last few years to the meaning of the word 'violence'. Violence is bad. It necessarily involves use of force.

Therefore, any action that involves the use of force is bad. This fallacious argument led to national derangement of reason and led to unforeseen confusion between dos and don'ts. If an armed robber breaks into a house that is violence, because it involves use of force; and if you manage to stab and injure him and thereby protect your innocent children, that too, is violence since it involves force. Ravana's forcible abduction of Seeta is violence and so is Rama's act of decapitating all his ten heads. In Kohat, the numerically stronger Muslims forcibly beheaded Hindus and wreaked monstrous havoc by arson. That is violence. But if the Hindu minority bravely countered them in self-defense with guns, that too, is violence! The foreigners who invaded Italy, America or Ireland and forcibly enslaved them were violent, and the heroes like Garibaldi, Washington, Emmet or De Valera, who cut off the bayonet carrying hands of intoxicated enemies with their concealed daggers are violent as well! The inhuman rogue who scotches the throat of a sleeping infant to grab its ornaments is violent and so is the judge who sentences him to death. Bheema is as sinful as Dushshasan who tried to denude his virtuous wife!! Because both indulged in forcible actions and anything that involves force is violence. That is what some naïve pundits have said. A snake is violent because it stings and a man because it kills the snake! Of them, the snake stings instinctively but the man kills it intentionally.

Therefore, man is more violent, more sinful, and more condemnable. That is what has come to pass! Our heroes, who died fighting on the battlefields for our nation, came to be labeled 'sinners.' Everywhere you came across hunchback, sheepish, lifeless youngsters donning khadi caps, condemning Shivaji and Rana Pratap as violent. And then there were those lifeless non-violent monks patting the backs of those equally lifeless youngsters who would wince even at the sight of a stick, when the whole world was engaged in the arms race! The valour, barely making its presence felt, disappeared again. And the enemies subdued by that valour bounced back again.

Those who loathed this disgraceful situation slowly began condemning it. But surprisingly, being themselves stuck in this erroneous definition of violence, they could not reasonably justify their condemnation. Many revolutionaries, sick of this chaotic confusion over non-violence announced, 'Yes, we *will* indulge in violence'. But even someone, out of desperation admits to indulging in violence or injustice he is not able to justify it. Many, including the President, have confessed in the Madras session of National Congress, "Even though we are non-violent today, we can't promise to remain so in future." But as this implies that they will be violent, and as 'violence' signifies something bad, it amounts to their commitment to injustice, sin etc. and are therefore creating guilt. Thus, when their intentions are noble, the wrong wording creates a bad image and hence, the forcible action which they want to justify becomes condemnable precisely due to that justification.

The root cause of this mess is the the erroneous definition of violence accepted by most people. It is true that violence involves employment of force, but from this the converse viz. 'Whatever requires force is violent', doesn't follow. Violence is just one of the several deeds, good as well as bad,

which require the use of force. An arsonist lit fire and so does a cook. But this doesn't mean that the cook is an arsonist. In the same way, a national hero wielding weapon in a just war for the liberation of one's own country, a martyr beheading an impetuous tyrant and going to gallows for that or a spirited man up in armed defense of the temples, property and one's kin from organized hoodlums can't be said to be violent though their actions involve force. Rather, their acts are virtuous.

A forceful action is violent only if it is done with a bad intention and in order to hurt others. When it is done in defense of the good people and with just intention it is righteousness. So, violence is properly defined as a hurtful use of force or power. Violence is always condemnable, but not force; because violence is aggressively used. Hence, an impetuous person alone is violent and the impetuous use of force is violence!

The force which is used to hurt others is violence; but if force is used to resist it, it not a violence. On the contrary, it is a righteous act; because it stands the test of all righteous acts viz. they are conducive to public welfare. A blow is violent, a counter-blow is a noble act. The tyrannical sword which Kamsa carried to Devaki's maternity cell in the jail was violent, but the sword which was carried by Krishna when he entered the court of impetuous tyrant Kamsa in order to liberate the people of Mathura and with which he beheaded Kamsa after pulling him down from his throne is a symbol of righteousness. Those were the two swords, both weapons, both resulting in forceful actions; but one is sinful as it caused the height of public harm, whereas the other is a means of public interest and therefore righteous and adorable because it liberated the innocent people from the clutches of a tyrannical rascal.

Otherwise, as per the present distorted idea, both the swords will be treated as violent as both employ force. This

results in equating a benevolent deed with violence – a terrible situation indeed – and you are not able to explain even to yourself why one of them is punishable and the other adorable. But if you remember that the force that results in unjust aggression alone is violent and the force that offers justified resistance is benevolent, then the intellectual illusion vanishes. When thieves, robbers or murderers harass the innocents at the point of gun or kill orphans, these acts are heinous, the force is aggressive, injurious and harmful. Hence it can justly be called violence. But when the householder forcefully hits back at a robber by sticking a dagger in his chest, or when a judge sentences such a killer to death, their act even though it is armed resistance, or the force behind it doesn't amount to violence.

That is why Revered Manu, the first law-giver says: *“If an impetuous person attacks, he or she should be killed without second thoughts. One who kills such a person, secretly or openly, is not guilty of murder. Through him (as if) the very God of Anger is resisting the anger of the impetuous person”*. (Manusmriti –Ch.8, 351-352)

Any impetuous person is violent. Whosoever kills him secretly or openly is not violent but virtuous. Even legally, from the oldest legal texts to the latest Indian Penal Code under the British rule, the force used in to protect oneself is grouped under ‘Self-defense’ and is not called violent. Violence is legally punishable, but weapon used to protect oneself or legitimate force falls under just and legal force. It is not violence but a legitimate action.

The same hold true in politics. Austrian subjugation of Italy by military might and against the wishes and interests of Italy was violence.

But the armed counteraction of Garibaldi, Craspy, and Mazzini to attain freedom was a legitimate act. On the same

lines, the mammoth revolutionary war of independence that took place in India in 1857 can't be called violence.

From what is said above, it will be wrong to conclude that someone in a particular country must rise up now in armed revolution. Because the topic of the present article is not whether a particular country should now or ever or never rise up in armed revolution. The reasons for justification or condemnation of armed revolution differ from country to country. But even those who believe that an armed revolution is not feasible or desirable today can not maintain that it is violent just because it is armed. The present article intends to establish just that. So, if we remember the correct definitions of violence and just actions, we will never commit the extreme blunder committed in the past. - 9/2/ 1928

10. Who Is the Emperor of Free India?

In the 13th October 1940 issue of 'Harijan', Gandhiji has written an article titled 'Hyderabad'. In it , he has expressed his views regarding , 'What claim does Nizam have over Berar, North Karwar etc. which have been taken over by the British government?'- a problem raised by a real or hypothetical reader. There is, in fact, hardly anything in this article worth cognizance. But its contents are instigating the Pro-Pakistan movement of the Muslims and that is bound to adversely affect the Hindus. The present article intends to draw the attention of the Hindus towards this development and to denounce the mischievous article, both of which are necessary and inevitable.

Gandhiji's aforementioned article is likely to make the fanatic Muslims believe that they should continue to push their Pakistan movement more confidently and if, at an

opportune moment, the Muslims make a concerted move to establish an Islamic state in India, it is very likely to succeed. Not only this, they will also get Gandhiji's moral and political support for the same. And, from the overall tone of the article, it appears that it must have been written with this very 'noble' intention.

During the Anglo-German war in 1914, this very Gandhi had hatched the dangerous plan on behalf of Muslim leaders to invite Amir Amannulla of Afghanistan to invade India. A very trustworthy and competent person like Swami Shraddhananda has established this with ample evidence and has convinced the world of this by quoting it in newspapers like 'Kesari' and 'Maratha'.

Gandhiji and his devotees in Congress have said this time and again that, if Muslims want to balkanize India and establish absolute Muslim rule in some of the states, there is nothing that can prevent them from doing so. These patriots from Congress have gone to the extent of declaring that they will willingly accept this Pakistani plan and accept it as 'Hindi Rule'.

In this context, we must also take into account the Gandhian attempts to make advances to the tribal brethren on our north-western front for the last several years. Mirabehn, Parrybehn, Bhulabhai, Asafbhai and many such 'behns' (sisters) and 'bhais' (brothers) are being sent there as Gandhiji's trusted ambassadors to woo the Pathans, to transform their hearts. These 'behns' and 'bhais' keep on explaining sympathetically how these 'god-fearing' (according to Gandhi) people have to resort to some 'valid' ways for survival only due to their moral and economic blockade. It is only due to this complicated situation that they are forced to murder mercilessly the Hindu men and women in the frontier provinces, to convert them forcibly, to plunder and abduct them and perpetrate several such atrocities. If Gandhiji's aforementioned article in 'Harijan' is

read in the light of these old and recent antics of Gandhism, any Hindu reader will realize that Gandhi himself and his Hindu followers in Congress are once again going to play the same self-destructive game that they played during the Anglo-German war.

The Sword Defines the National Boundaries:

The Muslims in India are trying to establish Muslim rule either by crushing the Hindus under British pressure by a constitution on the lines of Pakistan or, if the British have to leave India as the result of a fateful blow in a world war, by establishing Muslim supremacy by armed revolution. It is certain that these Gandhiists will not hesitate to back this dangerous Pakistan plan already initiated by the Muslims.

If the reader asking the question to Gandhiji, believes that the moment some petty lower court declares that the Nizam has the right over the region taken over by the British, the latter will immediately hand over the region to Nizam, he must be utterly naïve. Swords and cannons define the boundaries and rights of states. But disregarding this, with the same seriousness with which this foolish question was asked, Gandhiji ruminated and declared that, since the British have unjustly confiscated these regions from Nizam, they don't have a genuine right over those regions.'

Granting that Gandhi has only cursory acquaintance with the Indian history, he should at least know the basic facts about the topic on which he is writing. The regions handed over by the Nizam to the British were in lieu of the protection the British were going to provide Nizam from the mighty Marathas. At the battle of Kharda, the Marathas had virtually liquidated Nizam. Hence, realizing that he too will have to wait handcuffed at the doorsteps of the Peshwas like his prime minister, he was begging the British for protection. The remaining region was conquered by the British.

Gandhi's half-truth worse than a lie:

Yet, if Gandhiji is not prepared to admit that might is right, then instead of asking the British to return the regions gained from Nizam through war or contract, he should first advise Nizam himself to quit his whole state. The reason is that, Nizam himself had rebelled and usurped this whole region when in fact he was appointed by the Mughal Emperor as its Subhedar.

If might is not right, then the entire region presently under Nizam and all the provinces coming under British rule truly belong to the Emperor of Vijayanagar, because his ancestors were the legitimate owners of this land which was snatched away by the invading muscle-power of the Muslims.

But setting aside this issue of 'right', Gandhiji writes, 'If someone asks me to think of what is just, I will say only this, 'Let the people of Berar, North Karwar or Karnataka etc. make their own decision.' This suggestion is indeed acceptable, but we must remember that this is an escape route to avoid disclosure of the whole truth. In such matters, the key lies in determining what the public choice is.

If Gandhiji had really felt like supporting the democratic principle, he would have carried this thought to its logical end and have insisted that the issue should be settled by majority. But Gandhiji knows the bitter truth that, not just in the lapsed territory but in the proper state of Nizam himself, the Hindus are a majority. As such, taking a plebiscite would amount to asking the Nizam to quit his princely state lock, stock and barrel. Hence, the second part of the article primarily attempts to appease the Muslim 'bhais'.

Gandhiji to Confer the Emperorship of India to Nazam!

Not being content with replying to this so-called reader, Gandhiji has raised an altogether irrelevant point in this article. After dwelling at length on the possible options for India's future, he concludes that if the British rule is deposed

due to war and if no other non-Indian global power replaces it, there would be anarchy in India. In such a situation, the strongest power will establish its supremacy over India and, according to Gandhi it will be none other than Hyderabad! Says Gandhiji, 'all other princely states, big and small, will ultimately surrender themselves to the supreme might of Nizam and thus Nizam will decorate the throne of India!'

But what will be the role of Gandhi himself and Congress? According to Gandhiji, 'If it remains loyal to its goal of non-violence, poor Congress is bound to perish.'

What other fate will an organization with such a goal enjoy?

Gandhi's prediction is perfect! Gandhiji, who says about himself, 'I am a believer and nothing is impossible for a believer in this world', admits that the future of Congress is dark. He himself has said, 'The Present situation has hardly any hope to offer!'

But don't think that, if Congress goes broke and there is anarchy in the country, Gandhiji will take it lying down.

Look at what he says: 'I will prefer anarchy to a well organized rule of the British or any other foreigner. Suppose, the states in this country willingly become subalterns of Nizam, or Nizam comes to the throne with the backing of the Muslim tribes on the frontier, then I will welcome such anarchy.' And the reason why he would do it is worth noting. "If the Nizam becomes the emperor of Hindusthan by subjugating the Hindu states with the help of the tribes on the frontiers, it will be a cent per cent Swaraj. It will be 'Home Rule'!"

And, at the end he writes, 'Of course, all this is theoretical, academic!!'

The Rule of Aurangzeb

That way, even Aurangzeb was born and brought up in Hindusthan, but did the Hindus look at his reign as 'Swaraj'? No. on the contrary, they despised him. Even in future, the reign of any Muslim conqueror will be vehemently condemned and a reincarnation of Shivaji, Bajirao or Ranajit will not rest till it is reduced to dust.

For this and from the non-violent point of view too, I request Gandhi in all earnestness that he should stick to his dear creed of non-violence without any regard to events, reason, practicability, circumstances or divine events. He himself says that he is an optimist and there is nothing impossible for an optimist like him. Then why shouldn't he materialize the 'possibility' of establishing a permanent non-violent empire in Hindusthan with a single stroke of 'hope'? Fortunately, he has a Vinoba Bhave, with the spinning wheel under his arm, raring to be the Non-violent Emperor of Hindusthan, much preferable to Nizam armed with spears, swords and guns. There is however a catch. Being a Hindu, Vinoba Bhave is not worthy of this supreme honour, and no Muslim will accept a Hindu ruler. But, in any case, the non-violent Hindus will take pride in bowing to a Muslim ruler. Gandhi appears to have no option left but to coronate Nizam in the absence of any Muslim subscribing to non-violence.

Be it as it is. We can't help making a friendly suggestion to Nizam in this regard. He should think twice before bowing down before the Pakistani Muslims of the few Gandhian crazy nuts.

In the past, these very Gandhi-Azads, together with the Khilafat supporters, had tried to convince Amir Amanullah that he is the God-sent claimant of the Indian throne. Unfortunately, Bachcha-i-Saku, an ordinary lad, dethroned him. Now the same Gandhian herd, hand-in-gloves with the Muslims is trying to instigate poor Nizam to usurp the crown of Hindusthan. May God save Nizam from facing the same fate as that of Amir Amanullah.

The Emperor of Independent India is 'His Majesty the King of Nepal' and not 'His Highness the Nizam'.

We, the Organizers of the Hindus, too can make a theoretical prediction similar to the theoretical discussion of the Gandhiists. Because, the Organizers of the Hindus can't forget that the millions of Hindus from Kashmir to Kanyakumari are charged with the principle of 'Unity of Hindus.' In case the Muslims initiate a nation-wide civil war, there is no reason to believe that the Hindu Princes will take it lying down. The Prominent Hindu princes are now convinced that their doom is inextricably linked with the doom of Hinduism. These reserved forces of the Hindu world, this consolidated Hindu might, ready to defend the Hindu religion and Hindu honour will easily trounce a Hyderabad or a Bhopal. Even a single handed Shinde on one side will trash the whole Nizam forces on a new Udgir or Kharda battlefield. When all the Hindu kings from Udaypur to Kolhapur and from Mysore to Cochin will attack the Muslim invaders in unison, it will leave no trace of Muslim rule from the Indian Ocean in the south to Yamuna in the north.

The Idea of Founding a Mughal Empire will prove to be hollow

What remains is the problem of the tribes on the frontier and the Islamic states outside India. But it will be a wonder if countries like Afghanistan, Arabia or Turkey survive the holocaust of a European war!

What could not be achieved in the heydays of Nadir Shah and Ahmedshah can't be expected to be achieved by their petty descendents. They shouldn't even dream of intruding into Hindusthan and establish a Mughal empire here. As for the frontier tribals, our brave Sikhs are capable of dealing with them even before they cross Ravi.

Anyway, nobody can afford to neglect the independent Hindu state of Nepal. Because, if this kind of anarchy prevails in India, the innumerable disciplined Nepali Hindu guns hold the key to a bright Hindu future. Besides, even as per Gandhi's definition, the Kingdom of the kind of Nepal is an autonomous 'swaraj'. And even if it is a matter of theoretical discussion, one will have to concede that the Emperor of Independent India is 'His Majesty the King of Nepal' and not 'His Exalted Highness the Nizam'.

If any Muslim ever aspires to establish political supremacy on Hindusthan and attempts an uprising in north, south or the frontier, the king of Nepal will unfailingly come forward as the patron of religion and Commander in Chief of the Hindu army. The Nepali government will not fail to make such a move at least in order not to miss this golden opportunity to acquire sovereign power. If the present status quo remains, the Gorkha platoons can easily attack Bihar, Bengal and Assam to the east, and up to Sindhu River in the west. The Noakhali goons of Mr. Haq or the Khaksars parading spades are simply incapable of obstructing the onslaught of these up-to-date Nepali soldiers backed by lakhs of Hindu organizers.

Can a mere heap of sand obstruct the giant oceanic waves? At least the Hindus should know what a historian Like Percival Laden writes about the importance of the independent state of Nepal for Hindusthan. He says:

The fact is that the communal strife from one end of India to the other invests Nepal with an importance that *'it would be foolish to overlook.'* Englishmen should attempt to understand the high position which Nepal holds in the Southern Asiatic balance and the great and growing importance which she will possess in the future in the solution of the problems which beset the present state of India. *It is not impossible that Nepal may even be called upon to control the destiny of India itself.*

And this dream of a free Hindu empire will soon be realized!

We too, reiterate that all this is theoretical. But if the Hindus examine, from a Pan-Hindu perspective, the possibility of a greater consolidation of Hindu power compared to Muslims, and unify all those power-centres well in time, today's theoretical discussion may be tomorrow's undeniable fact! The dream of a well-organized, mighty and independent Hindu empire will have materialized sooner than the Hindus can even imagine!

11. Goddess Snail

The satyagrahis should not carry weapons while going for Satyagraha because Mahatma Gandhi says that, for a true satyagrahi, even touching a weapon is a sin, even carrying a staff is a shame. Because he is a mahatma. But Mahatma Bholchand has announced that a satyagrahi should also not carry teeth and nails while going for a Satyagraha as basically they are given to us by Nature as weapons. Even when we have vowed not to use a sword or a staff to hurt anyone, it doesn't become a satyagrahi to carry them. Similarly, even though we don't use teeth and nails to bite or claw at someone, a satyagrahi should not carry them lest he is tempted suddenly to bite a passer-by, because these too are weapons. So, mahatma Bholchand says that a satyagrahi should clip his nails from the roots and knock all his teeth off to purify himself totally and then set off on a satyagraha. He, too, is a mahatma.

One of Gandhi's favourite disciples Mr. Bharucha and his friends have expressly opined that it is impossible as per Gandhi's views to shun weapons altogether in this world, rather it is impracticable. This is really defiance to Gandhi.

But Bharucha still believes that, even though impracticable, Gandhiji's counsel is so exalted that, by virtue of just that counsel, he proves to be superior to even Buddha and Shrikrishna.

If verbal preaching of whatever is impracticable and extravagant in this world is the precondition of being superior to Buddha and Shrikrishna, then Bharucha will have to admit that Mahatma Bholchand is far superior to Mahatma Gandhi. If impracticable eccentricity is the mark of a lofty principle, then Mahatma Bholchand's principle viz. 'A true satyagrahi is one who knocks his own teeth off before proceeding to satyagraha!' is much more lofty than the Gandhian principle viz. 'A true satyagrahi is one who doesn't carry even a staff.' Thus it is obvious that Mahatma Bholchand is superior not just to Buddha and Shrikrishna, but even to Gandhiji!

Mahatma Bholchand is right. Both, teeth and nails, were originally weapons. Even a sword is but an extended form of nail. Because a nail couldn't claw adequately, it took the form of a sword and the tooth became a spear. The tusk of a wild boar is the ancestor of the spear. So if a satyagrahi has to purify his soul by bidding farewell to arms, he should begin this virtuous exercise by knocking off his own teeth instead of being content with discarding sword and staff. Everybody knows that a toothless mouth can't preach virtue. In fact, such talk of virtue doesn't even become a normal mouth. Isn't the roar of a sharp fanged lion harsh and terrorizing? But look at a toothless snail. If someone tramples upon her, she may get crushed but won't bite back. A virtual incarnation of 'virtuous, harmless and armless' satyagraha!

We would make a loving suggestion to Mahatmaji: As a symbol of virtuosity, a snail is more appropriate than the spinning wheel, hence it alone should be given a place on Indian national flag.

And the Hindus , too, should revere a snail (*goagle guy* in Marathi) as the symbol of our culture instead of a cow (*Guy* in Marathi). We Hindus turned ourselves into a cow by cow-worship. Now, it's time we rise one step above! Even a cow has teeth; it kicks as well and may even stab you with its horns. That is why, in spite of our cow-worship, we have not attained perfect self-purification. Otherwise, why would a fiery Shashimohan be a blot on our virtuous culture? So, if we want an imbecile 'self-purification' that is utterly harmless, armless and bereft of any trace of resistance, we should forthwith worship the snail which is teeming with these qualities. For the world is yet to come across a true satyagrahi hero like a snail.

In all sincerity, the snail is superior even to Gandhiji in the noble virtues. Because, even Gandhiji occasionally feels like shedding blood by taking up arms, not of the British but of the Germans. He also actually slaughtered thousands of live germs, growing up in his stomach, causing appendicitis by getting himself operated on. He caused terminal injury to those germs which were like his own 'offspring'. Hence, in keeping with the adage that, 'Even the most bitter truth must be told.', we hereby do the satyagraha of telling that, 'With respect to "harmless, armless and imbecile' self-purity, the snail is superior to Gandhiji.'.

18 - 10 - 1927

12. Non-violent pseudo code

It is indeed a matter of great pleasure that Mahatmaji finally worked out a way for the success of the satyagrah to remove the statue of Neil. Hearing that some oafish volunteer snapped of the leg of the horse of the statue of Neil, all non-violent, non-oppressive heroes felt such intense agony as was not felt even by the stone horse! There is a

legend as to how Lord Buddha became torn with sorrow at the sight of an injured lamb. But that was a live lamb. Anybody may become agitated due to the injury of a live creature. But it takes a true non-violent great hero to feel the pinch when a stone is damaged. Many of these great heroes approached the Master of Non-violence and gave vent to their grief. Commiserating with them the master issued an edict, 'Hence onwards, nobody should carry a hammer to a satyagraha, because a hammer too, is a weapon.' The Indian Penal Code may not have a punishment for it. But the non-violent pseudo code must have. Carrying a weapon itself is sinful. When there was a satyagrah in Nagpur for the right to carry weapons, the Master had said, 'Satyagraha for weapons? The two - satya and weapon can't go together.'

Satyagraha for the right to use weapons implies a gross misuse of the word Satyagraha. The ban on use of weapons is a just one. Like other restrictions in IPC, such as 'Don't steal', 'Don't rob.', 'Don't carry weapons.' too is a restriction; and it is therefore, wrong to violate it according to the science of non-violence.' Therefore, going a step ahead of IPC, the non-violent pseudo code regards any weapon- be it hammer or staff- punishable.

But these non-violent great heroes had a problem, 'Oh Master, machineguns are not available. Hammers, sticks and stones are but you forbid their use! Pray, what shall we carry when we go to the statue of Neil?'

Soon we received the holy edict, 'Carry mud!' The satyagrahi hero should carry mud to Neil's statue and keep on slinging mud-balls at it till the police arrest them. Hearing this decision, all the valiant great heroes in the devout non-violent army became ecstatic. Real great heroes! Though we are not one of those great heroes, we would like to make a suggestion. True, mud won't hurt as much as a hammer will. But how should a man who has espoused the cause of non-violence even throw mud? Because, even mud

could cause harm if it enters the eyes of the statue. Hence, it is our humble submission that the satyagrahi heroes should approach the statue of Neil without even carrying mud and - And just keep on making faces to the statue from a distance. This will be more befitting a pure satyagrahi than slinging mud. Like hammer, stick or stone, mud too is a weapon, and hence should be boycotted as per the pseudo-code of non-violence.

That way, even a hand too, is a weapon, and so, the satyagrahis should cut it off as well before proceeding to a satyagraha. But let's exempt hand. It is of great use in dining and eating fruits such as bananas, oranges or sweet limes!! So, the satyagrahi great heroes should merely make faces before Neil's statue!

10 -1 - 1928

13. Speech and Action

The Satyagraha to remove Neil's statue is going on. Some time back, there was a Satyagraha in Punjab to remove the statue of Lawrence which had some matter insulting Indians engraved below.

'Remove Lawrence's statue or we will forcibly dislodge it; or as Gandhiji has suggested, we will gather the whole of Lahore around it! Just gather! Then you may shoot us. We will die but not retreat.' That's how the talk went on. Just talk!

For this kind of empty talk, a few volunteers were jailed. When the talk grew louder, the police stepped up their bandobast. Gandhiji's crazy plans of gathering the whole of Lahore - men, women and children alike - vanished into blue. The statue of Lawrence won't move, nor the insulting matter on it.

Then there was a guy who said to himself, 'Why gather the whole of Lahore-womenfolk as well- to remove an ordinary statue? So that the police may shoot and we may die? Or everyone should walk up to the police and admit, 'I am here to smash the statue! Arrest me!', then get arrested. Umpteen men rotting in jail just for moving a statue. Some Satyagraha! Just talk!'

In a few days, the English newspapers flashed a news, 'Last night, when the police were napping, a wicked guy crawled up the statue and smashed the sword in its hand and defaced the statue!' Everyone said, 'Now, that is some action!'

That was it! The government thought, 'No statue is better than a defaced one! It first covered it on its own, then installed a new one minus the humiliating remarks.' A single guy did at one go for which the whole Lahore (including womenfolk) was 'prepared' to face guns.

Soon, the people in Madras too were against the Neil statue there. Once again, the protocol of Satyagraha kicked in. Non-violence (Ahimsa) espoused to Satyagraha was bound to join. Here, a problem of a lifetime cropped up. 'Does boxing, slapping or rocking a stone statue amount to violence or non-violence?'

Immediately, the herd of the disciples approached the Master of nonviolence and, prostrating humbly before him, asked, 'o Mahatmaji! To remove Neil's statue is to hurt it. If in course of the flurry of removing or digging for that if the stone is damaged, does it amount to violence? Is hurting a stone a 'no-no' for a non-violent satyagrahi?' Before the Master of Non-violence would ponder over this inscrutable riddle and warn the disciples not to remove the statue except by non-violent means - Another boorish volunteer said to himself, 'Oh! Hurting a stone! Thank God he raised the issue just about Neil's statue! Otherwise, if it were a matter of all

stones, one would have problem even with treading upon the steps on one's home and would be advised to use one's head instead (literally). Worse still, since walking as such involves hurting stones, big or small, in the way there could be a diktat against walking! Some Satyagraha! Just rubbish!

He just grabbed a sledgehammer, got to Neil's statue at night and, with the police off guard, just ripped the leg of the horse off! Everybody said, 'That was some action!!!'

Many more examples of 'speech and act' are taking place. After murdering Swami Shraddhanand, Abdul Rashid said, 'I am eager to go to heaven. Why should I be afraid of death? I killed a kafir, an enemy of my religion!!' this is what he said.

But, when Death knocked at his prison-cell to escort him to heaven and said, 'Let's go, o devout!', he had the fear of his life, he ran fever, he feigned madness but also petitioned like a guy in his senses -pleading for mercy! Ended up black and blue with fright of death! Some action!

Ditto for wish and its fulfillment. When at last, Abdul went to the gallows, the Muslims wished to give this devout martyr a grand farewell befitting a sultan, with fifty thousand Muslims in tow, give him a ritual - and may be, construct a Taj mahal later on. That is so far as the wish goes. But when the Muslims actually grabbed his body and took it out in a procession, some machineguns and bayonets gave them a surprise guard of honour! All the fifty thousand devout soldiers dropped the corpse and took to heels just at the menacing growl of the guns.

Poor Abdul! Nobody could take him out of the death row as promised. He could not even get a decent burial in the cemetery. His body kept on lying on the road for more than an hour, gathering dust like an unclaimed corpse! There was not one in those 50 thousand 'champions of the meek' who could courageously stand by this 'martyr'. In the end the

body was buried by the guards in a place reserved for the burial of thieves, robbers or murderers in the prison. That's how he reached where he truly belonged! Intention was to construct a Taj mahal on the corpse, what was built actually was a prison!!

Abdul Rashid, '*Bhai Abdul Rashid*' as Gandhiji would put it, went to the gallows and 50 thousand Muslims paid him their last respects.

Mahatmaji had said earlier, '*Abdul Rashid acted as an individual. Don't blame all Muslims for it, because Muslims as a whole didn't have support or sympathy for it.*' This is how his words stood the test of time. After all, those were the utterances of a Seer!

Mahatmaji carried on a fast of twenty-one days to create Hindu-Muslim unity. The Muslims immediately celebrated the end of this fast by engineering four major riots from Allahabad to Calcutta. Now the executive committee of the National Congress announced the end of all Hindu- Muslim strife and their full and final unity. Fifty thousand Muslims in Delhi instantly endorsed it with the blood of a Hindu. Now, even Dr. Munje won't be able to accuse the Muslims of disrupting this unity! - 8/12/ 1927

14. But the Movement of Purification won't die out.

One Muslim speaker announced angrily in a Delhi meeting, 'We won't part with Muslim solidarity for sake of Hindus. We will be united with the Muslim nations the world over with the loving bonds of Pan-Islamism.' Good, go ahead! But make sure whether those Muslims all over the world are interested in getting tied with the loving bonds.

Or else, you may land in a pitiable plight where you belong to nowhere!

In the mouthpiece of the educated Muslims, Mr. Fajne Hamid writes, 'I believe that it is a sin to say 'I am Indian first and a Muslim thereafter.'" No problem in saying so. But isn't it ok if a few Muslims say so once in a while to dupe the gullible Hindus?

The readers need not be reminded of a poem published in the newspaper of Hassan Nijami after the assassination of Shradhdhanand, hinting at the cremation of the Purification Movement on the banks of Yamuna:

*(Madan Mohan) Malaviya and (Lala) Lajpat (Rai) have raised a hue and cry. But when both of them come to their senses they will see stars in broad daylight. If we are really worth the salt, we won't rest till we have put the Purification Movement to rest. Look at how the Swami (Shradhdhanand) is silent on the banks of Yamuna after the cremation of the Purification Movement *** (Need to verify.)*

Poet Govindram had a rejoinder to this in 'Hindu Punch' after the assassination of Shradhdhanandaji:

Whether we are beheaded with swords or saws, or bullets are pumped in our chests; we will die following this path, but the Movement of Purification will not die out. O murderer, what did you achieve by slaying Shradhdhanand? Look, now the whole Hindu society has become Shradhdhanand! The Juggernaut of Purification is pushing forward. O Nijami, when the Muslims will become Hindus en masse in a few days it will be you who will see stars in broad daylight! The spirit of the martyrs possesses us! Death you are nonplussed!

The sons of the famous leader of the staunch orthodox Hindu camp, Pandit Deendayal Sharma, used to oppose the reformative activities of the Hindu Mahasabha. But in the last session of the Orthodox Sabha, where both of them were present, the younger one stood up and declared that

Purification is supported by the scriptures and that they will now arrange for the purification of any convert. Well done Panditji, in spite of our differences, we are birds of the same feather!!

Hassan Nijami has threatened the Hindu scavengers of Delhi on strike for salary, that if they continue to harass the Muslims under the pressure of Arya Samaj, he will raise a class in Muslims doing the scavenging job. Not only that, he himself would be the chief scavenger!

Go ahead! The earlier the better! In fact, he should have done this right since he was born. This job suits his born talents more than the work for Tablig.

Some people are surprised to find that Mahatmaji, who had raised a hue and cry for Hindu help for the Khilafat movement during the Anglo- Turkish war, is silent over the outcry in China. But there is really nothing surprising. Turks are Muslims, he was the Caliph of the Indian Muslims; hence it was the duty of the Hindus to help him. But China is Hindu. Is it the duty of a Hindu to help another Hindu?

When the Boers were fighting against the British for their independence, Gandhiji had joined the British camp as their most loyal subject by forming a nursing force. Going a step ahead, when the Germans waged a war to upturn the English diplomacy, the non-violent Gandhiji didn't hesitate to send Indian youth to kill the Germans on behalf of the British. On the same lines, Gandhiji should really form platoons of Indian volunteers to attack the Chinese, on behalf of the British, fighting for their freedom. That he is not doing so is indeed a great favour on China. What more sympathy should he and his disciples shower on China? China is anyway a conscious political and religious ally of Hindusthan; why show it active sympathy? What magnanimity does it show? True magnanimity consists offering support to England against China - the kind that

was displayed in Boer war or the Anglo- German war! And we are sure that, as a result of some 'goodwill visit' to the Viceroy or Governor General, Mahatmaji may display the same in this '*Anglo-China*' war!

'Arjun' has published the news that someone has abducted Abdul Rashid's son. Poor Abdul, this ghost of Shraddhanand won't leave him! Hadn't he orphaned Shraddhanand's son! A witness had stated in the court that the devout Abdul had once beaten his son black and blue after locking themselves in!!!

Jaffer Ali wrote that, since Shraddhanand believed in rebirth, he might have been reborn as a cow now waiting at a butcher's doorstep. But, just now we have received a message from the heaven on the *planchet (check spelling)* informing us that far from it, Shraddhanand has been appointed to purify the Malkana Rajputs and he has founded a Purification Board in the heaven as well and has reverted Jafar Ali's grandfather and great-grandfather to Hinduism! The purification ceremony of Jafar Ali's and Hassan Nizami's fathers was scheduled this week!

At last we have the good news that the Hindu Sabha, which could not till recently be founded in Dharwad despite the efforts of Shri Shankaracharya Dr. Kurtakoti was finally founded after Shraddhanand's murder. But when is it going to be operative? Or, are the people of Dharwad waiting for the murder of another great sannyasin to start the work as they waited for founding the body till one was murdered?

The Tablik (*check spelling*) is after propagating Islam by luring the thieves, robbers and innocent kids and by abducting helpless women. Over there, thousands of Hindu men and women and eminent scientists, poets, writers and princes have voluntarily accepted Krishnamurti - a Hindu Brahmin lad as the incarnation of God are prostrating before him, reading the Bhagavad-Gita! On the one hand you have

the ominous hooting of Hassan Nizami! On the other, the angelic music welcoming the Upanishadic dawn !!!

'Do you want the release of the political detainees in Bengal?', writes Gandhiji seriously in 'Young India', 'Spin the spinning wheel.' Well, we ecstatically spun the wheel instantly. No political detainee was released.

I thought, I must not have spun the wheel for a sufficient period. I have referred the matter to 'Young India'. Most likely the answer will be - 'for the whole of this life, and may be, the next!'

From the Times we gather that, the Japanese have suffered a lot as a result of an earthquake. Similarly, in Mauritius, an entire ship was swept away with the passengers due to a storm. Why don't these people spin the spinning wheel? If a whole army sent to China can be recalled just by spinning a wheel at home, can't one pacify the storms and earthquakes? But *'the people of Maharashtra are devoid of faith'*! And so are the Japanese!!!

After arguing with a doubting Thomas at Shimposhi, Gandhiji told him, 'When people listen to my arguments about Khadi as the means of freedom, they become my followers.' How true? After listening to his irrefutable argument about winning freedom by Khadi, similar to the argument about recalling the army in China by the same wheel, people, far from going ahead, are not even willing to go *with* him. Hence, being mentally crippled due to the crazy arguments, they lag behind - creating a scene of *'followers'*.

There is this news that the revolutionaries have distributed pamphlets in the Indian army in China asking them not to fight against China.

These, of course, are the sporadic cases! When will an epidemic break out?

15. What does Gandhi say?

‘All other princely states, big and small, will ultimately surrender themselves to the supreme might of Nizam and thus Nizam will decorate the throne of India!’

‘I will prefer anarchy to a well organized rule of the British or any other foreigner. Suppose, the states in this country willingly become subalterns of Nizam, or Nizam comes to the throne with the backing of the Muslim tribes on the frontier, then I will welcome such anarchy.’

“If the Nizam becomes the emperor of Hindusthan by subjugating the Hindu states with the help of the tribes on the frontiers, it will be a cent per cent Swaraj. It will be ‘Home Rule’!”

What does Savarkar say?

Even a single handed Shinde on one side will trash the whole Nizam forces on a new Udgir or Kharda battlefield.

The Organizers of the Hindus can't forget that the millions of Hindus from Kashmir to Kanyakumari are charged with the principle of ‘Unity of Hindus.’ In case the Muslims initiate a nation-wide civil war, there is no reason to believe that the Hindu Princes will take it lying down. When all the Hindu kings from Udaypur to Kolhapur and from Mysore to Cochin will attack the Muslim invaders in unison, it will leave no trace of Muslim rule from the Indian Ocean in the south to Yamuna in the north.

During the Anglo-German war in 1914, this very Gandhi had hatched the dangerous plan on behalf of Muslim leaders to invite Amir Amanulla of Afghanistan to invade India.

Swords and cannons define the boundaries and rights of states!