

GANDHI INFORMATIONEN ZENTRUM

Tolstoy and Gandhi

Christian Bartolf



**Schriften zur
Gewaltfreiheit**

GANDHI INFORMATIONEN ZENTRUM

Impressum

1. Auflage, Juni 1994

Gandhi-Informations-Zentrum
Lübecker Straße 44
D-10559 Berlin
Postfach 21 01 09
D-10501 Berlin
(0 30) 3 94 14 20

Alle Rechte der Vervielfältigung und Verbreitung sind dem Autor vorbehalten. Kein Teil des Werkes darf in irgendeiner Form (durch Fotokopie, Mikrofilm oder anderes Verfahren) ohne schriftliche Genehmigung der Lizenzgeber reproduziert oder unter Verwendung elektronischer Systeme verarbeitet, vervielfältigt oder verbreitet werden.

ISBN 3-930093-07-3

Tolstoy and Gandhi (Non-Violent Resistance)

by Christian Bartolf
(on the occasion of Gandhiji's 125th birthday)

A. Tolstoy's writings of confession

Doubtlessly the dialogue between Gandhi and Tolstoy was not only a correspondence of letters, but also a correspondence of the ideas of two of the most important "ancestors" of ours. Gandhi's reading of Tolstoy's writings can be dated back to the year 1894. Significantly the young lawyer in South Africa (who soon became a political advocate of the Indian minority in South Africa and guided their struggle for emancipation by advise and action) first of all read Tolstoy's writings of confession after dehumiliating experiences of racist discrimination agitated by British and Boer colonial powers. Hence Gandhi's interest as a reader was not attracted by the famous novelist, but by the doctrine of Non-Resistance first composed by Tolstoy in his three essays of confessions ("My Confession", "My Religion", "The Kingdom of God is Within You or Christianity Not as a Mystic Religion but as a New Theory of Life"). Tolstoy had found a way out of his midlife crisis through a new understanding of the New Testament's Gospel. Assisted by a Rabbi, Tolstoy had found the clue to a new understanding of the Gospel and of his conforming life as a Count and famous writer in a radical interpretation of Matthew's verse (5; 38,39): "Thou have learned: eye for an eye, tooth for a tooth. I but ask Thou not to resist evil." This Non-Resistance however, according to Tolstoy, does not mean the victory of evil accepted with fatalism, but on the contrary its destruction by the refusal to cooperate with injustice respectively by the refusal to resist evil by evil means. According to the doctrine of Non-Resistance it is necessary to struggle without unjust means in order to take up the fight against injustice in all social, political and economical fields of human life.

B. My Religion

Tolstoy wrote in "My Religion":

*"My personal life is interwoven with the social, political life, and the political life demands of me a non-Christian activity, which is directly opposed to Christ's commandment. Now, with the universal military service and the participation of all in the court in the capacity of jurymen, this dilemma is with striking distinctness placed before all people. Every man has to take up the weapon of murder, the gun, the knife, and, though he does not kill, he must load his gun and whet his knife, that is, be prepared to commit murder. Every citizen must come to court and be a participant in the court and in the punishments, that is, every man has to renounce Christ's commandment of non-resistance to evil, not only in words, but in action as well."*¹

And by the example of the superior court and district court, criminal court

and the court of arbitration (Tolstoy himself was a judge in a court of arbitration!), of various senates and departments Tolstoy illustrates the Christian doctrine counteracting the state's principle of retaliation:

*"Christ says, Do not resist evil. The purpose of the courts is to resist evil. Christ prescribes doing good in return for evil. The courts retaliate evil with evil. Christ says, Make no distinction between the good and the bad. All the courts do is to make this distinction. Christ says, Forgive all men; forgive, not once, not seven times, but without end; love your enemies, do good to those who hate you. The courts do not forgive, but punish; they do not do good, but evil, to those whom they call enemies of society. Thus it turns out, according to the meaning, that Christ must have rejected the courts."*²

Whereafter Tolstoy points out how often Christ came into conflict with the political law, because he stuck to the origin of Divine Law in contrast to the caste administering law, which led to his execution. The lasting impression of a public execution in France during his trip through Europe is reflected in Tolstoy's words of ethical disgust with the human criminal law in "My Religion":

*"No man with a heart has escaped that impression of terror and of doubt in the good, even at the recital, not to speak of the sight, of the executions of men by just such men, by means of rods, the guillotine, the gallows."*³

*"Christ says, You have been impressed with the idea, and you have become accustomed to it, that it is good and rational by force to repel the evil and to pluck an eye out for an eye, to establish criminal courts, the police, the army, to resist the enemy: but I say, Use no violence, do not take part in violence, do no evil to any one, even to those whom you call your enemies."*⁴

Already in this challenging essay of his, Tolstoy realized that he would have to meet principal resistance from groups of people belonging to quite different ideological camps:

*"These men belong to the two extreme poles: they are the patriotic and conservative Christians, who acknowledge that their church is the true one, and the atheistic Revolutionists. Neither the one nor the other will renounce the right of forcibly resisting what they regard as an evil. Not even the wisest and most learned among them want to see the simple, obvious truth that, if we concede to one man the right forcibly to resist what he considers an evil, a second person may with the same right resist what he regards as an evil."*⁵

Not the annihilation of evil but the increase of injustice would have been the result of the law of violence in the social, political and economical field of human life:

"Not only Christ, but all Jewish prophets, John the Baptist, all the true sages of the world, speak of precisely this church, this

*state, this culture, this civilization, calling them evil and destruction of men."*⁶

Tolstoy juxtaposes the law of violence with the law of love, benevolence and conscience. And he appeals to the moral scruples, the ethical inhibitions – no longer tortures or executions of more and more victims :

*"Who will deny that it is repulsive and painful to human nature, not only to torture or kill a man, but even to torture a dog, or to kill a chicken or a calf? (I know men living by agricultural labour, who have stopped eating meat only because they had themselves to kill their animals.)"*⁷

*"Not one judge would have the courage to strangle the man whom he has sentenced according to his law. Not one chief would have the courage to take a peasant away from a weeping family and lock him up in prison. Not one general or soldier would, without discipline, oath, or war, kill a hundred Turks or Germans, and lay waste their villages; he would not even have the courage to wound a single man. All this is done only thanks to that complicated political and social machine, whose problem it is so to scatter the responsibility of the atrocities which are perpetrated so that no man may feel the unnaturalness of these acts. Some write laws; others apply them; others again muster men, educating in them the habit of discipline, that is, of senseless and irresponsible obedience; others again – these same mustered men – commit every kind of violence, even killing men, without knowing why and for what purpose."*⁸

No analysis could be given more precisely of the system of command-and-obey which characterises the "banality of evil" (Hannah Arendt) of totalitarian dictatorships before their origin. Tolstoy objected to the despotisms of the Russian Tzar and the German Kaiser as harshly as to the dilution of the same principle of power by British parliamentarism. In his writings of confession he testified against the pseudo-security of a complacent bourgeoisie and feudal caste:

*"(...) whether to know that my peace and security and that of my family, all my joys and pleasures, are bought by the poverty, debauch, and suffering of millions, – by annual gallows, hundreds of thousands of suffering prisoners and millions of soldiers, policemen, and guards, torn away from their families and dulled by discipline, who with loaded pistols, to be aimed at hungry men, secure the amusements for me; whether to buy every dainty piece which I put into my mouth, or into the mouths of my children, at the cost of all that suffering of humanity, which is inevitable for the acquisition of these pieces; or to know that any piece is only then my piece when nobody needs it, and nobody suffers for it."*⁹

Tolstoy is right to juxtapose the reproaches of Christ's doctrine being a chimera with the reality of the real social and political disorder:

“Christ’s teaching about non-resistance to evil is a dream! And this, that the life of men, into whose souls pity and love for one another is put, has passed, for some, in providing stakes, knouts, racks, cat-o’-nine-tails, tearing of nostrils, inquisitions, fetters, hard labour, gallows, executions by shooting, solitary confinements, prisons for women and children, in providing slaughter of tens of thousands in war, in providing revolutions and seditions; and for others, in executing all these horrors; and for others again, in avoiding all these sufferings and retaliating for them, – such a life is not a dream!”¹⁰

Tolstoy illustrated the lucidity of the Christian doctrine of Non-Resistance (being at the same time the key to the understanding of the complete Gospel) with the prophet Elijah to whom God manifested himself not with thunder and lightning but in a smooth breeze blowing from the refreshed leas after the storm:

“The movement of humanity toward the good takes place, not thanks to the tormentors, but to the tormented. As fire does not put out fire, so evil does not put out evil. Only the good meeting the evil, and not becoming contaminated by it, vanquishes the evil. (...) Every step in advance has been made only in the name of non-resistance to evil. (...) And if this progress is slow, it is so because the clearness, simplicity, rationality, inevitableness, and obligatoriness of Christ’s teaching have been concealed from the majority of men in a most cunning and dangerous manner; they have been concealed under a false teaching which falsely calls itself his teaching.”¹¹

Being old of age, Tolstoy learned Hebrew and Greek in order to read and translate the Holy Scriptures of Christianity and Judaism in their original language. He was excommunicated by the Orthodox Church after his “Criticism of Theological Dogmatics” which encouraged him to compose a “Short Interpretation of the Gospel” and to give an account of Christian doctrines in a children’s version, which was to explain the original meaning of Christ’s teachings to all people reading and listening.

C. The Kingdom of God is Within You

Significantly preachers, having given up their offices within their denominations, founded communities of “Utopian Socialism” according to the influence of Charles Fourier in order to realize the pioneering spirit of the Pilgrim Fathers in post-revolutionary USA against the expansionist tendency of an economy of commodities penetrating all spheres of life. Among them we find the first theorists of a secular Non-Resistance with arguments for non-believing atheists or agnostics. In his book “The Kingdom of God is Within You” Tolstoy quoted the voices of Adin Ballou and the abolitionist William Lloyd Garrison who opposed slavery. “The Kingdom of God is Within You” captured young Gandhi’s interest as an Indian lawyer in South Africa and won him over to follow Tolstoy’s influence.

D. William Lloyd Garrison

The participants of the Peace Convention in Boston 1838 drafted a Declaration of Sentiments in order to abolish war. These American precursors of Tolstoy’s teachings of Non-Resistance were quoted by him as follows:

“We register our testimony, not only against all wars, whether offensive or defensive, but all preparations for war; against every naval ship, every arsenal, every fortification; against the militia system and a standing army; against all military chieftains and soldiers; against all monuments commemorative of victory over a foreign foe, all trophies won in battle, all celebrations in honor of military or naval exploits; against all appropriations for the defence of a nation by force and arms on the part of any legislative body; against every edict of government, requiring of its subjects military service. Hence we deem it unlawful to bear arms, or to hold a military office.”

“As every human government is upheld by physical strength, and its laws are enforced virtually at the point of the bayonet, we cannot hold any office which imposes upon its incumbent the obligation to compel men to do right, on pain of imprisonment or death. We therefore voluntarily exclude ourselves from every legislative and judicial body, and repudiate all human politics, worldly honors, and stations of authority. If we cannot occupy a seat in the legislature or on the bench, neither can we elect others to act as our substitutes in any such capacity.”¹²

These words indicate the principal refusal to cooperate with a system of injustice which was followed by all those rational “sectarians” who followed the original spirit of Christ’s doctrine (Cathares, Nazarenes, Bogomiles, Quakers and the Russian Doukhobors and Molokans) and consequently imitated Christ’s ways of action in the social, economical and political field. This practical criticism of ‘ius talionis’, the law of retaliation, as it had been laid down in the Roman Law of Twelve Tables, this practical criticism of revenge as an endemical principle of contagious violence was inspired by the source of prophetic tradition and by an eschatological awareness of the messianic end of all times taught by Rabbi Jeshua from Nazareth.

“If we abide by our principles, it is impossible for us to be disorderly, or plot treason, or participate in any evil work; we shall submit to every ordinance of man, for the Lord’s sake; obey all the requirements of government, except such as we deem contrary to the commands of the gospel; and in no case resist the operation of law, except by meekly submitting to the penalty of disobedience.

But while we shall adhere to the doctrine of non-resistance and passive submission, we purpose, in a moral and spiritual sense, to speak and act boldly in the cause of God; to assail iniquity in high places and in low places; to apply our principles

to all existing civil, political, legal, and ecclesiastical institutions; and to hasten the time when the kingdoms of this world have become the kingdoms of our Lord and of His Christ, and He shall reign forever.”¹³

The individual boycott of war and poll taxes, as Henry David Thoreau did before writing his essay “On the Duty of Civil Disobedience” against the Government, the massive individual conscientious objection against all military services, against war preparations or participations, as Leo Tolstoy recommended, the modern tradition of Civil Disobedience, from the “civil disobedients” (Smuts) of Indian Satyagrahi in South Africa to the boycotts of Black Americans in USA led by Dr. Martin Luther King for equal rights of all ethnic groups in public life – these were the consequences of the first secular theories of Non-Cooperation with a political system which is based on injustice.

“It appears to us a self-evident truth, that, whatever the gospel is designed to destroy at any period of the world, being contrary to it, ought now to be abandoned. If, then, the time is predicted when swords shall be beaten into plowshares, and spears into pruning-hooks, and men shall not learn the art of war any more, it follows that all who manufacture, sell, or wield those deadly weapons do thus array themselves against the peaceful dominion of the Son of God on earth. (...)

Hence, we shall employ lecturers, circulate tracts and publications, form societies, and petition our state and national governments, in relation to the subject of Universal Peace. It will be our leading object to devise ways and means for effecting a radical change in the views, feelings, and practices of society, respecting the sinfulness of war and the treatment of enemies.

In entering upon the great work before us, we are not unmindful that, in its prosecution, we may be called to test our sincerity even as in a fiery ordeal. It may subject us to insult, outrage, suffering, yea, even death itself. We anticipate no small amount of misconception, misrepresentation, calumny. Tumults may rise against us. The ungodly and violent, the proud and pharisaical, the ambitious and tyrannical, principalities and powers, and spiritual wickedness in high places, may contrive to crush us. So they treated the Messiah, whose example we are humbly striving to imitate. If we suffer with Him we know that we shall reign with Him. We shall not be afraid of their terror, neither be troubled.”¹⁴

E. Adin Ballou

Tolstoy corresponded with Adin Ballou, author of a dialogue on the teaching of Non-Resistance, and discussed the problem of self-defence, a

possibility principally rejected by Tolstoy – contrary to Ballou. In a pamphlet entitled “How many people are necessary to transform evil into justice” Ballou rejected pseudo-legitimations for politically sanctioned murder, an early version of Kurt Tucholsky’s dictum “Soldiers are murderers” which has been prosecuted by German courts from the year 1932 starting with the trial against Carl von Ossietzky, later Noble Peace Laureate as prisoner in a Nazi concentration camp, until today. In his Catechism of Non-Resistance, Adin Ballou consistently rejects human ways of behaviour such as insults, killing and hurting because of self-defense (with Ballou restricted later), the judicial way of claiming to punish people for an insult, the participation in armies against interior or exterior enemies, the participation in wars or armaments for war, the participation in drafting or equipping soldiers, voting at the poll elections, the participation in the courts or in the administration as well as participation in the power of governments, the paying of taxes for a government “that is kept up by war power, by capital punishment, generally by violence”, which means that one should not resist taxation by means of violence. The comprehensive criticism of violence by Ballou also affects the political monopoly of violence and calls it evil that can only be destroyed by the doctrine of Non-Resistance. Martyrs’ suffering and sacrifices of scapegoats who purified themselves from all violence is implied in this socio-ethical precept; Ballou writes:

“Good deeds cannot be performed under all circumstances without self-sacrifice, privations, suffering, and, in extreme cases, without the loss of life itself. But he who prizes life more than the fulfilment of God’s will is already dead to the only true life. Such a man, in trying to save his life, will lose it. Furthermore, wherever non-resistance costs the sacrifice of one’s life, or of some essential advantage of life, resistance costs thousands of such sacrifices.

Non-resistance preserves; resistance destroys.

It is much safer to act justly than unjustly; to endure an offense rather than resist it by violence; safer even in regard to the present life. If all men refused to resist evil, the world would be a happy one. (...)

Even if but one man were to act thus, and the others should agree to crucify him, would it not be more glorious for him to die in the glory of non-resisting love, praying for his enemies, than live wearing the crown of Caesar, besprinkled with the blood of the murdered? But whether it be one man or thousands of men who are firmly determined not to resist evil by evil, still, whether in the midst of civilized or uncivilized neighbors, men who do not rely on violence are safer than those who do. A robber, a murderer, a villain, will be less likely to harm them if he finds them offering no armed resistance. “All they that take the sword shall perish

with the sword," and he who seeks peace, who acts like a friend, who is inoffensive, who forgives and forgets injuries, generally enjoys peace, or if he dies, he dies a blessed death."¹⁵

And Adin Ballou resumes in his Catechism of Non-Resistance:

"Hence, if all were to follow the commandment of non-resistance, there would manifestly be neither offense nor evil-doing. If even the majority were composed of such men they would establish the rule of love and good-will even toward the offenders, by not resisting evil by evil nor using violence. Even if such men formed a numerous minority, they would have such an improving moral influence over society that every severe punishment would be revoked, and violence and enmity would be replaced by peace and good-will. If they formed but a small minority, they would rarely experience anything worse than the contempt of the world, while the world, without preserving it or feeling grateful therefor, would become better and wiser from its latent influence. And if, in the most extreme cases, certain members of the minority might be persecuted unto death, these men, thus dying for the truth, would have left their doctrine already sanctified by the blood of martyrdom.

Peace be with all ye who seek peace; and may the all-conquering love be the imperishable inheritance of every soul who submits of its own accord to the law of Christ.

Resist not evil by violence."¹⁶

F. Anti-Conscription Manifesto

Tolstoy quotes the ideas of Garrison and Ballou in his book "The Kingdom of God is Within You"; Gandhi reads this correspondence in the thinking of Americans and the Russian Count Tolstoy and learns from this for the years 1894 to 1909 when he reads other volumes of Tolstoy's with high esteem: "What is Art?", "Creutzer-Sonata", "My Confession" et.al. The early reading of Tolstoy's "The Kingdom of God is Within You" as a source of inspiration later resulted in Gandhi's signature under the Anti-Conscription Manifesto published in "Young India", his weekly magazine, on September 16, 1929, and signed by Martin Buber, Rabindranath Tagore, Bertrand Russell, Albert Einstein, Romain Rolland, Leonhard Ragaz, Annie Besant, H.G. Wells, C.F. Andrews, Toyohiko Kagawa and many others:

"It is our belief that conscript armies, with their large corps of professional officers, are a grave menace to peace. Conscription involves the degradation of human personality, and the destruction of liberty. Barrack life, military drill, blind obedience to commands, however unjust and foolish they may be, and deliberate training for slaughter undermine respect for the individual, for democracy and human life."

"The State which thinks itself entitled to force its citizens to go to war will never pay proper regard to the value and happiness of their lives in peace."

"The Government of a country which maintains conscription has little difficulty in declaring war, for it can silence the whole population by a mobilization order. When Governments have to depend for support upon the voluntary consent of their peoples, they must necessarily exercise caution in their foreign policies."¹⁷

In his book "The Kingdom of God is Within You", after the introduction of conscription in the Tzar's Russia (1874), Tolstoy had written:

"Armies, then, are needed by governments and by the ruling classes above all to support the present order, which, far from being the result of the people's needs, is often in direct antagonism to them, and is only beneficial to the government and ruling classes.

To keep their subjects in oppression and to be able to enjoy the fruits of their labor the government must have armed forces.

But there is not only one government. There are other governments, exploiting their subjects by violence in the same way, and always ready to pounce down on any other government and carry off the fruits of the toil of its enslaved subjects. And so every government needs an army also to protect its booty from its neighbor brigands. Every government is thus involuntarily reduced to the necessity of emulating one another in the increase of their armies. This increase is contagious, as Montesquieu pointed out 150 years ago. (...)

The rivalry of the European states in constantly increasing their forces has reduced them to the necessity of having recourse to universal military service, since by that means the greatest possible number of soldiers is obtained at the least possible expense. Germany first hit on this device. And directly one state adopted it the others were obliged to do the same. And by this means all citizens are under arms to support the iniquities practiced upon them; all citizens have become their own oppressors."¹⁸

Tolstoy considers conscription an inevitable and necessary result of the political power and its logic of sacrificial violence and as the final expression of the antinomical social conception of life that could only be kept up by violent methods:

"Universal military service may be compared to the efforts of a man to prop up his falling house who so surrounds it and fills it with props and buttresses and planks and scaffolding that he manages to keep the house standing only by making it impossible to live in it.

In the same way universal military service destroys all the

benefits of the social order of life which it is employed to maintain.

The advantages of social organization are security of property and labor and associated action for the improvement of existence – universal military service destroys all this.

The taxes raised from the people for war preparations absorb the greater part of the produce of labor which the army ought to defend.

The withdrawing of all men from the ordinary course of life destroys the possibility of labor itself. The danger of war, ever ready to break out, renders all reforms of social life vain and fruitless.¹⁹

For Tolstoy conscription as a political institution functions as a cornerstone that holds together a whole building:

“Universal service is the extreme limit of violence necessary for the support of the whole state organization, and it is the extreme limit to which submission on the part of the subjects can go. It is the keystone of the whole edifice, and its fall will bring it all down.

The time has come when the ever-growing abuse of power by governments and their struggles with one another has led to their demanding such material and even moral sacrifices from their subjects that everyone is forced to reflect and ask himself, “Can I make these sacrifices? And for the sake of what am I making them? I am expected for the sake of the state to make these sacrifices, to renounce everything that can be precious to man – peace, family, security, and human dignity.”²⁰

Whereafter Tolstoy refutes all arguments for the maintenance of the political monopoly of violence and accuses the political state of having failed in solving the most urgent problems of the time:

“In our day governments not only fail to encourage, but directly hinder every moment by which people try to work out new forms of life for themselves. Every attempt at the solution of the problems of labor, land, politics, and religion meets with direct opposition on the part of government. (...)

The power of the state, far from being a security against the attacks of our neighbors, exposes us, on the contrary, to much greater danger of such attacks. So that every man who is led, through his compulsory service in the army, to reflect on the value of the state for whose sake he is expected to be ready to sacrifice his peace, security, and life, cannot fail to perceive that there is no kind of justification in modern times for such a sacrifice.”²¹

Written by Leo Tolstoy in his third writing of confession “The Kingdom of God is Within You”, which Gandhi read as a young lawyer in South Africa in 1894 before transforming into practice the teaching of Non-Resistance and

comprehensive Non-Cooperation with an existing system of injustice.

G. Tolstoy’s correspondence with Indians

As early as the year 1901 Tolstoy responded to the request of the Indian journalist A. Ramaseshan to take a stand and find encouraging words in favour of the Indian people in its freedom struggle against the British colonial power. Tolstoy already recommended in his letter of response to Ramaseshan the objection to military service and to service within the Colonial administration offices – resistance not as an armed upheaval in the form of revolutionary struggle but by “non-doing”, “non-participation” in the political administration offices. Tolstoy combined his statement with a vehement rejection of the unjust caste system in India which he considered to cause disharmony between the ethnic groups and oppression of many people by others within the same population.

In a letter correspondence with the Muslim Mufti Muhammed Sadiq who wanted to confront Christian missionaries with Muslim missionaries in India, Tolstoy clearly stated that he disapproved of the activity of Muslim priests in India, because they might also contribute to communal disharmony. That was in the year 1903.

In 1905 the famous Indian philosopher and pupil of Vivekananda, Baba Premananda Bharati (Surendranath Mukherji), sent a pamphlet from his US-American exile to Tolstoy which warned against the “White Danger” (adapted from the hypothetical “Yellow Danger” of Chinese and Japanese which was supposedly threatening European civilization) as a reaction to the Russian-Japanese War. Tolstoy was not only concerned about the corrupting influence of the British dominion in India, but also about the passionate voice of the letter addressed to him. Bharati, together with his second letter from January 7, 1907, also sent his book “Shri Krishna-the Lord of Love”. Tolstoy was so fascinated by Krishna’s philosophy of benevolence and love that he introduced each of the chapters of his “Letter to a Hindoo” (which he wrote in the year 1909) with a quotation from the Krishna book. Gandhi asked for permission to reprint Tolstoy’s “Letter to a Hindoo” in his weekly “Indian Opinion”. That is why this “Letter to a Hindoo” shall be quoted without denying that Tolstoy refuted the miraculous legends, the cosmological myths and historical legends about the origin of the world as mere fancy products, but emphasizing that Tolstoy especially stressed the ethics of Krishna’s philosophy of benevolence and love. Bharati always published Tolstoy’s letters of response in his US-exile magazine “The Light of India” so that another Indian contemporary, the journalist and sociologist Taraknath Das, took note of this correspondence and sent a letter to Tolstoy, the “Letter to a Hindoo”.

H. Letter to a Hindoo

On May 22, 1908 the Bengal journalist Taraknath Das sent two issues of his magazine “Free Hindustan” to Tolstoy from his Canadian exile together

with a letter in which the social revolutionary from Vancouver succeeded in mediating the Indian situation to Tolstoy. Taraknath Das pointed out that during the years 1891 until 1900 19 million Indians had starved to death, whereas in the wars from 1793 to 1900 only 5 million people had died:

*"You hate war, but hunger in India is more terrible than any war. It occurs in India, not due to shortage of food, but because of the plundering of the people and by the ravaging of the country by the British Government. Is it not a shame that millions of people in India are hungry, while the English traders export from India thousands of tons of rice and other foodstuffs?"*²²

In the name of millions of Indians starving to death Taraknath Das asked Tolstoy for support. Tolstoy started writing his letter of reply to Taraknath Das on June 7, 1908; but it took half a year, 29 versions and 413 manuscript pages, which are kept in one of Moscow's museums on Tolstoy, before Tolstoy had composed his "Letter to a Hindoo" in December 1908 after having informed himself more precisely about the social, economical and political situation of India. Only the additional letter of an Indian teacher (G.D. Kumar) from August 21, 1908, and further information, which Tolstoy asked Taraknath Das for, enabled Tolstoy to write his statement.

Tolstoy started his article by expressing his deep concern about the situation of misery of the oppressed Indians:

"The reason for the astonishing fact that a majority of working people submit to a handful of idlers who control their labour and their very lives is always and everywhere the same – whether the oppressors and oppressed are of one race or whether, as in India and elsewhere, the oppressors are of a different nation.

*This phenomenon seems particularly strange in India, for there more than two hundred million people, highly gifted both physically and mentally, find themselves in the power of a small group of people quite alien to them in thought, and immeasurably inferior to them in religious morality."*²³

Tolstoy saw the reason for this unnatural and inconceivable phenomenon in the fact that the enslaved people does not look for indigenous means of liberation from the intolerable oppression but "in its assimilation to the anti-religious and deeply immoral social disorder in which the English and other pseudo-Christian peoples live". Science as a substitute religion was as much castigated by Tolstoy as the obedience to authorities like Tzars, Sultans, Rajas, Shahs and other heads of states who claim privileges for themselves:

"But unfortunately not only were the rulers, who were considered supernatural beings, benefited by having the peoples in subjection, but as a result of the belief in, and during the rule of, these pseudo-divine beings, ever larger and larger circles of people grouped and established themselves around them, and under an appearance of governing took advantage of the people. And when the old deception of a supernatural and God-appointed authority had dwindled away these men were only con-

*cerned to devise a new one which like its predecessor should make it possible to hold the people in bondage to a limited number of rulers."*²⁴

Among the pseudo-legitimations of this ruling class of bureaucracy Tolstoy first discovered the scientific justification of using violence as a "law of history", Darwin's theory of the survival of the fittest in the struggle of existence analogous to the world of animals (Socio-Darwinism) and the pragmatic-decisionistic theory of violence:

*"The only difference in this justification by pseudo-science consists in the fact that, to the question why such and such people and not others have the right to decide against whom violence may and must be used, pseudo-science now gives a different reply to that given by religion – which declared that the right to decide was valid because it was pronounced by persons possessed of divine power. 'Science' says that these decisions represent the will of the people, which under a constitutional form of government is supposed to find expression in all the decisions and actions of those who are at the helm at the moment."*²⁵

Scientific superstition criticized by Tolstoy would however conquer even Japan and India and would make the oppressed commit the same mistakes as their oppressors so that Tolstoy doubts the truth of the magazine's ("Free Hindustan") motto and thesis: "Resistance against aggression is not only justified but demanded: Renunciation of resistance harms altruism as much as egotism." And Tolstoy replies to Taraknath Das:

"You say that the English have enslaved your people and hold them in subjection because the latter have not resisted resolutely enough and have not met force by force.

But the case is just the opposite. If the English have enslaved the people of India it is just because the latter recognised, and still recognise, force as the fundamental principle of the social order. (...)

*A commercial company enslaved a nation comprising two hundred millions. Tell this to a man free from superstition and he will fail to grasp what these words mean. What does it mean that thirty thousand men, not athletes but rather weak and ordinary people, have subdued two hundred million vigorous, clever, capable, and freedom-loving people? Do not the figures make it clear that it is not the English who have enslaved the Indians, but the Indians who have enslaved themselves?"*²⁶

In the sixth and seventh chapter, also introduced by a quotation from Krishna, Tolstoy finishes his "Letter to a Hindoo" on December 14, 1908 with a comprehensive appeal criticizing civilisation:

"If only people freed themselves from their beliefs in all kinds of Ormuzds, Brahmas, Sabbaoths, and their incarnation as Krishnas and Christs, from beliefs in Paradises and Hells, in reincarnations and resurrections, from belief in the interference

of the Gods in the external affairs of the universe, and above all, if they freed themselves from belief in the infallibility of all the various Vedas, Bibles, Gospels, Tripitakas, Korans, and the like, and also freed themselves from blind belief in a variety of scientific teachings about infinitely small atoms and molecules and in all the infinitely great and infinitely remote worlds, their movements and origin, as well as from faith in the infallibility of the scientific law to which humanity is at present subjected: the historic law, the economic laws, the law of struggle and survival, and so on – if people only freed themselves from this terrible accumulation of futile exercises of our lower capacities of mind and memory called the ‘Sciences’, and from the innumerable divisions of all sorts of histories, anthropologies, homiletics, bacteriologies, jurisprudences, cosmographies, strategies – their name is legion – and freed themselves from all this harmful, stupefying ballast – the simple law of love, natural to man, accessible to all and solving all questions and perplexities, would of itself become clear and obligatory. (...)

Yes, in our time all these things must be cleared away in order that mankind may escape from self-inflicted calamities that have reached an extreme intensity. Whether an Indian seeks liberation from subjection to the English, or anyone else struggles with an oppressor either of his own nationality or of another – whether it be a Negro defending himself against the North Americans; or Persians, Russians, or Turkish governments, or any man seeking the greatest welfare for himself and for everybody else – they do not need explanations and justifications of old religious superstitions such as have been formulated by (...) a number of (...) interpreters and exponents of things that nobody needs; nor the innumerable scientific theories about matters not only unnecessary but for the most part harmful. (In the spiritual realm nothing is indifferent: what is not useful is harmful.)

What are wanted for the Indian as for the Englishman, the Frenchman, the German, and the Russian, are not Constitutions and Revolutions, nor all sorts of Conferences and Congresses, nor the many ingenious devices for submarine navigation, and aerial navigation, nor powerful explosives, nor all sorts of conveniences to add to the enjoyment of the rich, ruling classes; nor new schools and universities with innumerable faculties of science, nor an augmentation of papers and books, nor gramophones and cinematographs, nor those childish and for the most part corrupt stupidities termed art – but one thing only is needful: the knowledge of the simple and clear truth which finds place in every soul that is not stupefied by religious and scientific superstitions – the truth that for our life one law is valid – the

law of love, which brings the highest happiness to every individual as well as to all mankind. Free your minds from those overgrown, mountainous imbecilities which hinder your recognition of it, and at once the truth will emerge from amid the pseudo-religious nonsense that has been smothering it: the indubitable, eternal truth inherent in man, which is one and the same in all the great religions of the world. It will in due time emerge and make its way to general recognition, and the nonsense that has obscured it will disappear of itself, and with it will go the evil from which humanity now suffers.”²⁷

I. Gandhi in South Africa

When Gandhi took up his correspondence with Tolstoy from London, he had gathered experience as a lawyer and political advocate of the Indian minority in South Africa for more than 15 years. With his wife Kasturba he had four children (Harilal, Manilal, Ramdas, Devdas), before he decided in 1906 to live his marriage in celibacy. Gandhi became *abrahmachari*, a seeker for truth in renunciation by his experiences in an Indian stretcher-bearer-corps. He did no longer dress himself as an English gentleman but started to remember his Indian descentance. From an assimilation always compromised by racist oppression he proceeded to the laborious work for the emancipation of ostracized Indian indentured labourers. His path and that of numerous seekers for truth, *satyagrahi*, led into prison, because the Indian movement for emancipation massively acted as civil disobedients, that is calculated transgression of dehumiliating and unjust laws. In January 1908 Gandhi was in a Johannesburg prison for 20 days, because he disobeyed to an order to leave the Transvaal. In October 1908 Gandhi was in Volksrust and Pretoria prison for about two months, in prison clothes, together with black jail inmates and ordinary criminals under arrest. An agreement with General Smuts did result in a preliminary release from prison end of January 1908; Gandhi, however, again took up the campaign of civil disobedience when General Smuts broke his promise and did not keep his word in the agreement. *Satyagraha* campaigns in South Africa started 1906 in Johannesburg. An amendment bill to the so-called Asiatic laws was drafted to curtail the rights of Asiatic settlers. About 3.000 delegates of Indian settlers then held a meeting in Johannesburg and pledged “with God as witness” to resist the bill by non-violent means in case of it being passed. 200 *Satyagrahi* were sentenced to various prison terms because of their non-violent resistance. In January 1907 Gandhi and Smuts signed another agreement; but Smuts again could not keep his promise to withdraw the bill after voluntary registration of the Indians. The *Satyagraha* campaign was revived with a bonfire of 2.000 passports in an open meeting at Johannesburg on August 16, 1908. The *Satyagrahi* expected mass arrests, fines and prison sentences. Public floggings and open volley fire were the consequence. The Transvaal Indian struggle for emancipation led by Gandhi was the starting point for the first letter to Tolstoy. In addition, Gandhi had edited the weekly magazine of the

Indian minority in South Africa, "Indian Opinion", during his first farm experiment, Phoenix Settlement near Durban, an ashram where Gandhi practised his own life reforms with Satyagrahi families. Gandhi was strongly impressed and influenced by John Ruskin's ideas whose plea for manual labour, handicrafts and agriculture as "good labour" had impressed him. Similar ideas by the Russian peasant writers Bondarew and Sjutajew were borrowed by Tolstoy who propagated them as "bread labour" in his pamphlets. At first Gandhi was impressed by Tolstoy's book "The Kingdom of God":

*"Tolstoy's The Kingdom of God is Within You overwhelmed me. It left an abiding impression on me. Before the independent thinking, profound morality, and the truthfulness of this book, all the books given me (...) seemed to pale into insignificance."*²⁸

In addition he read Tolstoy's writings of social ethics "What is Art?", "The Slavery of our Time" or "Modern Slaves", "The First Step", "What Shall Be Done?" and the "Letter to a Hindoo".

J. Tolstoy and Gandhi

In his first letter from October 1, 1909, that Gandhi wrote during his negotiations in London concerning the withdrawal of the so-called "Black Act", Gandhi gave Tolstoy an account of the situation of the Indian minority in Transvaal, of the racial discrimination against 13.000 Indians so that half the population retreated from the Transvaal so as not to bow to the unjust law whereas almost 2.500 Satyagrahi went into prison, partly more than five times, for reasons of conscience. The prison term was four days to six months, in the majority of the cases combined with hard forced labour. The financial ruin of the prisoners and more than a hundred prison inmates had to be complained at the time when Gandhi wrote his first letter to Tolstoy. The delegation for the negotiations Gandhi belonged to most of all hoped to popularize its matter in Great Britain itself.

Gandhi asked Tolstoy for permission to publish a translation of his "Letter to a Hindoo" with a certain modification, namely to cross out the passage quoted above, in which Tolstoy refuted the belief of reincarnation and transmiration, because millions of Indians and Chinese set great store by this religious conviction. This concept of rebirth was taught and affirmed not by scientific proof but by experience, and would thus explain some secrets of life. To many a Satyagrahi who was detained in the Transvaal prisons this belief had been a comfort. Gandhi did not want to persuade Tolstoy of the validity of this belief, but only asked for the permission to cross out this passage. Besides, Gandhi asked Tolstoy about the title of the book from which Tolstoy had quoted Krishna for his "Letter to a Hindoo".

On October 7, 1909, Tolstoy responded to Gandhi from Yasnaya Polyana:

"May God help all our dear brothers and co-workers in the Transvaal. This fight between gentleness and brutality between humility and love on one side, and conceit and violence on the other, makes itself ever more strongly felt here to us also - espe-

*cially in the sharp conflicts between religious obligations and the laws of the State - expressed by the conscientious objection to render military service. Such objections are taking place very frequently."*²⁹

Tolstoy gave Gandhi the permission to publish his letter, even with changes, but Tolstoy pointed out that the immortality of the soul and the belief in divine truth and love would be more deeply rooted within a universal religion than the belief in rebirth. Besides religious enterprises should be free from financial matters. That is why Tolstoy did not want to accept a fee for the publication of his letter.

On November 10, 1909, Gandhi thanked Tolstoy in another letter from London in which he added Joseph Doke's biography on Gandhi and stressed the importance of the Transvaal struggle in which 50 percent of the concerned activists had to endure much suffering, hardships and many tribulations because of their principles. In this letter Gandhi pointed out that one of his sons had been arrested for the fourth time being sentenced to six months forced labour. In another letter from April 4, 1910, Gandhi reminded Tolstoy of a reply and additionally sent him his dialogue "Hind Swaraj or Indian Home Rule", his radical criticism of modern civilization.

K. Hind Swaraj

In the seventeenth chapter of "Hind Swaraj or Indian Home Rule" which Tolstoy appreciated most and which Gandhi translated from Gujarati into English in 1909, Gandhi, in his dialogue, stresses the superiority of "soul force" contrary to "brute force". In his plea for the power of truth and love Gandhi criticizes history perceived as an unbroken chain of wars; historical description was nothing else than a report of the permanent interruption of the natural path, of the permanent interruption of the power of soul force. In this chapter Gandhi elaborates the method to secure innate rights by voluntary suffering, as an alternative to armed resistance. He describes calculated breach of law as "soul force", e.g. the prison term which the Satyagrahi puts up with as "self-sacrifice". Instead of sacrificing other people, self-sacrifice was superior to any other sacrifice. Even if the issue proves to be unjust and a mistake, no one else has to suffer from an irreparable and irreconcilable damage by this way of solving a conflict. Conscience does not allow any submission to unjust laws and suspended normality: naive obedience to laws and permanent degradation by unjust laws. Gandhi stresses the principle of "home rule", "self rule" in opposite to enslaving tyranny. Gandhi criticizes the principle of decisions of majorities against minorities, because the majority might be "a gang of thieves" and the minority a "pious man". In opposite to coercion and intimidation under penalty of violence, Gandhi stresses non-violent resistance which questions and guarantees the basis for non-cooperation, by agreement. Gandhi asks in "Hind Swaraj" who has got courage: the violator or he or she who does not bow to violence? Equanimity and control over passions decide. Non-violent resistance of a seeker for truth with soul-force was "a sword to all sides"

which calls forth far-reaching results without blood shedding. A permanent competition for truth in compromise leads to a permanent and inexhaustable effort in search of common truth. Truthful people do not follow unjust laws; thus, peasants e.g. ignore unjust political restrictions and abandon them by non-cooperation. A special physical exercise for such a kind of non-violent resistance was not necessary, the weakening of the physical condition by a luxurious life and child-marriage, however, unreasonable. Easy enough but at the same time very difficult, such kind of "soul-force" was for sick and frail as well as for healthy and sound people. The complete liberation from sexual passions, renunciation and voluntary poverty, permanent search for truth and the culture of fearlessness are pre-conditions for Satyagraha. Life in celibacy, even in marriages, prevents man and woman from being weak and cowardly. No financial ambitions but indifference to money shall be combined with the search for truth. Not possessions, false ambitions, false honours, but fearlessness are the pre-condition to be free from worries about relatives, the government, wounds or death. A fearless person does not need a sword:

"A man with a stick suddenly came face to face with a lion and instinctively raised his weapon in self-defence. The man saw that he had only prated about fearlessness when there was none in him. That moment he dropped the stick and found himself free from all fear."³⁰

Meanwhile Gandhi had published Tolstoy's "Letter to a Hindoo" in which he calls himself a modest and humble follower of Tolstoy. Thus, Gandhi sent Tolstoy comprehensive information. Tolstoy replied from Yasnaya Polyana on May 8, 1910 that the biography on Gandhi had fascinated him and had given him the opportunity to know Gandhi better. On April 23, 1910, according to the diary of Tolstoy's doctor, Dushan P. Makovitzki, Tolstoy had said that Gandhi's book "Hind Swaraj" had interested him outstandingly; the book would be a deep condemnation of the modern European civilization from the point of view of a religious Hindoo. In a letter to his secretary Vladimir G. Chertkov Tolstoy noted on April 22, 1910 that Gandhi was very close to him, Tolstoy. In that letter from April 25 (May 8) Tolstoy wrote to Gandhi about "Hind Swaraj" that "the question you are dealing with in this book – passive resistance – ... is a matter of utmost importance not only for Indians but for whole mankind", whereas Gandhi himself substituted the term "passive resistance" by Satyagraha ("sticking to truth") during these years.

L. Tolstoy Farm

Meanwhile the non-violent resistance of the Transvaal Indians escalated. Hundreds of Indian families who did not want to bow to the colonial administration were ruined and deprived of their property. Gandhi, together with his German-Jewish friend and architect Hermann Kallenbach, organised a piece of land near Johannesburg for cultivation. Kallenbach gave these acres of land, a settlement with agriculture and fruit trees and gardens to the

Indian refugees who cultivated the land. Kallenbach had been impressed especially by Tolstoy's "Confession", because in this report of an existential midlife crisis Kallenbach discovered his own experiences. Kallenbach asked Tolstoy in a letter for permission to name the settlement after Tolstoy: "Tolstoy Farm" in order to realize a community of life and work according to Tolstoy's ideals on an area of about 100.000 acres of land. In his letter of August 15, 1910, Gandhi asked Tolstoy for the same and expressed his deep friendship with Hermann Kallenbach. By the name "Tolstoy Farm", Gandhi gave Tolstoy the chance to actively participate in the campaign of non-cooperation and non-violent resistance of the Transvaal Indians.

M. Tolstoy's legacy

In his letter of response dated September 7, 1910, from Kotschety, soon before his death (The letter arrived at Gandhi's place when Tolstoy had died!), Tolstoy revealed his thoughts which arose during his reading of the Gandhi letters and reports:

"The more I live – and specially now that I am approaching death, the more I feel inclined to express to others the feelings which so strongly move my being, and which, according to my opinion, are of great importance. That is, what one calls non-resistance, is in reality nothing else but the discipline of love undeformed by false interpretation. Love is the aspiration for communion and solidarity with other souls, and that aspiration always liberates the source of noble activities. That love is the supreme and unique law of human life, which everyone feels in the depth of one's soul. We find it manifested most clearly in the soul of the infants. Man feels it so long as he is not blinded by the false doctrines of the world.

That law of love has been promulgated by all the philosophies – Indian, Chinese, Hebrew, Greek and Roman. I think that it had been most clearly expressed by Christ, who said that in that law is contained both the law and the Prophets. But he has done more; anticipating the deformation to which that law is exposed, he indicated directly the danger of such deformation which is natural to people who live only for worldly interests. The danger consists precisely in permitting one's self to defend those interests by violence; that is to say, as he has expressed, returning blow by blows, and taking back by force things that have been taken from us, and so forth. Christ knew also, just as all reasonable human beings must know, that the employment of violence is incompatible with love, which is the fundamental law of life. He knew that, once violence is admitted, doesn't matter in even a single case, the law of love is thereby rendered futile. (...)

At present the question poses itself evidently in the following manner: either it must be admitted that we do not recognise any

discipline, religious or moral, and that we are guided in the organisation of life only by the law of force, or that all the taxes that we exact by force, the judicial and police organisations and above all the army must be abolished."³¹

In his last letter Tolstoy gives the example of resistance without violence by massive individual conscientious objection to military service, and Tolstoy indicates to the "manifest outrageous contradiction" between Christian teaching and political logic by ending his letter as follows:

"That contradiction is felt by all the governments, by your British Government as well as by our Russian Government; and therefore, by the spirit of conservatism natural to these governments, the opposition is persecuted, as we find in Russia as well as in the articles of your journal, more than any other anti-governmental activity. The governments know from which direction comes the principal danger and try to defend themselves with a great zeal in that trial not merely to preserve their interests but actually to fight for their very existence.

With my perfect esteem, LEO TOLSTOY."³²

- 1 Leo Tolstoy: **My Religion**, on life, thoughts on God and on the meaning of life, transl. by Leo Wiener (Complete Works, Vol.16), My Religion (1884), Boston 1904, p. 22, ch. III
- 2 Leo Tolstoy: **My Religion** (1884), Boston 1904, p. 25, III
- 3 Leo Tolstoy: **My Religion** (1884), Boston 1904, p. 35, III
- 4 Leo Tolstoy: **My Religion** (1884), Boston 1904, p. 36, IV
- 5 Leo Tolstoy: **My Religion** (1884), Boston 1904, p. 37, IV
- 6 Leo Tolstoy: **My Religion** (1884), Boston 1904, p. 40, IV
- 7 Leo Tolstoy: **My Religion** (1884), Boston 1904, p. 41, IV
- 8 Leo Tolstoy: **My Religion** (1884), Boston 1904, p. 41f., IV
- 9 Leo Tolstoy: **My Religion** (1884), Boston 1904, p. 42, IV
- 10 Leo Tolstoy: **My Religion** (1884), Boston 1904, p. 43, IV
- 11 Leo Tolstoy: **My Religion** (1884), Boston 1904, p. 44, IV
- 12 William Lloyd Garrison: **Declaration of Sentiments** (adopted by the Peace Convention, held in Boston, September 18,19 and 20, 1838) (quoted by Leo Tolstoy: The Kingdom of God is Within You. Christianity Not as a Mystic Religion But as a New Theory of Life (1893), New York 1894, pp. 4f., ch.I) (William Lloyd Garrison: Selections from Writings and Speeches of William Lloyd Garrison, Boston 1852, pp. 72-77) – notes 12 to 16: Garrison and Ballou quoted from: Leo Tolstoy, Writings on Civil Disobedience and Nonviolence, Philadelphia 1987, pp. 287-302 -
- 13 William Lloyd Garrison: **Declaration of Sentiments** (adopted by the Peace Convention, held in Boston, September 18,19 and 20, 1838)

(quoted in Leo Tolstoy: The Kingdom of God is Within You..., p. 6, ch.I)

- 14 William Lloyd Garrison: **Declaration of Sentiments** (adopted by the Peace Convention, held in Boston, September 18,19 and 20, 1838) (quoted in Leo Tolstoy: The Kingdom of God is Within You..., pp. 6f., ch.I)
- 15 Adin Ballou: **The Catechism of Non-Resistance** (quoted in Leo Tolstoy: The Kingdom of God is Within You..., p. 15, ch.I)
- 16 Adin Ballou: **The Catechism of Non-Resistance** (quoted in Leo Tolstoy: The Kingdom of God is Within You..., pp. 15f., ch.I)
- 17 **International Anti-Conscription Manifesto** (Young India, 16.9.1926, quoted in The Collected Works of Mahatma Gandhi, Vol. XXXI, Ahmedabad 1969, pp. 414f. – Gandhi added: "The manifesto is signed by well-known men and women from England, Finland, France, Germany, India, Sweden, Holland, Czechoslovakia, Belgium, Spain, Switzerland, Denmark, Austria, Japan, and Norway. The first step towards the abolition of the military spirit is no doubt abolition of conscription. But the reformers will have to put up an immense struggle to secure State action in the desired action. Each is afraid and distrustful of his neighbour.")
- 18 Leo Tolstoy: **The Kingdom of God is Within You ...**, pp. 174f., ch.VII
- 19 Leo Tolstoy: **The Kingdom of God is Within You ...**, p. 176, ch.VII
- 20 Leo Tolstoy: **The Kingdom of God is Within You ...**, p. 178, ch.VII
- 21 Leo Tolstoy: **The Kingdom of God is Within You ...**, pp. 180f., ch.VII
- 22 Letter from Taraknath Das to Leo Tolstoy (22.5.1908) (quoted from Alexander Shifman: Tolstoy and India, New Delhi 1978, p.71)
- 23 Leo Tolstoy: **Letter to a Hindoo** (1908) (documented by Kalidas Nag: Tolstoy and Gandhi, Patna 1950, p. 82, ch.I)
- 24 Leo Tolstoy: **Letter to a Hindoo** (1908) (documented by Kalidas Nag, p. 88, ch.III)
- 25 Leo Tolstoy: **Letter to a Hindoo** (1908) (documented by Kalidas Nag, p. 90, ch.IV)
- 26 Leo Tolstoy: **Letter to a Hindoo** (1908) (documented by Kalidas Nag, pp. 92f., ch.V)
- 27 Leo Tolstoy: **Letter to a Hindoo** (1908) (documented by Kalidas Nag, pp. 96-98, ch.VI,VII)
- 28 M.K. Gandhi: **An Autobiography** or The Story of my Experiments with Truth, chapter XV: „Religious Ferment“
- 29 Letter from Leo Tolstoy to M.K. Gandhi (7.10.1909) (documented by Kalidas Nag, p. 63)
- 30 M.K. Gandhi: **Hind Swaraj or Indian Home Rule** (1908), Chapter 17
- 31 Letter from Leo Tolstoy to M.K. Gandhi (7.9.1910) (documented by Kalidas Nag, pp.71-73)
- 32 Letter from Leo Tolstoy to M.K. Gandhi (7.9.1910) (documented by Kalidas Nag, p. 75)