

Chapter 12 Anticolonialism, Nationalism, and Revolution • 435

in all justice that a crushing burden would be imposed on Turkey, on her existence; her entire resources and all her forces would be placed at the disposal of the Caliph? . . .

I made statements everywhere, that were necessary to dispel the uncertainty and anxiety of the people concerning this question of the Caliphate. . . . I gave the people to understand that neither Turkey nor the handful of men she possesses could be placed at the disposal of the Caliph so that he might fulfill the mission attributed to him, namely, to found a State comprising the whole of Islam. The Turkish nation is incapable of undertaking such an irrational mission.

For centuries our nation was guided under the influence of these erroneous ideas. But what has been the result of it? Everywhere they have lost millions of men. "Do you know," I asked, "how many sons of Anatolia have perished in the scorching deserts of the Yemen? Do you know the losses we have suffered in holding Syria and Iraq and Egypt and in maintaining our position in Africa? And do you see what has come out of it? Do you know? . . .

"New Turkey, the people of New Turkey, have no reason to think of anything else but their own existence and their own welfare. She has nothing more to give away to others." . . .

[The Suppression of the Progressive Republicans]

As you know, it was at the time that the members of the opposition had founded a party under the name of "Republican Progressive Party" and published its program. . . .

Under the mask of respect for religious ideas and dogmas the new Party addressed itself to the people in the following words:

"We want the re-establishment of the Caliphate; we do not want new laws; we are satisfied with the religious law; we shall protect the Medressas, the Tekkes, the pious institutions, the Softahs, the Sheikhs⁴ and their disciples. Be on our side; the party of Mustafa Kemal, having abolished the Caliphate, is breaking Islam into ruins; they will make you into unbelievers. . . ."

Read these sentences, Gentlemen, from a letter written by one of the adherents of this program: . . . "They are attacking the very principles which perpetuate the existence of the Muslim world. . . . The assimilation with the Occident means the destruction of our history, our civilization. . . ." Gentlemen, facts and events have proved that the program of the Republican Progressive Party has been the work emanating from the brain of traitors. This Party became the refuge and the point of support for reactionary and rebellious elements. . . .

The Government and the Committee found themselves forced to take extraordinary measures. They caused the law regarding the restoration of order to be proclaimed, and the Independence Courts to take action. For a considerable time they kept eight or nine divisions of the army at war strength for the suppression of disorders, and put an end to the injurious organization which bore the name "Republican Progressive Party."

The result was, of course, the success of the Republic. . . .

Gentlemen, it was necessary to abolish the fez,⁵ which sat on our heads as a sign of ignorance, of fanaticism, of hatred to progress and civilization,

⁴A *medressa* (also *madrasah* or *madrassa*) is an advanced school of Islamic learning; a *tekke* is a small teaching mosque usually built over the tomb of a saint; a *softah* is a student in an Islamic school; a *sheikh*, or *shaykh*, is a master of a religious order of Sufis, who adopted a mystical approach to Islam.

⁵The fez was a brimless hat popular among Turkish men during the nineteenth century; its lack of a brim allowed the wearer to touch his forehead to the ground while kneeling during prayer without removing the hat.

436 • The Global Community and Its Challenges

and to adopt in its place the hat, the customary headdress of the whole civilized world, thus showing, among other things, that no difference existed in the manner of thought between the Turkish nation and the whole family of civilized mankind. We did that while the law for the Restoration of Order was still in force. If it had not been in force we should have done so all the same; but one can say with complete truth that the existence of this law made the thing much easier for us. As a matter of fact the application of the law for the Restoration of Order prevented the morale of the nation being poisoned to a great extent by reactionaries.

Gentlemen, while the law regarding the Restoration of Order was in force there took place also the closing of the Tekkes, of the convents, and of the mausoleums, as well as the abolition of all sects⁶ and all kinds of titles such as Sheikh, Dervish, . . . Occultist, Magician, Mausoleum Guard, etc.⁷

One will be able to imagine how necessary the carrying through of these measures was, in order to prove that our nation as a whole was no primitive nation, filled with superstitions and prejudices.

Could a civilized nation tolerate a mass of people who let themselves be led by the nose by a herd of Sheikhs, Dedes, Seids, . . . Babas and Emirs,⁸ who entrusted their destiny and their

lives to chiromancers,⁹ magicians, dice-throwers and amulet sellers? Ought one to conserve in the Turkish State, in the Turkish Republic, elements and institutions such as those which had for centuries given the nation the appearance of being other than it really was? Would one not therewith have committed the greatest, most irreparable error to the cause of progress and reawakening?

If we made use of the law for the Restoration of Order in this manner, it was in order to avoid such a historic error; to show the nation's brow pure and luminous, as it is; to prove that our people think neither in a fanatical nor a reactionary manner.

Gentlemen, at the same time the new laws were worked out and decreed which promise the most fruitful results for the nation on the social and economic plane, and in general in all the forms of the expression of human activity . . . the Citizens' Legal Code, which ensures the liberty of women and stabilizes the existence of the family.

Accordingly we made use of all circumstances only from one point of view, which consisted therein: to raise the nation on to that step on which it is justified in standing in the civilized world, to stabilize the Turkish Republic more and more on steadfast foundations . . . and in addition to destroy the spirit of despotism for ever.

⁶Islamic religious orders.

⁷A *dervish*, or *darvish*, was a member of an Islamic sect famous for its whirling dances that symbolized the movement of the heavenly spheres. An *occultist* was a Sufi who achieved a state of withdrawal from the world. A *mausoleum guard* guarded the tomb of a saint or holy person.

⁸A *dede* was head of a Sufi order. *Seids*, or *sayyids*, were descendents of the prophet Muhammed through his daughter Fatima. *Baba* was a popular surname among Sufi preachers. In this context *emir* is an honorary Turkish title.

⁹People who told the future by reading palms.

Impasse in Palestine

95 • REPORT OF THE PALESTINE ROYAL COMMISSION (THE PEEL COMMISSION), JULY 1937

Despite six wars, dozens of minor conflicts, continual negotiations, and countless proposals, the Arab-Israeli conflict remains a source of ongoing tension in the Middle East and beyond. The immediate cause was the founding of the state of Israel in 1947 and the displacement of approximately 750,000 Palestinian Arabs during and after the 1948 Arab-Israeli War, but the roots of conflict go much deeper.

Chapter 12 Anticolonialism, Nationalism, and Revolution • 437

Its origins go back to 70 C.E., when the Jews were exiled from Palestine by the Romans, forcing them into a long period in which they resettled in other parts of the Middle East, North Africa, Europe, and years later the Americas. In their years of exile, Jews maintained a strong attachment to the “Land of Canaan,” which according to Hebrew scriptures, God had given them as their promised land after becoming His chosen people. Only in the nineteenth century, however, in response to growing anti-Semitism and fears over the loss of Jewish identity, did a number of intellectuals and religious leaders conclude that Jews could escape persecution and preserve their traditions only by returning to their former homeland in Palestine, the region between the Mediterranean Sea and the Jordan River. This movement came to be known as Zionism, derived from Mount Zion, one of the two major hills overlooking Jerusalem, the ancient Jewish capital and religious center.

The first advocates of Jewish resettlement in Palestine were Russian Jews reacting to the anti-Jewish pogroms of the 1880s and 1890s. Political Zionism, which advocates the foundation of a Jewish state (not just resettlement), dates from the late 1890s, when the Vienna-based journalist Theodor Herzl published *Der Judenstaat* (*The Jewish State*) in 1896 and one year later convened the first international Zionist conference in Basel, Switzerland. On the eve of World War I, approximately 60,000 Jews, about half of whom were recent immigrants, lived in Palestine compared to 620,000 Muslims and 70,000 Christians.

The situation in Palestine became more volatile in the 1920s and 1930s. The Palestinian Arabs, who had come to identify themselves politically with Syria, were bitterly disappointed when Great Britain and France reneged on their wartime promises to support the creation of an independent Arab state and instead turned the former Arab provinces of the Ottoman Empire into mandates. They were embittered further when the British, who held the Palestinian mandate, made good on the wartime pledge of their foreign minister Arthur Balfour to facilitate Jewish immigration to Palestine and make it a “national home” for the Jewish people. Between 1919 and 1939, the number of Jews in Palestine’s population grew from slightly under 10 percent to 30 percent. These Jews purchased land, established industries, founded Jewish schools and universities, and with support from the Zionist Organization laid the groundwork for the foundation of a Jewish state. Meanwhile, Arabs pressured British authorities to halt Jewish immigration, limit land sales to Jews, and grant immediate independence to Syria. With Arab frustration growing, in 1936 sporadic violence escalated into Arab general strikes, tax boycotts, bombings, and property destruction directed against Jews and British officials.

In response, the British government sent the former Secretary of State for India, Lord William Peel, to Palestine to head a commission charged with the task of investigating the causes of the violence and recommending solutions. After gathering information and interviewing well over 100 people, the commission published its report in mid-1937. Concluding that compromise and cooperation were impossible, it recommended the partition of Palestine into three parts: Jewish territory in the northwest; Arab territory in the east and south; and continued British control of Nazareth, Jerusalem, and a corridor between Jerusalem and the coast (see map on page 441). Although

438 • The Global Community and Its Challenges

the proposals were endorsed by the British government, they bitterly divided the Jews and were rejected totally by the Arabs. The political future of Palestine was not settled until 1947, when the independent state of Israel was born. But the discord continued.

QUESTIONS FOR ANALYSIS

1. What do the Arab and Jewish lists of grievances reveal about the economic and social status of the two communities?
2. Given the two sides' lists of grievances, what reasonable chance did the British have of satisfying each side?
3. Why, according to the report's authors, are the Arab and Jewish communities inherently and permanently incompatible?
4. On what basis do the report's authors predict that the Arab-Jewish conflict will worsen?
5. Why, according to the report, does the use of force provide no long-term solution to the problems of the region?
6. How, according to the report, will continuation of the status quo damage Great Britain's standing in the world?
7. Overall, does the tone and content of the report seem more sympathetic to the Arabs or Jews?
8. Arabs resolutely rejected the commission's plan for partition. Among Jews, the plan had supporters and opponents. What arguments might these groups have offered to defend their point of view? Consult the map in addition to the report itself for possible answers to these questions.

Conclusions and Recommendations

Arab Grievances

- (1) The failure to develop self-governing institutions.
- (2) The acquisition of land by the Jews.
- (3) Jewish immigration.
- (4) The use of Hebrew and English as official languages.
- (5) The employment of British and Jewish officers, and exclusion of Arabs from the higher posts.
- (6) The creation of a large class of landless Arabs, and the refusal of Jews to employ Arab labourers.
- (7) Inadequate funds for Arab education.

Whilst we believe that these grievances are sincerely felt, we are of opinion that most of them cannot be regarded as legitimate under the terms of the Mandate and we are therefore not called

upon to make recommendations on them. It is only in regard to the last that we are able to suggest any remedy. We would welcome increased expenditure on Arab education, especially in the direction of village agricultural schools.

Jewish Grievances

- (1) Obstruction in the establishment of the National Home owing to dilatory action in dealing with proposals demanding executive action.
- (2) The display of "pro-Arab" proclivities by officials and their failure to carry out the Mandate. . . .
- (3) Great delay in the decision of civil suits; inefficiency in criminal procedure, as instanced by the fact that 80 Jews were murdered during 1936, and no capital sentence was carried out.

Source: Report of the Palestine Royal Commission, June 22, 1937. Reprinted by permission of Her Majesty's Copyright

Office. Reproduced under the terms of the Click-Use license.

Chapter 12 Anticolonialism, Nationalism, and Revolution • 439

- (4) Toleration by the Government of subversive activities, more especially those of the Mufti of Jerusalem.¹
- (5) As regards the land, failure to introduce a land system appropriate to the needs of the country, the continuance of the system of *Masha'a*;² no arrangement for the consolidation of holdings, great delay in the ascertainment of rights during land settlement, difficulty in obtaining a satisfactory title to land when purchased; . . . insufficient encouragement of irrigation and drainage schemes.
- (6) Reluctance really to facilitate [Jewish] immigration, . . . and uncontrolled illegal Arab immigration.
- (7) Trans-Jordan should be opened to Jewish immigration.³
- (8) The necessary steps have not been taken to secure the removal or alleviation of restrictions on the importation of Palestine citrus fruits into foreign countries.
- (9) Progressive Jewish Municipalities are unduly restricted by Government rules and regulations.
- (10) Failure to ensure public security.

> While the authors of the report rejected most Arab grievances as "illegitimate" under terms of the mandate, they proposed numerous administrative and policy changes in response to the grievances of the Jewish community. They concluded the section as follows.

¹A reference to Hajj Amin al-Husayni (1895[?]–1974), who as Mufti of Jerusalem (the Sunni cleric who oversaw Islamic holy places in Jerusalem) helped organize attacks on Jews and British officials in 1937–1938. He also helped found the Arab Higher Committee, which called for nonpayment of taxes, organized a general strike of Arab workers and businesses, and demanded an end to Jewish immigration. The committee was banned by the mandate administration in September 1937. Amin al-Husayni fled to Lebanon and then Iraq to escape arrest by the British. During World War II, he lived in Rome

These are the recommendations which we submit . . . They are the best palliatives we can devise for the disease from which Palestine is suffering, but they are only palliatives. They might reduce the inflammation and bring down the temperature, but they cannot cure the trouble. The disease is so deep-rooted that, in our firm conviction, the only hope of a cure lies in a surgical operation.

The Force of Circumstances

Before submitting the proposals we have to offer for its drastic treatment we will briefly restate the problem of Palestine. . . .

An irrepressible conflict has arisen between two national communities within the narrow bounds of one small country. About 1,000,000 Arabs are in strife, open or latent, with some 400,000 Jews. There is no common ground between them. The Arab community is predominantly Asiatic in character, the Jewish community predominantly European. They differ in religion and in language. Their cultural and social life, their ways of thought and conduct, are as incompatible as their national aspirations. . . . The War and its sequel have inspired all Arabs with the hope of reviving in a free and united Arab world the traditions of the Arab golden age. The Jews similarly are inspired by their historic past. They mean to show what the Jewish nation can achieve when restored to the land of its birth. National assimilation between Arabs and Jews is thus ruled out. . . . Neither Arab nor Jew has any sense of service to a single State.

and Berlin and made pro-Axis radio broadcasts for Arab audiences. The degree of his knowledge of and support for the Holocaust is the subject of ongoing debate among historians.

²The collective ownership of land by a village community.

³The emirate of Transjordan, to the east of the Jordan River, was created in 1921 to provide a kingdom for Abdullah bin al-Hussein, who had led the Arab revolt against the Ottomans in World War I. The original mandate exempted Britain from the responsibility of encouraging Jewish immigration to Transjordan, so this grievance was rejected by the Peel Commission.

440 • *The Global Community and Its Challenges*

The conflict has grown steadily more bitter. It has been marked by a series of five Arab outbreaks, culminating in the rebellion of last year. . . .

This intensification of the conflict will continue. . . . The educational systems, Arab and Jewish, are schools of nationalism, and they have only existed for a short time. Their full effect on the rising generation has yet to be felt. And patriotic "youth-movements", so familiar a feature of present-day politics in other countries of Europe or Asia, are afoot in Palestine. As each community grows, moreover, the rivalry between them deepens. The more numerous and prosperous and better-educated the Arabs become, the more insistent will be their demand for national independence and the more bitter their hatred of the obstacle that bars the way to it. As the Jewish National Home grows older and more firmly rooted, so will grow its self-confidence and political ambition. . . .

Meantime the "external factors" will continue to play the part they have played with steadily increasing force from the beginning. On the one hand, Saudi Arabia, the Yemen, Iraq and Egypt are already recognized as sovereign states, and Trans-Jordan as an "independent government." In less than three years' time Syria and the Lebanon will attain their national sovereignty.⁴ The claim of the Palestinian Arabs to share in the freedom of all Asiatic Arabia will thus be reinforced. . . . That they are as well qualified for self-government as the Arabs of neighbouring countries has been admitted.

On the other hand, the hardships and anxieties of the Jews in Europe are not likely to grow less in the near future. . . . The appeal to the good faith and humanity of the British people will lose none of its force. The Mandatory [Great Britain] will be urged unceasingly to admit as many Jews into

Palestine as the National Home can provide with a livelihood and to protect them when admitted from Arab attacks. . . .

In these circumstances, we are convinced that peace, order and good government can only be maintained in Palestine for any length of time by a rigorous system of repression. . . . If "disturbances", moreover, should recur on a similar scale to that of last year's rebellion, the cost of military operations must soon exhaust the revenues of Palestine and ultimately involve the British Treasury to an incalculable extent. The moral objections to maintaining a system of government by constant repression are self-evident. Nor is there any need to emphasize the undesirable reactions of such a course of policy on opinion outside Palestine.

And the worst of it is that such a policy leads nowhere. However vigorously and consistently maintained, it will not solve the problem. It will not allay, it will exacerbate the quarrel between the Arabs and the Jews. The establishment of a single self-governing Palestine will remain just as impracticable as it is now. It is not easy to pursue the dark path of repression without seeing daylight at the end of it. . . .

In these last considerations lies a final argument for seeking a way out, at almost any cost, from the existing deadlock in Palestine. For a continuance or rather an aggravation—for that is what continuance will be—of the present situation cannot be contemplated without the gravest misgivings. It will mean constant unrest and disturbance in peace and potential danger in the event of war. It will mean a steady decline in our prestige. It will mean the gradual alienation of two peoples who are traditionally our friends: for already the Arabs of Palestine have been antagonized and the patience of their kinsmen throughout the Arab world is being strained; and already the Jews, particularly,

⁴Saudi Arabia was recognized as an independent state in 1927; Iraq became independent in 1932, although Britain maintained military bases and continued to exercise

influence over Iraqi foreign policy. The report exaggerates the progress toward independence in Egypt, Yemen, Syria, and Lebanon.

Chapter 12 Anticolonialism, Nationalism, and Revolution • 441



Peel Commission proposal for partition of Palestine

we understand, in the United States, are questioning the sincerity with which we are fulfilling the promises we made and suggesting that negligence or weakness on our part is the real cause of all the trouble. . . .

Manifestly the problem cannot be solved by giving either the Arabs or the Jews all they want. . . . But, while neither race can justly rule all Palestine, we see no reason why, if it were practicable, each race should not rule part of it.

No doubt the idea of Partition as a solution of the problem has often occurred to students of it, only to be discarded. There are many who would have felt an instinctive dislike to cutting up the

Holy Land. . . . Others may have felt that Partition would be a confession of failure. . . . Others, again, if they thought of Partition, dismissed it, no doubt, as impossible. The practical difficulties seemed too great. And great they unquestionably are. . . . We do not underestimate them. They cannot be brushed aside. Nevertheless . . . , those difficulties do not seem so insuperable as the difficulties inherent in the continuance of the Mandate or in any other alternative arrangement which has been proposed to us or which we ourselves could devise. Partition seems to offer at least a chance of ultimate peace. We can see none in any other plan.

Anticolonialism in India and Southeast Asia

By the late nineteenth century, when Indians were already in a full-scale debate about their relationship with Great Britain and some were demanding independence, many Southeast Asians were experiencing direct European political control for the first time. Nonetheless, in the first half of the twentieth century, developments in both areas showed some marked similarities. Nationalism swept through the Indian population, and despite their many differences in religion, education, and caste status, millions of Indians came to agree that Great Britain should “quit India” and allow Indian self-rule. Nationalism also intensified in Southeast Asia, especially in Vietnam and the Dutch East Indies, where force was needed to suppress anticolonial movements in both areas in the 1920s and 1930s.

The reasons for this upsurge of anti-European sentiment included revivals of Hinduism in India, Buddhism in Burma, and Islam in Southeast Asia, all of which heightened people's awareness of their differences from the West; the emergence of Japan, which demonstrated that an Asian nation could become a great power; the carnage of World War I, which raised doubts about the Europeans' “superiority”; and the spread of Western education and political ideologies. Most telling, however, was anger over the disparity between the Europeans' stated good intentions about their colonies' futures and their actual record of economic exploitation, racial prejudice, and authoritarian rule.

To these factors were added the influence of charismatic leaders such as Mohandas Gandhi, who drew the Indian masses into the nationalist movement; Jawaharlal Nehru, who guided the Indian Congress Party after 1941; Ho Chi Minh, who built a strong nationalist coalition in Vietnam; and Achmed Sukarno, who rallied Indonesian nationalists despite opposition from the Dutch.

World War II was the catalyst for the creation of independent nations throughout the region in the late 1940s and the 1950s, but events and leaders of the first half of the twentieth century set the stage.

Gandhi's Vision for India

96 • MOHANDAS GANDHI, INDIAN HOME RULE

Mohandas Gandhi, the outstanding figure in modern Indian history, was born in 1869 in a village north of Mumbai on the Arabian Sea. His father was a government official who presided over an extended family with strict Hindu practices. Gandhi studied law in England, and after failing to establish a legal practice in Mumbai moved to South Africa in 1893 to serve the country's large Indian population.

Chapter 12 Anticolonialism, Nationalism, and Revolution • 443

In South Africa, he became incensed over discriminatory laws against Indians, many of whom were indentured servants employed by whites or petty merchants. During his struggle to improve the lot of South Africa's Indian population, Gandhi developed his philosophy of *satyagraha*, usually translated into English as "soul force." Satyagraha sought justice not through violence but through love, a willingness to suffer, and conversion of the oppressor. Central to Gandhi's strategy was nonviolent resistance: his followers disobeyed unjust laws and accepted the consequences—even beatings and imprisonment—to reach the hearts of the British and change their thinking.

Gandhi first wrote about his theories of satyagraha in 1908 after meeting with a group of Indians in England who favored force to oust the British. In response, he composed a pamphlet, "Hind Swaraj," or "Indian Home Rule," in which he explains his theory of nonviolent resistance and his doubts about the benefits of modern civilization. Written as a dialogue between a "reader" and an "editor" (Gandhi), "Indian Home Rule" was printed in hundreds of editions and still serves as the best summary of Gandhi's philosophy.

QUESTIONS FOR ANALYSIS

1. What does Gandhi see as the major deficiency of modern civilization?
2. According to Gandhi, how has civilization specifically affected women?
3. Why does Gandhi have faith that Hindus and Muslims will be able to live in peace in India?
4. What, according to Gandhi, is true civilization, and what is India's role in preserving it?
5. What leads Gandhi to his conviction that love is stronger than force?
6. Why did Gandhi's attack on civilization gain him support among the Indian masses?

Chapter VI

Civilization

READER: Now you will have to explain what you mean by civilization. . . .

EDITOR: Let us first consider what state of things is described by the word "civilization." Its true test lies in the fact that people living in it make

bodily welfare the object of life. We will take some examples: The people of Europe today live in better-built houses than they did a hundred years ago. This is considered an emblem of civilization, and this is also a matter to promote bodily happiness. Formerly, they wore skins, and used as their weapons spears. Now, they wear long trousers, and for embellishing their bodies they wear a variety of clothing, and, instead of spears,

Source: Mohandas Gandhi, *Indian Home Rule* (Madras, India: Ganesh & Co., 1922), pp. 30–35, 47–50, 63, 64, 85, 68, 90, 91.

Copyright © 1967 by Harper & Row, Publishers, Reprinted by permission of the authors.

444 • *The Global Community and Its Challenges*

they carry with them revolvers containing five or more chambers. If people of a certain country, who have hitherto not been in the habit of wearing much clothing, boots, etc., adopt European clothing, they are supposed to have become civilized out of savagery. Formerly, in Europe, people plowed their lands mainly by manual labor. Now, one man can plow a vast tract by means of steam-engines, and can thus amass great wealth. This is called a sign of civilization. Formerly, the fewest men wrote books, that were most valuable. Now, anybody writes and prints anything he likes and poisons people's minds. Formerly, men traveled in wagons; now they fly through the air, in trains at the rate of four hundred and more miles per day. This is considered the height of civilization. It has been stated that, as men progress, they shall be able to travel in airships and reach any part of the world in a few hours. Men will not need the use of their hands and feet. They will press a button, and they will have their clothing by their side. They will press another button, and they will have their newspaper. A third, and a motor-car will be in waiting for them. They will have a variety of delicately dished up food. Everything will be done by machinery. Formerly, when people wanted to fight with one another, they measured between them their bodily strength; now it is possible to take away thousands of lives by one man working behind a gun from a hill. This is civilization. Formerly, men worked in the open air only so much as they liked. Now, thousands of workmen meet together and for the sake of maintenance work in factories or mines. Their condition is worse than that of beasts. They are obliged to work, at the risk of their lives, at most dangerous occupations, for the sake of millionaires. Formerly, men were made slaves under physical compulsion, now they are enslaved by temptation of money and of the luxuries that money can buy. There are now diseases of which people never dreamed before, and an army of doctors is engaged in finding out their

cures, and so hospitals have increased. This is a test of civilization. Formerly, special messengers were required and much expense was incurred in order to send letters; today, anyone can abuse his fellow by means of a letter for one penny. True, at the same cost, one can send one's thanks also. Formerly, people had two or three meals consisting of homemade bread and vegetables; now, they require something to eat every two hours, so that they have hardly leisure for anything else. What more need I say? All this you can ascertain from several authoritative books. These are all true tests of civilization. And, if any one speaks to the contrary, know that he is ignorant. This civilization takes note neither of morality nor of religion. . . .

This civilization is irreligion, and it has taken such a hold on the people in Europe that those who are in it appear to be half mad. They lack real physical strength or courage. They keep up their energy by intoxication. They can hardly be happy in solitude. Women, who should be the queens of households, wander in the streets, or they slave away in factories. For the sake of a pittance, half a million women in England alone are laboring under trying circumstances in factories or similar institutions. This awful fact is one of the causes of the daily growing suffragette movement.

This civilization is such that one has only to be patient and it will be self-destructed.

Chapter X

The Hindus and the Muslims

READER: But I am impatient to hear your answer to my question. Has the introduction of Islam not unmade the nation?

EDITOR: India cannot cease to be one nation because people belonging to different religions live in it. The introduction of foreigners does not necessarily destroy the nation, they merge in it.