



themselves into a combination that could fight a similar combination of their employees. One-sided technically though our investigation was, we endeavoured to examine the millowners' side, and came to the conclusion that 35 per cent. increase was fair. Before announcing the figure to the millhands we informed the employers of the result of our inquiry and told them that we would correct ourselves if they could show any error. The latter would not co-operate. They sent a reply saying as much, but they pointed out in it that the rate of increase granted by the Government as also the employers in Bombay was much less than the one contemplated by us. I felt that the addendum was beside the point, and at a huge meeting announced 35 per cent. for the millhands' acceptance. Be it noted that the plague bonus amounted to 70 per cent. of their wages and they had declared their intention of accepting not less than 50 per cent. as high prices increase. They were now called upon to accept the mean, finding the mean was quite an accident between the millowners 20 per cent. and their own 50 per cent. After some grumbling, the meeting accepted the 35 per cent. increase it always being understood, that they would recognise at the same time the principle of arbitration whenever the millowners did so. From that time forward, i.e., day after day thousands of people gathered together under the shade of a tree outside the city walls, people walking long distances in many cases and solemnly repeated their determination in the name of God not to accept anything less than 35 per cent. No pecuniary assistance was given them. It is easy enough to understand that many must suffer from the pangs of starvation and that they could not, while they were without employ-



ment, get any credit. We, who were helping them, came, on the other hand to the conclusion that we would only spoil them if we collected public funds and utilised them for feeding them unless the able-bodied amongst them were ready to perform bread-labour. It was a difficult task to persuade men who had worked at machines to shoulder baskets of sand or bricks. They came, but they did so grudgingly. The millowners hardened their hearts. They were equally determined not to go beyond 20 per cent. and they appointed emissaries to persuade the men to give in. Even during the early part of the lockout, whilst we had declined to help those who would not work we had assured them that we would feed and clothe ourselves after feeding and clothing them. Twenty two days had passed by; hunger and the Millowners' emissaries were producing their effect and Satan was whispering to the men that there was no such thing as God on earth who would help them and that vows were dodges resorted to by weaklings. One morning instead of an eager and enthusiastic crowd of 5 to 10 thousand men with determination written on their faces, I met a body of about 2,000 men with despair written on their faces. We had just heard that millhands living in a particular chawl had declined to attend the meeting, were preparing to go to work and accept 20 per cent. increase and were taunting us (I think very properly) that it was very well for us who had motors at our disposal and plenty of food, to attend their meetings and advise staunchness even unto death. What was I to do? I held the cause to be just. I believe in God as I believe that I am writing this letter. I believe in the necessity of the performance of "one's promises" at

all costs. I knew that the men before us were God-fearing men, but that the long-drawn out lockout or strike was putting an undue strain upon them. I had the knowledge before me that during my extensive travels in India, hundreds of people were found who as readily broke their promises as they made them. I knew, too, that the best of us have but a vague and indistinct belief in soul-force and in God. I felt that it was a sacred moment for me, my faith was on the anvil, and I had no hesitation in rising and declaring to the men that a breach of their vow so solemnly taken was unendurable by me and that I would not take any food until they had the 35 per cent. increase given or until they had fallen. A meeting that was up to now unlike the former meetings totally unresponsive, worked up as if by magic. Tears trickled down the cheeks of every one of them and man after man rose up saying that they would never go to the mills unless they got the increase, and that they would go about the city and steel the hearts of those who had not attended the meeting. It was a privilege to witness the demonstration of the efficacy of truth and love. Every one immediately realised that the protecting power of God was as much with us to-day as it used to be in the days of yore. I am not sorry for the vow, but with the belief that I have, I would have been unworthy of the truth undertaken by me if I had done anything less. Before I took the vow, I knew that there were serious defects about it. For me to take such a vow in order to affect in any shape or form the decision of the millowners would be a cowardly injustice done to them, and that I would so prove myself unfit for the friendship which I had the privilege of



enjoying with some of them. I knew that I ran the risk of being misunderstood. I could not prevent my fast from affecting my decision. Their knowledge moreover put a responsibility on me which I was ill able to bear. From now I disabled myself from gaining concessions for the men which ordinarily in a struggle such as this I would be entirely justified in securing. I knew, too, that I would have to be satisfied with the minimum I could get from the millowners and with a fulfilment of the letter of the men's vow rather than its spirit and so hath it happened. I put the defects of my vow in one scale and the merits of it in the other. There are hardly any acts of human beings which are free from all taint. Mine, I know, was exceptionally tainted, but rather the ignominy of having unworthily compromised by my vow, the position and independence of the millowners, than that it should be said by posterity that 10,000 men had suddenly broken a vow which they had for over twenty days solemnly taken and repeated in the name of God. I am fully convinced that no body of men can make themselves into a nation or perform great tasks unless they become as true as steel and unless their promises come to be regarded by the world like the law of the Medes and Persians, inflexible, and unbreakable, and whatever may be the verdict of friends, so far as I can think at present, on given occasions, I should not hesitate in future to repeat the humble performance which I have taken the liberty of describing in this communication.

I cannot conclude this letter without mentioning two names of whom India has every reason to be proud. The millowners were represented by Mr. Ambalal Sarabhai who is a gentleman in every sense of the term. He is a



man of great culture and equally great abilities. He adds to these qualities a resolute will. The millhands were represented by his sister Anusuyabai. She possesses a heart of gold. She is full of pity for the poor. The mill hands adore her. Her word is law with them. I have not known a struggle fought with so little bitterness and such courtesy on either side. This happy result is principally due to the connection with it of Mr. Ambalal Sarabhai and Anusuyabai.

A LETTER TO THE VICEROY

Mr. M. K. Gandhi addressed the following letter to H. E. the Viceroy, Lord Chelmsford, soon after the Delhi War Conference :—

Sir, as you are aware, after careful consideration, I felt constrained to convey to Your Excellency that I could not attend the Conference for reasons stated in the letter of the 26th instant (April), but, after the interview, you were good enough to grant me, I persuaded myself to join it, if for no other cause than certainly out of my great regard for yourself. One of my reasons for abstention and perhaps the strongest, was that Lok. Tilak, Mrs. Besant and the Ali brothers, whom I regard as among the most powerful leaders of public opinion, were not invited to the Conference. I still feel that it was a grave blunder not to have asked them, and I respectfully suggest that that blunder might be possibly repaired if these leaders were invited to assist the Government by giving it the benefit of their advice at the Provincial Conferences, which, I understand, are to follow. I venture to submit that no Government can afford to disregard the leaders, who represent the large



masses of the people as these do, even though they may hold views fundamentally different. At the same time it gives me pleasure to be able to say that the views of all parties were permitted to be freely expressed at the Committees of the Conference. For my part, I purposely refrained from stating my views at the Committee at which I had the honour of serving, or at the Conference itself. I felt that I could best serve the objects of the Conference by simply tendering my support to the resolutions submitted to it, and this I have done without any reservation. I hope to translate the spoken word into action as early as the Government can see its way to accept my offer, which I am submitting simultaneously herewith in a separate letter. 2

I recognise that in the hour of its danger we must give, as we have decided to give ungrudging and unequivocal support to the Empire of which we aspire in the near future to be partners in the same sense as the Dominions Overseas. But it is the simple truth that our response is due to the expectation that our goal will be reached all the more speedily. On that account, even as performance of duty automatically confers a corresponding right, people are entitled to believe that the imminent reforms alluded to in your speech will embody the main general principles of the Congress-League scheme, and I am sure that it is this faith which has enabled many members of the Conference to tender to the Government their full-hearted co-operation. If I could make my countrymen retrace their steps, I would make them withdraw all the Congress resolutions and not whisper "Home Rule" or "Responsible Government" during the pendency of the War. I would make India offer 3



all her able-bodied sons as a sacrifice to the Empire at its critical moment and I know that India, by this very act, would become the most favoured partner in the Empire and racial distinctions would become a thing of the past. But practically the whole of educated India has decided to take a less effective course, and it is no longer possible to say that educated India does not exercise any influence on the masses. I have been coming into most intimate touch with the raiyats ever since my return from South Africa to India, and I wish to assure you that the desire for Home-Rule has widely penetrated them. I was present at the sessions of the last Congress and I was a party to the resolution that full Responsible Government should be granted to British India within a period to be fixed definitely by a Parliamentary Statute. I admit that it is a bold step to take, but I feel sure that nothing less than a definite vision of Home-Rule to be realised in the shortest possible time will satisfy the Indian people. I know that there are many in India who consider no sacrifice is too great in order to achieve the end, and they are wakeful enough to realise that they must be equally prepared to sacrifice themselves for the Empire in which they hope and desire to reach their final status. It follows then that we can but accelerate our journey to the goal by silently and simply devoting ourselves heart and soul to the work of delivering the Empire from the threatening danger. It will be a national suicide not to recognise this elementary truth. We must perceive that if we serve to save the Empire, we have in that very act secured Home Rule

Whilst, therefore, it is clear to me that we should



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

The Conference means for me, and I believe for many of us, a definite step in the consecration of our lives to the common cause, but ours is a peculiar position. We are to day outside the partnership. Ours is a consecration based on hope of better future. I should be untrue to you and to my country if I did not clearly and unequivocally tell you what that hope is. I do not bargain for its fulfilment, but you should know that disappointment of hope means disillusion. There is one thing I may not omit. You have appealed to us to sink domestic differences. If appeal involves the toleration of tyranny and wrong-doings on the part of officials, I am powerless to respond. I shall resist organised tyranny to the uttermost. The appeal must be to the officials that they do not ill-treat a single soul, and that they consult and respect popular opinion as never before. In Champaran by resisting an age-long tyranny, I have shown the ultimate sovereignty of British justice. In Kaira a population that was cursing the Government now feels that it, and not the Government, is the power when it is prepared to suffer for the truth it represents. It is, therefore, losing its bitterness and is saying to itself that the Government must be a Government for people, for it tolerates orderly and respectful disobedience where injustice is felt. Thus Champaran and Kaira affairs



are my direct, definite and special contribution to the War. Ask me to suspend my activities in that direction and you ask me to suspend my life. If I could popularise the use of soul-force, which is but another name for love-force in place of brute force, I know that I could present you with an India that could defy the whole world to its worst. In season and out of season, therefore, I shall discipline myself to express in my life this eternal law of suffering, and present it for acceptance to those who care, and if I take part in any other activity, the motive is two show the matchless superiority of that law.

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

RECRUITING FOR THE WAR

The following is the translation of Mr. M. K. Gandhi's address, delivered at a meeting in the District of Kaira in July 1918.

Sisters and Brothers of Kaira :—You have just come successful out of a glorious Satyagraha campaign. You have, during it, given such evidence of fearlessness,



tact and other virtues that I venture to advise and urge you to undertake a still greater campaign.

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

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

There can be no friendship between the brave and the effeminate. We are regarded as a cowardly people. If we want to become free from that reproach, we should learn the use of arms.

Partnership in the Empire is our definite goal.



We should suffer to the utmost of our ability and even lay down our lives to defend the Empire. If the Empire perishes, with it perish our cherished aspirations.

WAYS AND MEANS OF SWARAJ.

The easiest and the straightest way, therefore, to win Swarajya is to participate in the defence of the Empire. It is not within our power to give much money. Moreover, it is not money that will win the war. Only an inexhaustible army can do it. That army, India can supply. If the Empire wins mainly with the help of our army, it is obvious that we would secure the right we want.

Some will say that if we do not secure those rights just now, we would be cheated of them afterwards. The power acquired in defending the Empire will be the power that can secure those rights. Rights won by making an opportunity of the Empire's weakness are likely to be lost when the Empire gains its strength. We cannot be partners of the Empire by embarrassing it. Embarrassment in its hour of crisis will not avail to secure the rights we needs must win by serving it. To distrust the statesmen of the Empire is to distrust our own strength; it is a sign of our own weakness. We should not depend for our rights on the goodness or the weakness of the statesmen. We should depend on our fitness, our strength. The Native States are helping the empire and they are getting their reward. The rich are rendering full financial assistance to Government and they are likewise getting their reward. The assistance in either case is rendered conditionally. The sepoys are rendering their services for their salt and for their livelihood. They get their livelihood, and pzeris



and honours in addition. All these classes are a part of us, but they cannot be regarded as Home rulers, their goal is not Home Rule. The help they render is not consecrated to the country.

If we seek to win Swarajya in a spirit of hostility, it is possible for the Imperial statesmen to use these three forces against us and defeat us. If we want Swarajya, it is our duty to help the Empire and we shall, undoubtedly, get the reward of their help. If our motive is honest, Government will behave honestly with us. Assuming for a moment that they will not do so, our honesty should make us confident of our success. It is not a mark of greatness to return goodness for goodness only. Greatness lies in returning good for evil.

VALID OBJECTIONS.

Government do not give us commissions in the Army; they do not repeal the Arms Act; they do not open schools for military training. How can we then co-operate with them? These are valid objections. In not granting reforms in these matters, Government are making a serious blunder. The English nation has performed several acts of virtue. For these, God's grace be with it. But the heinous sin perpetrated by the English administrators in the name of that nation will undo the effect of these acts of virtue, if they do not take care betimes. If the worst happens to India, which may God forbid, and she passes into the hands of some other nation, India's piteous cry will make England hang her head in shame before the world, and curses will descend upon her for having emasculated a nation of thirty crores. I believe the statesmen of England have realised this, and they have taken the warning; but they are unable to alter



all of a sudden the situation created by themselves. Every Englishman upon entering India is trained to despise us, to regard himself as our superior and to maintain a spirit of isolation from us. They imbibe these characteristics from their Indian atmosphere. The finer spirits try to get themselves rid of this atmosphere and endeavour to do likewise with the rank and file, but their effort does not bear immediate fruit. If there were no crisis for the Empire, we should be fighting against this domineering spirit. But to sit still at this crisis, waiting for commissions, etc., is like cutting the nose to spite the face. It may happen perchance that we may idle away our time waiting for commissions till the opportunity to help the Empire may be gone.

Even if Government desire to obstruct us in enlisting in the army and rendering other help, by refusing us commissions, or by delay in giving them, it is my firm belief that it is incumbent upon us to insist upon joining the army.

THE NEED FOR MEN.

Government at present want five lakhs of men for the army. This number they are sure to raise some way or the other. If we supply this number, we would cover ourselves with glory, we would be rendering true service and the reports that we often hear of improper recruitment will be a thing of the past. It is no small thing to have the whole work of recruiting in our hands. If the Government have no trust in us, if their intentions are not pure, they would not raise recruits through our agency.

The foregoing argument will show that by enlisting in the army we help the Empire, we qualify ourselves



for Swarajya, we learn to defend India and to a certain extent, regain our lost manhood. I admit it is because of my faith in the English nation that I can advise as I am doing. I believe that, though this nation has done India much harm, to retain connection with that nation is to our advantage. Their virtues seem to me to outweigh their vices. It is miserable to remain in subjection to that nation. The Englishmen have the great vice of depriving a subject nation of its self-respect, but they have also the virtue of treating their equals with due respect and of loyalty towards them. We have seen that they have many times helped those groaning under the tyranny of others. In partnership with them we have to give and receive a great many things to and from each other and our connection with them based on that relationship is likely to benefit the world. If such was not my faith and if I thought it desirable to become absolutely independent of that nation, I would not only not advise co-operation but would certainly advise people to rebel and by paying the penalty of the rebellion, awaken the people. We are not in a position to-day to stand on our own legs unaided and alone. I believe that our good lies in becoming and remaining equal partners of the Empire and I have seen it throughout India that all Home Rulers are of the same belief.

APPEAL TO KAIRA AND GUJARAT.

I expect from Kaira and Gujarat not 500 or 700 recruits but thousands. If Gujarat wants to wipe herself free of the reproach of "effeminate Gujarat", she should be prepared to contribute thousands of sepoys. These must include the educated classes, the Pattidars, the Dharalas, Vaghris and all, and I hope they will fight



side by side as comrades. Unless the educated classes or the 'elite' of the community take the lead, it is idle to expect the other classes to come forward. I believe that those from the educated classes are above the prescribed age, but are able-bodied, may enlist themselves. Their services will be utilised, if not for actual fighting, for many other purposes accessory thereto, and for treating and nursing the sepoys. I hope also that those who have grown-up sons will not hesitate to send them as recruits. To sacrifice sons in the war ought to be a cause not of pain, but of pleasure to brave men. Sacrifice of sons at the crisis will be sacrifice for Swarajya.

To you, my sisters, I request that you will not be startled by this appeal, but will accord it a hearty welcome. It contains the key to your protection and your honour.

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



If we mean to do this, we have no time to lose. I wish the names of the fittest and the strongest in every village will be selected and sent up. I ask this of you, brothers and sisters. To explain things to you, and to clear the many questions that will arise, meetings will be held in important villages. Volunteers will also be sent out.

THE MONTAGU-CHELMSFORD SCHEME

On the publication of the "Report on Constitutional Reforms" by the Rt. Hon. Mr. E. S. Montagu and H. H. Lord Chelmsford, Mr. Gandhi wrote the following letter (dated, July 18, 1918) to the Hon. (now the Rt. Hon. Mr. V. S. Srinivasa Sastri, who had invited him to give an expression of his views on the subject for publication in the "Servant of India." Mr. Gandhi wrote:—

"After all, our standard of measurement must be the Congress-League scheme. Crude though it is, I think that we should with all the vehemence and skill, that we can command, press for the incorporation into it of the essentials of our own.

DOCTRINE OF COMPARTMENTS.

I would, therefore, for instance, ask for the rejection of the doctrine of compartments. I very much fear that the dual system in the Provinces will be fatal to the success of the experiment and as it may be only the success of the experiment that can take us to the next and I hope the final stage, we cannot be too insistent that the idea of reservation should be dropped. One cannot help noticing an unfortunate suspicion of our intentions regarding the



purely British as distinguished from the purely Indian interests. Hence, there is to be seen in the scheme elaborate reservations on behalf of these interests. I think that more than anything else it is necessary to have an honest, frank and straightforward understanding about these interests and for me personally this is of much greater importance than any legislative feat that British talent alone or a combination of British and Indian talent may be capable of performing. I would certainly, in as courteous terms as possible, but equally emphatic say that these interests will be held subservient to those of India as a whole and that therefore they are certainly in jeopardy in so far as they may be inconsistent with the general advance of India. Thus, if I had my way, I would cut down the military expenditure. I would protect local industries by heavily taxing goods that compete against products of our industries and I would reduce to a minimum the British element in our services, retaining only those that may be needed for our instruction and guidance. I do not think that they had or have any claim upon our attention, save by right of conquest. That claim must clearly go by the board as soon as we have awakened to a consciousness of our national existence and possess the strength to vindicate our right to the restoration of what we have lost. To their credit let it be said that they do not themselves advance any claim by right of conquest. One can readily join in the tribute of praise bestowed upon the Indian Civil Service for their proficiency, devotion to duty and great organising ability. So far as material reward is concerned that service has been more than handsomely paid and our gratitude otherwise can be best expressed by assimilating their virtues ourselves.



PRESENT TOP-HEAVY ADMINISTRATION.

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

INDIANS IN CIVIL SERVICE.

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



THE ROWLATT BILLS & SATYAGRAHA

During the debate on the Rowlatt Bills in the Imperial Legislative Council in 1919 Mr. Gandhi toured round the country organising an effective opposition to the passing of the Bills. Despairing of the efficacy of mere Non-official opposition in the Council, Mr. Gandhi inaugurated what is known as the Satyagraha Movement as the only legitimate weapon in the hands of the people, to make their opposition felt. In this connection he published several contributions and spoke on many occasions. An attempt is made in the following pages to record them in the order of dates.

MANIFESTO TO THE PRESS

[In commending the Satyagraha Pledge, Mr. M. K. Gandhi wrote to the Press under date, February 28, 1919 :—]

The step taken is probably the most momentous in the history of India. I give my assurance that it has not been hastily taken. Personally I have passed many sleepless nights over it. I have endeavoured duly to appreciate Government's position, but I have been unable to find any justification for the extraordinary Bills. I have read the Rowlatt Committee's Report. I have gone through the narrative with admiration. Its reading has driven me to conclusions just the opposite of the Committee's. I should conclude from the report that secret violence is confined to isolated and very small parts of India, and to a microscopic body of people. The existence of such men is truly a danger to



society. But the passing of the Bills, designed to affect the whole of India and its people and arming the Government with powers out of all proportion to the situation sought to be dealt with, is a greater danger. The Committee ignore the historical fact that the millions in India are by nature the gentlest on earth.

Now look at the setting of the Bills. Their introduction is accompanied by certain assurances given by the Viceroy regarding the Civil Service and the British commercial interests. Many of us are filled with the greatest misgivings about the Viceregal utterance. I frankly confess I do not understand its full scope and intention. If it means that the Civil Service and the British commercial interests are to be held superior to those of India and its political and commercial requirements, no Indian can accept the doctrine. It can but end in a fratricidal struggle within the Empire. Reforms may or may not come. The need of the moment is a proper and just understanding upon this vital issue. No tinkering with it will produce real satisfaction. Let the great Civil Service Corporation understand that it can remain in India only as its trustee and servant, not in name, but in deed, and let the British commercial houses understand that they can remain in India only to supplement her requirements, and not to destroy indigenous art, trade and manufacture, and you have two measures to replace the Rowlatt Bills.

It will be now easy to see why I consider the Bills to be an unmistakable symptom of a deep-seated disease in the governing body. It needs, therefore, to be drastically treated. Subterranean violence will be the remedy applied by impetuous, hot-headed youths who will have grown impatient of the spirit underlying the Bills and the



circumstances attending their introduction. The Bills must intensify the hatred and ill-will against the State of which the deeds of violence are undoubtedly an evidence. The Indian covenanters, by their determination to undergo every form of suffering make an irresistible appeal to the Government, towards which they bear no ill-will, and provide to the believers in the efficacy of violence, as a means of securing redress of grievances with an infallible remedy, and withal a remedy that blesses those that use it and also those against whom it is used. If the covenanters know the use of this remedy, I fear no ill from it, I have no business to doubt their ability. They must ascertain whether the disease is sufficiently great to justify the strong remedy and whether all milder ones have been tried. They have convinced themselves that the disease is serious enough, and that milder measures have utterly failed. The rest lies in the lap of the gods.

THE PLEDGE

Being conscientiously of opinion that the Bills known as the Indian Criminal Law (Amendment) Bill No. 1 of 1919, and the Criminal Law (Emergency Powers) Bill No. II of 1919, are unjust, subversive of the principle of liberty and justice, and destructive of the elementary rights of individuals on which the safety of the community as a whole and the State itself is based, we solemnly affirm that in the event of these Bills becoming law until they are withdrawn, we shall refuse civilly to obey these laws and such other laws as a committee to be hereafter appointed may think fit and further affirm that in this struggle we will faithfully follow truth and refrain from violence to life, person or property.



SPEECH AT ALLAHABAD

[*Mr. M. K. Gandhi in his speech at Allahabad on the 11th. March, explained the Satyagraha Pledge as follows :—*]

It behoves every one who wishes to take the Satyagraha Pledge to seriously consider all its factors before taking it. It is necessary to understand the principles of Satyagraha, to understand the main features of the Bills known as the Rowlatt Bills and to be satisfied that they are so objectionable as to warrant the very powerful remedy of Satyagraha being applied and, finally, to be convinced of one's ability to undergo every form of bodily suffering so that the soul may be set free and be under no fear from any human being or institution. Once in it, there is no looking back.

Therefore there is no conception of defeat in Stayagrah. A Satyagrahi fights even unto death. It is thus not an easy thing for everybody to enter upon it. It therefore behoves a Stayagrahi to be tolerant of those who do not join him. In reading reports of Satyagraha meetings I often notice that ridicule is poured upon those who do not join our movement. This is entirely against the spirit of the Pledge. In Satyagraha we expect to win over our opponents by self-suffering *i.e.*, by love. The process whereby we hope to reach our goal is by so conducting ourselves as gradually and in an unperceived manner to disarm all opposition. Opponents as a rule expect irritation, even violence from one another when both parties are equally matched. But when Satyagraha comes into play the expecta-



tion is transformed into agreeable surprise in the mind of the party towards whom Satyagraha is addressed till at last he relents and recalls the act which necessitated Satyagraha. I venture to promise that if we act up to our Pledge day after day, the atmosphere around us will be purified and those who differ from us from honest motives, as I verily believe they do, will perceive that their alarm was unjustified. The violationists wherever they may be will realise that they have in Satyagraha a far more potent instrument for achieving reform than violence whether secret or open and that it gives them enough work for their inexhaustible energy. And the Government will have no case left in defence of their measures if as a result of our activity the cult of violence is notably on the wane if it has not entirely died out. I hope therefore that at Satyagraha meetings we shall have no cries of shame, and no language betraying irritation or impatience either against the Government or our countrymen who differ from us and some of whom have for years been devoting themselves to the country's cause according to the best of their ability.

SPEECH AT BOMBAY

[*At the Bombay meeting against the Rowlatt Bills on 14th March, Mr. M. K. Gandhi's speech which was in Gujarati was read out by his secretary. The speech ran as follows:—*]

I am sorry that owing to my illness, I am unable to speak to you myself and have to have my remarks read to you. You will be glad to know that Sanyasi Shrad-dhanandji is gracing the audience to-day by his presence.



He is better known to us as Mahatma Munshiramji, the Governor of Gurukul. His joining our army is a source of strength to us. Many of you have perhaps been keenly following the proceedings of the Viceregal Council. Bill No. 2 is being steamrolled by means of the Official majority of the Government and in the teeth of the unanimous opposition from the Non-Official members. I deem it to be an insult to the latter, and through them to the whole of India. *Satyagraha* has become necessary as much to ensure respect for duly expressed public opinion, as to have the mischievous Bills withdrawn. Grave responsibility rests upon the shoulders of the *Satyagrahis* though, as I have so often said, there is no such thing as defeat in *Satyagraha*, it does not mean that victory can be achieved without *Satyagrahis* to fight for it, i.e., to suffer for it. The use of this matchless force is comparatively a novelty. It is not the same thing as Passive Resistance which has been conceived to be a weapon that can be wielded most effectively only by the strongest minded, and you may depend upon it that six hundred men and women who in this Presidency have signed the Pledge are more than enough for our purpose, if they have strong wills and invincible faith in their mission, and that is in the power of truth to conquer untruth which *Satyagrahis* believe the Bills represent. I use the word 'untruth' in its widest sense. We may expect often to be told—as we have been told already by Sir William Vincent—that the Government will not yield to any threat of Passive Resistance. *Satyagraha* is not a threat, it is a fact; and even such a mighty Government as the Government of India will have to yield if we are true to our Pledge. For the Pledge is



not a small thing. It means a change of heart. It is an attempt to introduce the religious spirit into politics. We may no longer believe in the doctrine of tit for tat : we may not meet hatred by hatred, violence by violence, evil by evil ; but we have to make a continuous and persistent effort to return good for evil. It is of no consequence that I give utterance to these sentiments. Every Satyagrahi has to live up to them. It is a difficult task, but with the help of God nothing is impossible. (Loud Cheers.)

SPEECH AT MADRAS.

[At the meeting held at the Madras Beach on the 18th March, Mr. Gandhi, in responding to the welcome, said :—]

You will forgive me for saying the few words that I want to say just now sitting in the chair. I am under strict medical orders not to exert myself, having got a weak heart. I am, therefore, compelled to have some assistance and to get my remarks read to you. But before I call upon Mr. Desai to read my remarks, I wish to say one word to you. Beware before you sign the Pledge. But if you do, you will see to it that you shall never undo the Pledge you have signed. May God help you and me in carrying out the Pledge.

[Mr. Desai, after a few words of introduction, read the following message :—]

I regret that owing to heart weakness I am unable to speak to you personally. You have no doubt attended many meetings, but those that you have been attending of late are different from the others in that at the meetings to which I have referred some immediate



tangible action, some immediate definite sacrifice has been demanded of you for the purpose of averting a serious calamity that has overtaken us in the shape of what are known as the Rowlatt Bills. One of them Bill No. I, has undergone material alterations and its further consideration has been postponed. In spite, however, of the alteration, it is mischievous enough to demand opposition. The Second Bill has probably at this very moment been finally passed by that Council, for in reality you can hardly call the Bill as having been passed by that august body when all its non-official members unanimously and in strong language opposed it. The Bills require to be resisted not only because they are in themselves bad, but also because Government who are responsible for their introduction have seen fit practically to ignore public opinion and some of its members have made it a boast that they can so ignore that opinion. So far it is common cause between the different schools of thought in the country. I have, however, after much prayerful consideration, and after very careful examination of the Government's standpoint, pledged myself to offer Satyagraha against the Bills, and invited all men and women who think and feel with me to do likewise. Some of our countrymen, including those who are among the best of the leaders, have uttered a note of warning, and even gone so far as to say that this Satyagraha movement is against the best interests of the country. I have naturally the highest regard for them and their opinion. I have worked under some of them. I was a babe when Sir Dinshaw Wacha and Babu Surendranath Bannerji were among the accepted leaders of public opinion in India. Mr.



Sastriar is a politician who has dedicated his all to the country's cause. His sincerity, his probity are all his own. He will yield to no one in the love of the country. There is a sacred and indissoluble tie binding me to him. My upbringing draws me to the signatories of the two Manifestoes. It is not, therefore, without the greatest grief and much searching of heart that I have to place myself in opposition to their wishes. But there are times when you have to obey a call which is the highest of all, *i.e.*, the voice of conscience even though such obedience may cost many a bitter tear, nay even more, separation from friends, from family, from the state to which you may belong, from all that you have held as dear as life itself. For this obedience is the law of our being. I have no further and other defence to offer for my conduct. My regard for the signatories to the Manifesto remains undiminished, and my faith in the efficiency of Satyagraha is so great that I feel that if those who have taken the Pledge will be true to it, we shall be able to show to them that they will find when we have come to the end of this struggle that there was no cause for alarm or misgivings. There is, I know, resentment felt even by some Satyagrahis over the Manifestoes. I would warn Satyagrahis that such resentment is against the spirit of Satyagraha. I would personally welcome an honest expression of difference of opinion from any quarter and more so from friends because it puts us on our guard. There is too much recrimination, innuendo and insinuation in our public life, and if the Satyagraha movement purges it of this grave defect, as it ought to, it will be a very desirable by-product. I wish further to suggest to Satyagrahis that any resentment of the two Manifestoes would be



but a sign of weakness on our part. Every movement, and Satyagraha most of all, must depend upon its own inherent strength, but not upon the weakness or silence of its critics.

Let us, therefore, see wherein lies the strength of Satyagraha. As the name implies it is in an insistence on truth which dynamically expressed means love; and by the law of love we are required not to return hatred for hatred, violence for violence but to return good for evil. As Shrimati Sarojini Devi told you yesterday the strength lies in a definite recognition of the true religious spirit and action corresponding to it, and when once you introduce the religious element in politics, you revolutionise the whole of your political outlook. You achieve reform then not by imposing suffering on those who resist it, but by taking the suffering upon yourselves and so in this movement we hope by the intensity of our sufferings to affect and alter the Government's resolution not to withdraw these objectionable Bills. It has, however, been suggested that the Government will leave the handful of Satyagrahis severely alone and not make martyrs of them. But there is here, in my humble opinion, bad logic and an unwarranted assumption of fact. If Satyagrahis are left alone, they have won a complete victory, because they will have succeeded in disregarding the Rowlatt Bills and even other laws of the country, and in having thus shown that a civil disobedience of a Government is held perfectly harmless. I regard the statement as an unwarranted assumption of fact, because it contemplates the restriction of the movement only to a handful of men and women. My experience of Satyagraha leads me to believe that it is such a potent force that, once set in motion, it



ever spreads till at last it becomes a dominant factor in the community in which it is brought into play, and if it so spreads, no Government can neglect it. Either it must yield to it or imprison the workers in the movement. But I have no desire to argue. As the English proverb says, the proof of the pudding lies in the eating. The movement, for better or for worse, has been launched. We shall be judged not by our words, but solely by our deeds. It is, therefore, not enough that we sign the Pledge. Our signing it is but an earnest of our determination to act up to it, and if all who sign the Pledge, act according to it, I make bold to promise that we shall bring about the withdrawal of the two Bills and neither the Government nor our critics will have a word to say against us. The cause is great, the remedy is equally great; let us prove worthy of them both.

APPEAL TO THE VICEROY

A public meeting of the citizens of Madras was held on March 20, 1919, at the Beach opposite the Presidency College, Madras, to appeal to the Viceroy to withhold his assent to the Rowlatt Act and to convey to Mr. M. K. Gandhi their profound and respectful thanks for the trouble he had taken to visit Madras in order to strengthen the Satyagraha movement. Mr. M. K. Gandhi did not attend owing to ill-health. Mr. Desai read the following message from Mr. M. K. Gandhi.

Friends,—This afternoon I propose to deal with some of the objections that have been raised against Satyagraha. After saying that it was a matter of regret that men like myself "should have embarked on this movement," Sir Wm. Vincent, in winding up



the debate on Bill No. 2, said, "they could only hope that (the Satyagraha) would not materialise. Mr. Gandhi might exercise great self-restraint in action, but there would be other young hot-headed men who might be led into violence which could not but end in disaster. Yielding to this threat, however, would be tantamount to complete abolition of the authority of the Governor-General-in-Council." If Sir William's fear as to violence is realised, it would undoubtedly be a disaster. It is for every Satyagrahi to guard against that danger. I entertain no such fear because our creed requires us to eschew all violence and to resort to truth and self-suffering, as the only weapons in our armoury. Indeed the Satyagraha movement is, among other things, an invitation to those who believe in the efficiency of violence for redress of grievances to join our ranks and honestly to follow our methods. I have suggested elsewhere that what the Rowlatt Bills are intended to do and what I verily believe they are bound to fail in achieving is exactly what the Satyagraha movement is pre-eminently capable of achieving. By demonstrating to the party of violence the infallible power of Satyagraha and by giving them ample scope for their inexhaustible energy, we hope to wean that party from the suicidal method of violence. What can be more potent than an absolute statement, accompanied by corresponding action, presented in the clearest terms possible that violence is never necessary for the purpose of securing reforms? Sir William says that the movement has great potentialities of evil. The Hon. Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya is said to have retorted, "and also of good." I would venture to improve upon

the retort by saying, "only of good." It constitutes an attempt to revolutionize politics and to restore moral force to its original station. After all, the Government do not believe in an entire avoidance of violence *i.e.*, physical force. The message of the West, which the Government of India, I presume, represent, is succinctly put by President Wilson in his speech delivered to the Peace Conference at the time of introducing the League of Nations Covenant. "Armed force is in the background in this programme, but it is in the background, and if the moral force of the world will not suffice, physical force of the world shall." We hope to reverse the process, and by our action show that physical force is nothing compared to the moral force, and that moral force never fails. It is my firm belief that this is the fundamental difference between modern civilisation and the ancient of which India, fallen though it is, I venture to claim, is a living representative. We, her educated children, seem to have lost faith in this—the grandest doctrine of life. If we could but restore that faith in the supremacy of Moral Force, we shall have made a priceless contribution to the British Empire, and we shall, without fail, obtain the reforms we desire and to which we may be entitled. Entertaining such views it is not difficult for me to answer Sir William's second fear as to the complete abolition of the authority of the Governor-General-in-Council. This movement is undoubtedly designed, effectively to prove to the Government that its authority is finally dependant upon the will of the people and not upon force of arms, especially when that will is expressed in terms of Satyagraha. To yield to a clear moral force cannot but enhance the prestige and the dignity of the yielder.



It is to such a movement that every man and woman in this great country is invited, but a movement that is intended to produce far-reaching results, and which depends, for success, on the purity and the capacity for self-suffering of those who are engaged in it, can only be joined after a searching and prayerful self-examination. I may not too often give the warning I have given at Satyagraha meetings that everyone should think a thousand times before coming to it, but having come to it he must remain in it, cost what it may. A friend came to me yesterday, and told me that he did not know that it meant all that was explained at a gathering of a few Satyagrahi friends and wanted to withdraw. I told him that he could certainly do so if he had signed without understanding the full consequences of the pledge. And I would ask everyone who did not understand the pledge as it has been explained at various meetings to copy this example. It is not numbers so much as quality that we want. Let me therefore note down the qualities required of a Satyagrahi. He must follow truth at any cost and in all circumstances. He must make a continuous effort to love his opponents. He must be prepared to go through every form of suffering, whether imposed upon him by the Government which he is civilly resisting for the time being, or only those who may differ from him. This movement is thus a process of purification and penance. Believe me that, if we go through it in the right spirit, all the fears expressed by the Government and some of our friends will be proved to be groundless and we will not only see the Rowlatt Bills withdrawn, but the country will recognise in Satyagraha a powerful and religious weapon for securing reforms and redress of legitimate grievances.



THE SATYAGRAHA DAY

Mr. M. K. Gandhi published the following under date, 23rd March, during his stay in Madras :—

Satyagraha, as I have endeavoured to explain at several meetings, is essentially a religious movement. It is a process of purification and penance. It seeks to secure reforms or redress of grievances by self-suffering. I therefore venture to suggest that the second Sunday after the publication of the Viceregal assent to Bill No. 2 of 1919 (*i.e.*, 6th April) may be observed as a day of humiliation and Prayer. As there must be an effective public demonstration in keeping with the character of the observance, I beg to advise as follows :

- (i) A twenty-four hours' fast, counting from the last meal on the preceding night, should be observed by all adults, unless prevented from so doing by consideration of religion or health. The fast is not to be regarded, in any shape or form, in the nature of a hunger-strike, or as designed to put any pressure upon the Government. It is to be regarded, for all Satyagrahis, as the necessary discipline to fit them for civil disobedience contemplated in their Pledge, and for all others, as some slight token of the intensity of their wounded feelings.
- (ii) All work, except such as may be necessary in the public interest, should be suspended for the day. Markets and other business places should be closed. Employees who are



required to work even on Sundays may only suspend work after obtaining previous leave.

I do not hesitate to recommend these two suggestions for adoption by public servants. For though it is unquestionably the right thing for them not to take part in political discussion and gatherings, in my opinion they have an undoubted right to express, upon vital matters, their feelings in the very limited manner herein suggested.

- (iii) Public meetings should be held on that day in parts of India, not excluding villages, at which resolutions praying for the withdrawal of the two measures should be passed.

If my advice is deemed worthy of acceptance, the responsibility will lie in the first instance, on the various Satyagraha Associations, for undertaking the necessary work of organisation, but all other associations will, I hope, join hands in making this demonstration a success.

SATYAGRAHA DAY IN MADRAS

Under the auspices of Madras Satyagraha Sabha, a public meeting was held at the Triplicane Beach on 30th March to explain the message of Mr. M. K. Gandhi for the observance of the Satyagraha Day :—

I am sorry that I shall not be with you for this evening's meeting, as I must take the train for Bezwada in order to keep my engagement with our Andhra friends. But before my departure, I would like to reduce to writing my impressions of the tour through the southern part of the Presidency, which I have just



completed, and to answer some criticism and some doubts that have been offered by friends.

I have visited Tanjore, Trichnopoly, Madura, Tuticorin and Negapatam ; and taking the lowest estimate, the people addressed must have been not less than thirty thousand. Those who have a right to give us warnings, to express misgivings and who have just as great a love of the Motherland as we claim to have, have feared the danger that, however well-meaning we may be, and however anxious we may be to avoid violence, the people who may join the movement under an enthusiastic impulse may not be able to exercise sufficient self-control and break out into violence, resulting in needless loss of life, and, what is more, injury to the National cause. After embarking upon the movement, I began addressing meetings at Delhi. I passed then through Lucknow, Allahabad, Bombay, and thence to Madras. My experience of all these meetings shows that the advent of Satyagraha has already altered the spirit of those who attend the Stayagraha meetings. In Lucknow, upon an innocent remark by the chairman as to the Manifesto signed by some of the members of the Imperial Legislative Council disapproving of our movement, the audience cried out 'shame, shame!' I drew their attention to the fact that Satyagrahis and those who attended Satyagraha meetings should not use such expressions and that the speeches at our meetings ought not to be punctuated with either marks of disapproval or of approval. The audience immediately understood the spirit of my remarks and never afterwards made any demonstration of their opinion. In the towns of this Presidency as elsewhere, whilst it is true that the large crowds have refrained from any noisy demonstra-



tion out of regard for my health, they have fully understood the necessity of refraining from it on the higher ground. The leaders in the movement have also fully understood the necessity for self-restraint. These experiences of mine fill me with the greatest hope for the future. I never had any apprehensions of the danger our friends feared and the various meetings I have described confirm my optimism but I would venture further to state that every precaution that is humanly possible is being and will be taken to avert any such danger. It is for that reason that our Pledge commits the signatories to a breach of those laws that may be selected for the purpose by a Committee of Satyagrahis, and I am glad that our Sind friends have understood their Pledge and obeyed the prohibition of the Hyderabad Commissioner of Police to hold their inoffensive procession, for it is no part of the present movement to break all the laws of the land the breach of which is not inconsistent with the Pledge. A Satyagrahi is nothing if not instinctively law-abiding, and it is his law-abiding nature which exacts from him implicit obedience to the highest law that is the voice of conscience which over-rides all other laws. His civil disobedience even of certain laws is only seeming disobedience. Every law gives the subject an option either to obey the primary sanction or the secondary, and I venture to suggest that the Satyagrahi by inviting the secondary sanction obeys the law. He does not act like the ordinary offender who not only commits a breach of the laws of the land whether good or bad but wishes to avoid the consequences of that breach. It will seem, therefore, that every thing that prudence may dictate has been done to avoid any untoward results. Some friends have said : " We under-



stand your breach of the Rowlatt legislation but as a Satyagrahi there is nothing for you in it to break. How can you however break the other laws which you have hitherto obeyed and which may also be good!" So far as good laws are concerned, that is, laws which lay down moral principles, the Satyagrahi may not break them and their breach is not contemplated under the Pledge. But the other laws are neither good nor bad, moral or immoral. They may be useful or may even be harmful. Those laws, one obeys for the supposed good Government of the country. Such laws are laws made for the purpose of revenue, or political laws creating statutory offences. Those laws enable the Government to continue its power. When therefore a Government goes wrong to the extent of hurting the National fibre itself, as does the Rowlatt Legislation, it becomes the right of the subject, indeed it is his duty, to withdraw his obedience to such laws to the extent it may be required in order to bend the Government to the National will. A doubt has been expressed during my tour and my friends have written to me as to the validity in terms of Satyagraha of the entrustment of the selection of the laws for breach to a Committee. For it is argued that it amounts to a surrender of one's conscience to leave such selection to others. This doubt misunderstands the Pledge. A signatory of the Pledge undertakes, so far as he is concerned, to break if necessary all the laws which it would be lawful for the Satyagrahi to break. It is not however obligatory on him to break all such laws. He can therefore perfectly conscientiously leave the selection of the laws to be broken to the judgment of those who are experts in the matter and who in their turn are necessarily subject to



the limitations imposed by the Pledge. The worst that can happen to any signatory is that the selection may not be exhaustive enough for him.

I have been told that I am diverting the attention of the country from the one and only thing that matters, namely, the forthcoming reforms. In my opinion the Rowlatt Legislation, in spite of the amendments which, as the Select Committee very properly says, does not affect its principles, blocks the way to progress and therefore to attainment of substantial reforms. To my mind the first thing needful is to claim a frank and full recognition of the principle that public opinion properly expressed shall be respected by the Government. I am no believer in the doctrine that the same power can at the same time trust and distrust, grant liberty and repress it. I have a right to interpret the coming reforms by the light that the Rowlatt Legislation throws upon them, and I make bold to promise that if we do not gather sufficient force to remove from our path this great obstacle in the shape of the Rowlatt legislation, we shall find the reforms to be a whitened sepulchre. Yet another objection to answer. Some friends have argued: "Your Satyagraha movement only accentuates the fear we have of the onrush of Bolshevism." The fact, however, is that, if anything can possibly prevent this calamity descending upon our country, it is Satyagraha. Bolshevism is the necessary result of modern materialistic civilisation. Its insensate worship of matter has given rise to a school which has been brought up to look upon materialistic advancement as the goal and which has lost all touch with the final things of life. Self-indulgence is the Bolshevist creed, self-restraint is the Satyagraha creed. If I can but induce the



Nation to accept Satyagraha if only as a predominant factor in life, whether social or political, we need have no fear of the Bolshevist propaganda. In asking the Nation to accept Satyagraha, I am asking for the introduction in reality of nothing new. I have coined a new word for an ancient law that has hitherto mainly governed our lives, and I do prophesy that if we disobey the law of the final supremacy of the spirit over matter, of liberty and love over brute force, in a few years time we shall have Bolshevism rampant in this land which was once so holy.

MESSAGE TO SATYAGRAHIS

On April 3, 1919, Mr. M. K. Gandhi sent the following message from Bombay to Mr. S. Kasturiranga Iyengar, Editor of the Hindu, Madras :—

Just arrived, having missed connection at Secunderabad.

Regarding the meeting at Delhi, I hope that the Delhi Tragedy will make Satyagrahis steel their hearts and the waverers to reconsider their position. I have no shadow of doubt that, by remaining true to the Pledge, we shall not only secure the withdrawal of the Rowlatt Legislation, but we shall kill the spirit of terrorism lying behind.

I hope the speeches on Sunday, the 6th April, will be free from anger or unworthy passion. The cause is too great and sacred to be damaged by exhibition of passion. We have no right to cry out against sufferings self-invited. Undoubtedly there should be no coercion for the suspension of business or for fast.



THE DELHI INCIDENT

Mr. M. K. Gandhi sent the following letter to the Press from Bombay under date 4th April, 1919:—

It is alleged against the Delhi people assembled at the Delhi Railway Station (1) that some of them were trying to coerce sweetmeat sellers into closing their stalls; (2) that some were forcibly preventing people from plying tramcars and other vehicles; (3) that some of them threw brickbats; (4) that the whole crowd that marched to the Station demanded the release of men who were said to be coercers and who were for that reason arrested at the instance of the Railway authorities; (5) that the crowd declined to disperse when the Magistrate gave orders to disperse. I have read Sanyasi Swami Shradhanandji's account of the tragedy. I am bound to accept it as true, unless it is authoritatively proved to be otherwise and his account seems to me to deny the allegations, 1, 2 and 3. But assuming the truth of all allegations it does appear to me that the local authorities in Delhi have made use of a Nasmyth hammer to crush a fly. On their action, however, in firing on the crowd, I shall seek another opportunity of saying more. My purpose in writing this letter is merely to issue a note of warning to all Satyagrahis. I would, therefore, like to observe that the conduct described in the allegations 1 to 4, if true, would be inconsistent with the Satyagraha Pledge. The conduct described in allegations can be consistent with the Pledge, but if the allegation is true, the conduct was premature, because the Committee contemplated in the Pledge, has not



decided upon the disobedience of orders that may be issued by the Magistrates under the Riot Act. I am anxious to make it as clear as I can that in this movement no pressure can be put upon people who do not wish to accept our suggestions and advice, the movement being essentially one to secure the greatest freedom for all Satyagrahis, cannot forcibly demand release of those who might be arrested, whether justly or unjustly. The essence of the Pledge is to invite imprisonment and until the Committee decides upon the breach of the Riot Act, it is the duty of Satyagrahis to obey, without making the slightest ado, Magisterial orders to disperse, etc., and thus to demonstrate their law-abiding nature. I hope that the next Sunday at Satyagraha meetings, all speeches will be free from passion, anger or resentment. The movement depends for its success entirely upon perfect self-possession, self-restraint, absolute adherence to truth and unlimited capacity for self-suffering. Before closing this letter, I would add that, in opposing the Rowlatt Legislation, Satyagrahis are resisting the spirit of terrorism which lies behind it and of which it is a most glaring symptom. The Delhi tragedy imposes an added responsibility upon Satyagrahis of steeling their hearts and going on with their struggle until the Rowlatt Legislation is withdrawn.

MESSAGE TO MADRAS SATYAGRAHIS

The following message from Mr. M. K. Gandhi was read at the great meeting in Madras held on the Satyagraha Day on 6th April:—

I do hope that the Presidency that produced beautiful Valliamma, Nagappan, Narayanaswami and so many



others of your Presidency with whom I was privileged to work in South Africa will not quail in the presence of sacrifice demanded of us all. I am convinced that reforms will be of no avail, unless our would-be partners respect us. And we know that they only respect those who are capable of sacrificing for ideals, as themselves. See how unstintingly they poured out treasure and blood during the War. Ours is a nobler cause, and our means infinitely superior, in that we refrain from shedding blood, other than our own.

MESSAGE TO THE BOMBAY CITIZENS

At the Satyagraha Demonstrations in Bombay on 6th April, Mr. M. K. Gandhi referred to the Delhi incident and pointed out :—

We have two authoritative versions of the episode. One was Swami Shradhanandji's stating the peoples' version, and the other was Government's, justifying the action of the local authorities. The two did not tally; they differed as to some main particulars. An impartial observer will regard both as partial statements. I beg of the popular party to assume for purposes of criticism the truth of the official narrative, but there are remarkable gaps in it amounting to the evasion of charges made against the local authorities by Sanyasi Shradhanandji. His statement was the first in the field, and he was on the scene immediately after the shooting incident near the Railway Station. If the Government have sought the co-operation of the National Leaders to regulate the crowd, there would not have been any need for the display or use of military force. Even if the official version was correct, there was no justification to



fire on the innocent people. The people were entirely unarmed, and at the worst what would they have done? In any other place but India, the Police would have been deemed sufficient to meet an emergency of the Delhi type, armed with nothing more than batons. He related how in 1917, at Durban, a mob of 6,000 Europeans bent upon lynching an innocent victim threatened the destruction of property worth £ 20,000, including the lives of nearly twenty men, women and children, and a dozen Police, though they would have been justified in calling Military aid, contended with the crowd themselves and succeeded in peacefully dispersing it. The Delhi crowd had no such intention of hurting any body. It threatened to do nothing except, as alleged, it refused to disperse. The authorities could have peacefully regulated the crowd; instead they followed the customary practice of calling the Military on the slightest pretext. He did not want to labour on the point. It was enough the crowd hurt nobody and were neither overawed nor infuriated. It was a remarkable incident that the people were sufficiently firm and self-possessed to hold a mass meeting of 40,000 after the shooting incidents, and it covered the Delhi people with glory. He has always emphasised that the people who took part in the struggle against the Rowlatt Act will be self-possessed and peaceful, but he has never said that the people will not have to suffer. Mr. Gandhi further said that to the satyagrahis such suffering must be welcome. The sterner they were the better. They have undertaken to suffer unto death. Sanyasi Shradhanandji has wired saying that 4 Mahommadans and 5 Hindus have so far died, and that about 20 people were missing and 13 persons were in



the hospital, being badly wounded. For Satyagrahis it was not a bad beginning. No country had ever risen, no nation had ever been made without sacrifice, and we were trying an experiment of building up ourselves by self-sacrifice without resorting to violence in any shape or form. That was a Satyagrahi. From Satyagraha standpoint the people's case in Delhi was weak, in that the crowd refused to disperse when asked to do so, and demanded the release of the two arrested men. Both acts were wrong. It was arrest and imprisonment they sought for by resorting to civil disobedience. In this movement it was open to Satyagrahis to disobey only those laws which are selected by the Committee contemplated in the Pledge. Before being able to offer effective civil disobedience, we must acquire habits of discipline, self-control and qualities of leadership and obedience. Till these qualities were developed and till the spirit of Satyagraha has permeated large bodies of men and women, Mr. Gandhi said he had advised that only such laws as can be individually disobeyed should be selected for disobedience, as, while disobeying certain selected laws, it was incumbent on the people to show their law-abiding character by respecting all the other laws.



DISTRIBUTION OF PROHIBITED LITERATURE

The Satyagraha Committee advised that, for the time being, laws regarding prohibited literature and registration of Newspapers may be civilly disobeyed. Accordingly Mr. Gandhi, President, and Secretaries of the Satyagraha Sabha, Bombay, issued on April 7, the following notice to organise, regulate and control the sale of these publications :—

Satyagrahis should receive copies of prohibited literature for distribution. A limited number of copies can be had from the Secretaries of the Satyagraha Sabha. Satyagrahis should, so far as possible, write their names and addresses as sellers so that they may be traced easily when wanted by the Government for prosecution. Naturally there can be no question of secret sale of this literature. At the same time, there should be no forwardness either in distributing it. It is open to Satyagrahis to form small groups of men and women to whom they may read this class of literature. The object in selecting prohibited literature is not merely to commit a civil breach of the law regarding it but it is also to supply people with clean literature of a high moral value. It is expected that the Government will confiscate such. Satyagrahis have to be as independent of finance as possible. When therefore copies are confiscated, Satyagrahis are requested to make copies of prohibited literature themselves or by securing the assistance of willing friends and to make use of it until it is confiscated by giving readings to the people from it. It



is stated that such readings would amount to dissemination of prohibited literature. When whole copies are exhausted by dissemination or confiscation, Satyagrahis may continue civil disobedience by writing out and distributing extracts from accessible books.

CIRCULATING UNREGISTERED NEWSPAPERS

Regarding the civil breach of the law governing the publication of newspapers, the idea is to publish in every Satyagraha centre a written newspaper without registering it. It need not occupy more than one side of half a foolscap. When such a newspaper is edited, it will be found how difficult it is to fill up half a sheet. It is a well known fact that a vast majority of newspapers contain much padding. Further, it cannot be denied that newspaper articles written under the terror of the very strict newspaper law have a double meaning. A Satyagrahi for whom punishments provided by law have lost all terror can give only in an unregistered newspaper his thoughts and opinion unhampered by any other consideration than that of his own conscience. His newspaper, therefore, if otherwise well edited, can become a most powerful vehicle for transmitting pure ideas in a concise manner, and there need be no fear of inability to circulate a hand-written newspaper, for it will be the duty of those who may receive the first copies to recopy till at last the process of multiplication is made to cover if necessary the whole of the masses of India and it must not be forgotten that we have in India the tradition of imparting instruction by oral teaching. ✓



MESSAGE AFTER ARREST

Mr. Gandhi was arrested at Kosi on his way to Delhi on the morning of the 10th April and served with an order not to enter the Punjab and the District of Delhi and to restrict himself to the Bombay Presidency. The officer serving the order treated him most politely, assuring him it would be his most painful duty to arrest him, if he elected to disobey, but that there would be no ill-will between them. Mr. Gandhi smilingly said that he must elect to disobey as it was his duty, and that the officer ought also to do what was his duty. Mr. Gandhi then dictated the following message to Mr. Desai, his Secretary, laying special emphasis on his oral message that none shall resent his arrest or do anything tainted with untruth or violence which is sure to draw the sacred cause. The message reads :—

To my countrymen. It is a matter of the highest satisfaction to me, as I hope to you, that I have received an order from the Punjab Government not to enter that Province and another from the Delhi Government not to enter Delhi, while an order of the Government of India has been served on me immediately after which restricts me to Bombay. I had no hesitation in saying to the officer, who served the order on me, that I was bound in virtue of the pledge to disregard it, which I have done, and I shall presently find myself a free man, my body being taken by them in their custody. It was galling to me to remain free whilst the Rowlatt Legislation disfigured the Statute Book. My arrest makes me free. It now remains for you to do your duty



which is clearly stated in the Satyagraha Pledge. Follow it, and you will find it will be your *Kamadhenu*. I hope there will be no resentment about my arrest. I have received what I was seeking either withdrawal of the Rowlatt Legislation or imprisonment. A departure from truth by a hair's breadth, or violence committed against anybody, whether Englishman or Indian, will surely damn the great cause the Satyagrahis are handling. I hope the Hindu-Muslim unity, which seems now to have taken firm hold of the people, will become a reality and I feel convinced that it will only be a reality if the suggestions I have ventured to make in my communication to the Press are carried out. The responsibility of the Hindus in the matter is greater than that of Muhammadans, they being in a minority and I hope they will discharge their responsibility in the manner worthy of their country. I have also made certain suggestions regarding the proposal of the Swadeshi vow. Now I commend them to your serious attention and you will find that, as your ideas of Satyagraha become natured, the Hindu-Muslim unity is but part of Satyagraha. Finally it is my firm belief that we shall obtain salvation only through suffering and not by reforms dropping on us from England, no matter how unstintingly they might be granted. The English are a great Nation, but the weaker also go to the wall if they come in contact with them. When they are themselves courageous they have borne untold sufferings and they only respond to courage and sufferings and partnership with them is only possible after we have developed an indomitable courage and a faculty for unlimited suffering. There is a fundamental difference between their civilisation



and ours. They believe in the doctrine of violence or brute force as the final arbiter. My reading of our civilisation is that we are expected to believe in Soul Force or Moral Force as the final arbiter and this is Satyagraha. We are groaning under sufferings which we would avoid if we could, because we have swerved from the path laid down for us by our ancient civilisation. I hope that the Hindus, Muhammadans, Sikhs, Parsis, Christians, Jews and all who are born in India or who made India their land of adoption will fully participate in these National observances and I hope too that women will take therein as full a share as the men.

THE "SATYAGRAHI"

The unregistered newspaper, the "Satyagrahi", which Mr. Gandhi as Editor brought out in Bombay on the 7th April in defiance of the Press Act, was only a small sheet of paper sold for one pice. It stated among other things: "The editor is liable at any moment to be arrested, and it is impossible to ensure the continuity of publication until India is in a happy position of supplying editors enough to take the place of those who are arrested. It is not our intention to break for all time the laws governing the publication of newspapers. This paper will, therefore, exist so long only as the Rowlatt Legislation is not withdrawn." It also contained the following instruction to Satyagrahis:—

We are now in a position to expect to be arrested at any moment. It is, therefore, necessary to bear in mind that, if any one is arrested, he should, without causing any difficulty, allow himself to be arrested, and, if sum-



moned to appear before a Court, he should do so. No defence should be offered and no pleaders engaged in the matter. If a fine is imposed with the alternative of imprisonment, the imprisonment should be accepted. If only fine is imposed, it ought not to be paid; but his property, if he has any, should be allowed to be sold. There should be no demonstration of grief or otherwise made by the remaining Satyagrahis by reason of the arrest and imprisonment of their comrade. It cannot be too often repeated that we court imprisonment, and we may not complain of it, when we actually receive it. When once imprisoned, it is our duty to conform to all prison regulations, as prison reform is no part of our campaign at the present moment. A Satyagrahi may not resort to surreptitious practices. All that the Satyagrahis do, can only and must be done openly. ✓

SATYAGRAHA AND DURAGRAHA.

Mr. Gandhi arrived in Bombay, on the afternoon of the 11th April, having been prevented from entering the Provinces of Punjab and Delhi. An order was soon after served on him requiring him to confine his activities within the limits of the Bombay Presidency. Having heard of the riots and the consequent bloodshed in different places, he caused the following message to be read at all the meetings that evening:—

I have not been able to understand the cause of so much excitement and disturbance that followed my detention. It is not Satyagraha. It is worse than Duragraha. Those who join Satyagraha demonstrations were bound one and all to refrain at all hazard