Was Gandhi a Racist?
His Writings in South Africa

NISHIKANT KOLGE

This is a chronological account of Gandhi's writings with a view to assess whether or not his outlook towards African blacks can be considered racist. This article also attempts to understand the immediate context in which Gandhi makes his comments on black Africans and argues that the absence of such an understanding might lead to a dubious or inappropriate conclusion.

I am grateful to Rajmohan Gandhi for his valuable comments on the first draft of the paper. I also thank R C Pradhan and Siby K Joseph sincerely for correcting earlier versions of this paper.

Nishikant Kolge (*nishikantkolge@tripurauniv.in*) is with the Department of History, Tripura University.

The past few years have seen a renewal of interest in Gandhi's life in South Africa starting from Nagindas Sanghavi's *The Agony of Arrival, Gandhi: The South Africa Years*[1] published in 2006, to Ashwin Desai and Goolam Vahed's *The South African Gandhi: Stretcher-Bearer of Empire*. This renewal of interest in Gandhi's life in South Africa is a welcome development not just because it tries to understand one of the least explored and understood periods of his life but also because it generates a debate on controversial issues like whether or not Gandhi was a homosexual, racist, committed imperialist or all of these. Works like Arundhati Roy's recent introduction "The Doctor and The Saint" to the annotated edition of *Annihilation of Caste* originally authored by B R Ambedkar should also be regarded as an opportunity to reassess Gandhi's iconic image of an infallible mahatma reserved only for worship, to receiving him more as a human being liable to making mistakes. Rather than ignoring assertions in such works as sacrilege, there is value in taking them seriously and examining them more objectively by reviewing one's perception towards Gandhi's life and work. In addition, one has to challenge such criticisms which disregard facts and take excerpts from Gandhi's writings out of context to offer shallow analysis or deliberate misrepresentation of his life and work. A well-informed approach is necessary and inevitable for a deeper understanding of issues involved in it. However, as a matter of polite and effective debate, arguments should not be personalised as attempted by Rajmohan Gandhi (2015). One should not try to pay Gandhi's critics in their own coin by quoting him out of context. They deserve a much more serious response.

A brief review of *The South African Gandhi: Stretcher-Bearer of Empire* is taken as an entry point of this discussion. It is an excellently critical book on the South African phase of Gandhi's life. The authors are successful in their effort to present his various roles in South Africa that often overlapped and sometimes were conflicting. The book presents Gandhi as a lawyer and lawbreaker, journalist and propagandist, a loyal subject of the empire and agitator, a fighter against discrimination and a racist, a man of principle and a dealmaker, a passive resister and sergeant major and a man of peace and yet a man of war (Desai and Vahed 2015: 269). The authors are more successful in presenting the central theme that during his long sojourn in South Africa, Gandhi demonstrated his loyalty as a British Indian to the empire time and again. They effectively argue (2015: 294)

> Throughout his stay in South Africa, Gandhi consistently maintained that loyalty to Empire was the best way to get the British to recognise

> the equality of Indians and ensure the progressive enhancement of their rights. This led him to become a stretcher-bearer in the Empire's many 'wars.'

However, they are not as successful regarding Gandhi's attitude towards the black Africans. It appears from their writings that Gandhi was a racist who believed that Indians were far superior to the black Africans. They arrive at this conclusion through two aspects. First, Gandhi was racist because while he struggled to remove racial discrimination between whites and British Indians, he never made any effort to form an alliance with the black Africans. Second, Gandhi was racist because he emphasised the Aryan connection of Indians to argue for equal treatment for British Indians in South Africa. It is true that Gandhi never made an attempt to form an alliance with the blacks and he emphasised the Aryan connection of Indians to argue for equal treatment of British Indians in South Africa. But there is need for a proper investigation of his writings in order to conclude whether Gandhi did so because of racial prejudices or if he was motivated by strong political considerations or was guided by other reasons. One of the major shortcomings of the book is that Gandhi's writings of that time have not been consulted properly to substantiate the argument about Gandhi's attitude towards the blacks. In order to arrive at any conclusion on this point, a comprehensive and objective research of Gandhi's writings on the blacks is essential.

The present paper is an attempt in this direction. It presents a chronological account of Gandhi's writings with a view to assess his outlook towards African blacks. It also looks at the immediate context of Gandhi's comments on the blacks. The absence of such awareness of the immediate context might lead to a dubious or inappropriate conclusion. For instance, Gandhi's following remarks on food served for African blacks in jail can easily be interpreted as the former's concern for them. He wrote (1908, in CWMG 8: 153):

> the vegetables are not washed, neither are they dressed with spices. Moreover, the vegetables served to the Kaffir prisoners consist mostly of the leftovers and peelings from the vegetables cooked for the whites.

However an understanding of the immediate context shows that Gandhi was actually concerned about the Indian prisoners and not the African natives. He makes this remark because the same food was served to the Indian prisoners in South African jails. To take another example, the following words of Gandhi can be easily used to label him a racist if they are taken out of their immediate context. Gandhi wrote (1910, in CWMG 10: 153):

> Some Indians do have contacts with Kaffir women. I think such contacts are fraught with grave danger. Indians would do well to avoid them altogether.

These words are part of Gandhi's article in *Indian Opinion*, his weekly journal in South Africa. Gandhi is suggesting, here, that people from the Indian community should refrain from indulging in immoral acts with the women in question.

A Word of Caution

It is a basic tenet of the practice of writing history not to judge the past by present-day standards. What we may regard as offensive today—sexist, or racist, or casteist, for example—might have once been socially accepted terms. For instance, those who are aware of the use of the word "kaffir" by Europeans and Indians settled in South Africa in the late 19th and early 20th centuries cannot regard Gandhi as racist for using the word to describe African natives, though in South Africa today the term is regarded as racially offensive. And those who have developed a proper understanding of the social, economic and political position of the Indian community in South Africa, as well as the nature of their grievances, and the limits to which they could articulate them, cannot regard Gandhi as racist for not making common cause with the black Africans. Given the historical context in which Gandhi was fighting for the rights of the British Indians in South Africa, such an alliance was an impossibility. In his two-decade-long struggle for the British Indians in South Africa, Gandhi could not fight for their political rights. Just a few days before leaving for South Africa, in July 1914, in an interview to *The Transvaal Leader*, Gandhi said "we have never asked for political equality. We do not hope to get that." He even denied that he fought for the right to vote. He says "what I always have insisted on was the removal of racial distinctions, not for equality" (Gandhi 1914, in CWMG 12: 479). When Gandhi could not think of fighting for political equality for Indians in South Africa, it would be too much to expect that he should fight for the rights of black Africans there. For the same reason, a reader who looks at Gandhi's writings in their historical context would hesitate to call him a racist on discovering that he wanted removal of racial distinctions between white Europeans and British Indians only—and not removal of all racial distinctions in South Africa.

Conflicting Views?

As early as in December 1894, around one and half years after his arrival in South Africa, Gandhi wrote: "a general belief seems to prevail in the Colony that the Indians are little better, if at all, than savages or the Natives of Africa" (CWMG 1894).

It appears that the intensity of racial overtones increased year after year. In 1896, Gandhi wrote (1896, in CWMG 2: 8):

> …in special legislation for Indians, which has for its object the degradation of the Indian community in that country. […] we are classed with the natives of South Africa—Kaffir race.

At the end of the same year, he wrote (1896, in CWMG 2: 74):

> Ours is one continual struggle against a degradation sought to be inflicted upon us by the Europeans, who desire to degrade us to the level of the raw Kaffir whose occupation is hunting, and whose sole ambition is to collect a certain number of cattle to buy a wife with and, then, pass his life in indolence and nakedness.

And in 1899, he again wrote "it would place them [British Indian], who are undoubtedly infinitely superior to the Kaffirs, in close proximity to the latter" (1899, in CWMG 3: 76).

Following are Gandhi's writings in chronological order that appear to have racial overtones.

> In contravention of the 14th article of the London Convention, the Transvaal Government passed laws practically classifying Indians with the natives of the soil (Gandhi 1902, in CWMG 3: 233).
>
> But, as it is the wont in this part of the world, they [British India] have been dragged down with the Kaffir without the slightest justification (Gandhi 1903, in CWMG 3: 285).

> We are informed that at the plague hospital, no distinction is made between Indians and Kaffirs, all being herded together indiscriminately (Gandhi 1905, in CWMG 4: 362).
>
> It was a gross injustice to seek to place Indians in the same class as the Kaffirs (Gandhi 1906, in CWMG 5: 324).
>
> If registration is made compulsory, there will be no difference between Indians and Kaffirs, and the neighbouring Colony will be tempted to adopt it as a precedent (Gandhi 1907, in CWMG 7: 414).
>
> Kaffirs as a rule are uncivilised—the convicts even more so. They are troublesome, very dirty and live almost like animals (Gandhi 1908, in CWMG 8: 135).
>
> But so long as Indian prisoners are classed with the Kaffirs, the danger will remain (Gandhi 1909, in CWMG 9: 108).
>
> These pinpricks will not be stopped so long as British Indians continue generally to be bracketed with the natives of South Africa (Gandhi 1911, in CWMG 11: 55).
>
> In General Hertzog's estimation, evidently, Natives and Asiatics should be classed together (Gandhi 1913, in CWMG 11: 452).

Another Gandhi

However if we look at these writings closely and clearly, we also find, as early as in December 1894 another Gandhi: visionary Gandhi who is very cordial, respectful and supportive of the cause of the black Africans of South Africans. In 1894, Gandhi wrote in *The Times of Natal* "the Indians do not regret that capable Natives can exercise the franchise. They would regret if it were otherwise" (Gandhi 1894, in CWMG 1: 136).

We find much evidence year after year in his writings wherein he is very respectful of the natives of South Africa. In 1895, he described the natives of the Trappist Mission as "patterns of simplicity, virtue and gentleness" (Gandhi 1895, in CWMG 1: 226). In 1896, he writes that Indian traders in South Africa "found a very valuable customer in the native of South Africa, called Zulu or Kaffir" (Gandhi 1896, in CWMG 2: 32). In 1903, we find that Gandhi was defending the right of the native Africans to travel in the railway first class against the charges of an anonymous writer of *The Transvaal Leader* "who waxes very wrathful over the audacity of the railway administration in having accommodated Native travelers in a first-class carriage on a local train." Gandhi wrote "they [Native Passengers] had paid their fares was no question for him [anonymous writer] to consider." He added "…Native passengers had paid first-class fares, they were as much entitled as the correspondent himself to travel by that train in a first-class carriage" (Gandhi 1903, in CWMG 4: 31). And in 1904 Gandhi criticised Loveday because "'to him [Loveday], evidently, the kaffir is an abomination' and no matter how much advanced he may be in education, he is not fit even to walk on the foot-paths" (Gandhi 1904, in CWMG 4: 105).

In 1905, we find Gandhi is registering his humble protest against the Johannesburg Town Council's proposed by-law whereby every native, holding a cycle permit and riding a cycle within municipal areas, was mandated to wear on his left arm, a numbered badge which shall be issued to him, together with his permit. Writing on the issue Gandhi remarked that passing such a drastic by-law was "a matter of painful surprise," he further added "we should be failing in our duty if we did not, in the interests of community of South Africa, raise our humble protest against them" (Gandhi 1905, in CWMG 4: 347). In the same year Gandhi wrote an article on Abraham Lincoln in *Indian Opinion* wherein he wants the Indians of South Africa to recognise the hardships of America's black slaves (Gandhi 1905, in CWMG 5: 50–52). At the end of the same year, Gandhi expressed his concern for the blacks of South Africa when the Johannesburg Town Council resolved that the kaffirs living near the Malay location would be shifted to Klipspruit. He wrote: "we wonder how the Kaffirs will manage to live at such distance" (Gandhi 1905, in CWMG 5: 135).

In 1906, in his weekly journal *Indian Opinion* he mentioned the efforts of an African black Tengo Jabavu, editor of Imvo, to create an interstate native college. Gandhi suggested that the British Indians of South Africa needed to learn from such an example. He wrote (1906, in CWMG 5: 235)

> If the Natives of South Africa, with all their financial disabilities and social disadvantages, are capable of putting forth this local effort, is it not incumbent upon the British Indian community to take the lesson to heart, and press forward the matter of education facilities with far greater energy and enthusiasm than have been used hitherto?

In 1907, Gandhi writes about Natal legislators passing a law which discriminated against both British Indian and Native Africans equally. He wrote (1907, in CWMG 7: 50):

> Our Natal legislators have passed a law which gives sweets to one and cactus to the other. From the Natal *Government Gezette* we gather that there are four classes of prisoners in Natal: white, Coloured, Indian and Kaffir. If any work is taken from the white or the Coloured prisoners, the Government will give them some reward. But the Indian or the Kaffir prisoners who do any work will get nothing. […]The Government have, in this manner, created classes even among prisoners.

Subsequently in 1908 he wrote, "Asiatic prisoners are classed with Natives. I do not object to this…" (Gandhi 1908, in CWMG 91: 74). In 1910 Lord Selborne suggested that if the whites of South Africa were not careful and persisted in their treatment of the native African, men would arise from among them and become their leaders. According to Selborne this was the biggest problem facing South Africa. Gandhi criticised Selborne and argued that "their [native of South Africa] sincere well-wishers, however, should welcome the rise of such leaders—the more the better—and encourage them" (Gandhi 1910, in CWMG 10: 125). In the same year in a letter to M P Fancy, he sympathised with the blacks of South Africa when he wrote: "I shuddered to read the account of the hardships that the Kaffirs had to suffer in the third-class carriages in the Cape and I wanted to experience the same hardships myself" (Gandhi 1910, in CWMG 10: 183).

Next year while writing to his friend H S L Polak, he informed him that he along with Kasturba and two friends travelled in the third class carriage where generally "Natives are herded together like cattle!" (Gandhi 1911, in CWMG 11: 443). We also know that Gopal Krishna Gokhale, whom Gandhi considered as his political guru was touring South Africa in Gandhi's company in 1912, and was taken by Gandhi to Dube's (a native of South Africa) school during a stay of less than 48 hours at Phoenix (Lelyveld 2011: 64).

These writings present us with a puzzle. They appear to reject an opinion largely held by Gandhian scholars that "the young lawyer [Gandhi]… initially shared some of the racial and class prejudices prevalent among those for who he worked,

however he outgrew these by around 1908, that is some six years before he left Africa" (Nauriya 2006: 13). They also appear to reject the idea propagated by the critics of Gandhi that in order to rescue Gandhi from his past and to make himself a South African hero, Gandhi as early as in 1909 began the project to rewrite the history of his struggle in South Africa (Roy 2014: 88). On the other hand, it appears that during the entire duration of Gandhi's stay in South Africa (1894–1914), his writings seem to be contradictory rather than evolutionary. It means that throughout the two decades in South Africa, we encounter two contrasting Gandhis—one the visionary Gandhi who is cordial and respectful towards black Africans while writing about them and two, the narrow racial pleader Gandhi who appears to be frankly racist. It appears from the above assessment that, as early as 1894 we are faced with two contrasting Gandhis; one who grumbles that an "Indian is being dragged down to the position of raw Kaffir" and the second one who writes that "the Natives of Trappist mission are patterns of simplicity, virtue and gentleness." Both Gandhis continued to remain noticeable as late as 1913. Joseph Lelyveld also found two contrasting Gandhis when he asked (2011: 60):

> how do we reconcile these two contrasting Gandhi, each circa 1908 in South Africa—this debater and visionary with narrow racial pleader who, earlier and afterward that same year, spoke in such and different vein?

He added, "Can one be seen as more real or enduring than the other?" It may not be easy to find a definite answer to Lelyveld's question. However, some clarity can be achieved in this respect by analysing Gandhi's writings and by putting them in the proper context.

The Immediate Context

A casual reading of Gandhi's writings reveal that all the quotes which appear to be burdened with racist undertones follow one single pattern; they were written to express Gandhi's concern about the British Indian being classified with the South African black. In all other instances, Gandhi seems to be respectful towards the natives of South Africa while writing about them. This investigation can only help us to understand whether Gandhi was really offended because British Indians were being classed with the blacks or his statements were guided by strong political considerations of his time or there were other reasons behind them. It also needs to be investigated why, in this particular context, Gandhi's statements on the blacks of South Africa are so harsh.

If we look at the context of the writings where Gandhi seems unhappy about Indians being classified with the blacks in South Africa, it appears that he is referring either to the white government's policy or the biases of the white people and not expressing his displeasure on the classification of Indians along with the natives. For example, in his speech at a public meeting in Bombay on 26 September 1896 he says (1896, in CWMG 2: 9):

> the policy of the Orange Free State, which, in the words of its leading organ, 'has made the British Indian an impossibility by simply classifying him with the South African natives,' is cherished by the other States as a model policy.

Let us consider another example from Gandhi's pamphlet titled *The Grievances of British Indian in South Africa: An Appeal to the Indian Public* written in 1896. He wrote (1896, in CWMG 2: 74):

> The aim of the Christian Governments, so we read, is to raise people whom they come in contact with or whom they control. It is otherwise in South Africa. There, the deliberately expressed object is not to allow the Indian to rise higher in the scale of civilization but to lower him to the position of the Kaffir; in the words of the Attorney-General of Natal, 'to keep him forever a hewer of wood and drawer of water', 'not to let him form part of the future South African nation that is going to be built'; in the words of another legislator in Natal, 'to make the Indian's life more comfortable in his native land than in the Colony of Natal'. The struggle against such degradation is so severe that our whole energy is spent in resistance.

Similarly Gandhi wrote (1902, in CWMG 3: 277):

> in contravention of the 14th article of the London Convention, the Transvaal Government passed laws practically classifying Indians with the natives of the soil. It will be remembered that both the late Lord Loch and Sir Hercules Robinson protested against any such classification and, under the above article, claimed for the Indians the same rights as the other British subjects.

It is evident from these excerpts that though Gandhi on many occasions expresses his concern for the British Indian being classed with South African blacks, he does not do so because he considers them as an inferior race.

He does so to record his opposition to the classification of British Indians as natives of South Africa in order to impose civil disabilities—such as forbidding them from walking on footpaths or travelling in the first class compartments of trains—on them.

However, one cannot ignore the fact that there are a few occasions when Gandhi categorically stated that British Indians are undoubtedly infinitely superior to the kaffirs. Such statements call for further clarification. In the 1890s, South Africa comprised four areas. The two British ones were the Cape Colony, which was self-governing under the crown; and Natal which was a crown colony. The two Boer republics were the Transvaal and the Orange Free State. There was severe racial discrimination in all these places. The whites considered themselves superior. However, it is to be noted that the white government was willing to grant civil rights and exempt the "educated" and "civilised" Asians and blacks of South Africa from racial discrimination. It was in this context that Gandhi tried to project the British Indians as being superior to the South African blacks. Thus Gandhi was not claiming that the British Indians are superior to African blacks, the educated and civilised ones. All that he was claiming was that unlike the African "savages" and "raw kaffirs" British Indians are eligible for certain kind of civil rights which were given to the "educated and civilised" African blacks.

Political Strategy, Not Racism

From the above analysis it is clear that while disassociating the British Indians from African blacks, Gandhi was only trying to claim equality with the whites as far as the question of civil rights was concerned. It should be taken as part of his political strategy rather than a byproduct of his racist outlook. It was

only in jail that Gandhi demanded different food and separate lavatories for British Indian prisoners (that context will be analysed later). However some of Gandhi's critics including Paul F Power (1969: 445), J H Stone II (1990: 724) and Arundhati Roy (2014: 67) have argued otherwise. According to them Gandhi petitioned the authorities and got a third entrance opened for British Indians at the Durban post office so that Indians did not need to use the same entrance as the "kaffirs." Roy writes: "The Post Office had only two entrances: one for Blacks and one for Whites. Gandhi petitioned the authorities and had a third entrance opened so that Indians did not need to use the same entrance as the 'Kaffirs'" (2014: 67). It is a fact that the post office had only two entrances; it is also true that the president of the Natal Indian Congress (NIC) petitioned the authorities in connection with separate entrances for Europeans and natives and Asiatics at the post office. These critics create the impression that Gandhi demanded separate entrance for Indians and blacks because he felt offended to share the existing entrance with the latter. These critics have not provided any major documentary evidence for their inference.

What is more, the original petition of the NIC is not available at present. Hence we are left with only one authentic source and that is the writings of Gandhi. While making a report to the NIC in August 1895, Gandhi mentioned that "a correspondence was carried on by the late President with the Government in connection with the separate entrances for the Europeans and Natives and Asiatics at the Post Office" (Gandhi 1895, in CWMG 1: 236). He further added that as a result separate entrances had beenSorry, nS provided for the three communities. He found the new arrangement "altogether unsatisfactory." One may ask why Gandhi found it unsatisfactory as the same has been demanded by the president of the NIC. Gandhi while making an appeal to Indian public underlined the fact that "In the Durban Post and Telegraph Offices, there were separate entrances for natives and Asiatics and Europeans." He further added, "we felt the indignity too much and many respectable Indians were insulted and called all sorts of names *by the clerks at the counter. We petitioned the authorities to do away with the invidious distinction*…" (Gandhi 1896, in CWMG 2: 13).

It is obvious that the earlier demand for separate entrances at the post office for British Indians and the subsequent appeal for removing such "invidious distinction" prove that Gandhi was primarily concerned about the indignities heaped on British Indians in both the cases and it had nothing to do with the actual separation from African blacks.

Even otherwise, there are other evidences which can be cited to counter and contradict untenable inferences drawn by Gandhi's critics. For instance, in 1904 Gandhi wrote an article in *Indian Opinion* titled as "Foot-Paths in the Transvaal." Therein he referred to a proposal of the colonial secretary which was being discussed in the legislative council. That proposal had sought the right of the municipalities to prohibit the use of the sidewalks of any public street by blacks not holding letters of exemption and issued under the Coloured Persons Relief Proclamation, 1901 and by coloured persons who were not respectable and well conducted. Gandhi quotes an instance narrated by Turner (he was Medical Officer of Health for the Colony of the Transvaal, and member of the Legislative Council

but Gandhi only mentions him by his surname) in which a white man was found outside the government buildings in Pretoria, "swaying to and fro, with his hands in his pockets and a pipe in his mouth, and spitting all round a clear six foot circle." Gandhi adds: "The question, therefore, is hardly one of colour, but of hygiene and sanitation. The proper thing would be to punish all people who soiled the foot-paths, and it provides an intelligible, safe and inoffensive remedy" (Gandhi 1904, in CWMG 4: 240).

It is evident that all that Gandhi was emphasising was that the issue was not one of colour but of hygiene. It is only in such a context that Gandhi's demand for separate food and lavatories for Indian prisoners in South African jails should be viewed. Here it is relevant to quote Gandhi to substantiate the argument that he was not making demands to show contempt for the blacks but out of concern for the well-being of Indian prisoners. In an article titled "My Experience in Goal–1," which appeared in *Indian Opinion*, he wrote, "It was, however, as well that we were classed with the Natives. It was a welcome opportunity to see the treatment meted out to Natives, their conditions (of life in gaol), and their habits."

After giving detailed descriptions of what kind of food was served in gaol, Gandhi wrote: "it is thus clear that both Kaffirs and Europeans get food suited to their tastes. The poor Indians—nobody bothers about them! They cannot get the food they want. … There is nothing for it but to let ourselves be classed with the Kaffirs and starve" (Gandhi 1908, in CWMG 8: 154). Elsewhere he also wrote: "Asiatic prisoners are classed with Natives. I do not object to this, but I claim that they should be supplied with food according to their customs" (Gandhi 1908, in CWMG 91: 74).

While sharing his second experience in gaol with his *Indian Opinion* readers, Gandhi informs that he demanded separate lavatories for Indian prisoners so that they need not share it with the natives of South Africa. He also informs the readers that he did it because he himself witnessed abuse and violence by the blacks of South Africa and he came to know that many Indians had to go through similar tribulations. It was only in such circumstances and due to his personal experiences that he demanded separate food and lavatories for Indian prisoners. Here Nelson Mandela is worth quoting: "He [Gandhi] was reacting not to African 'Natives', but criminalised Natives." He added "all in all, Gandhi must be forgiven those prejudices and judged in the context of time and the circumstances" (1995: 15).

Gandhi's attitude towards African blacks should be viewed at two levels. At one level, it appears that he held some strong opinions about the African blacks. However, when one analyses their immediate context, it appears that Gandhi espoused such opinions only while expressing his concern for the British Indian when the latter were being classed with the African blacks. Further investigation reveals that his concerns were guided by political considerations. This was the only way for him to argue for civil rights for the British Indians in South Africa.

Generally, he appears to be respectful and supportive of the cause of African blacks. This is also in consonance with what he wrote about them subsequently. In 1924, while writing in *Satyagraha in South Africa*, he tried to challenge the prevalent racial prejudices by calling Zulus "handsome." He went a step further when he said, "it is only vanity which makes us look upon the Negroes as savages. They are not the barbarians we imagine them to be" (Gandhi 1928: 9).

Concluding Remarks

In historical writings, there is a general belief that truth lies somewhere in between two extremes. However, even when we accept that there are two extreme positions of historical truth, the middle position cannot be exactly located as historical explanations and positions always involve prejudgments and preconceived notions. Therefore, there is always a danger of the middle point being tilted to one side or the other. This study, which is sympathetic to Gandhi could be concluded by taking the position that Gandhi was neither a champion of the anti-racist movement which aimed at complete eradication of racial prejudices nor a fanatical racist who always showed disdain for the South African blacks.

NOTE

1 Nagindas Sanghavi (2006), *The Agony of Arrival, Gandhi: The South Africa Years*, New Delhi: Rupa. For more examples Surendra Bhana and Goolam Vahed (2005), *The Making of a Political Reformer: Gandhi in South Africa, 1893–1914,* New Delhi: Manohar; Anil Nauriya (2006), *The African Element in Gandhi*, New Delhi: National Gandhi Museum (Electronic Version) and Ramachandra Guha (2013): *Gandhi Before India*, New Delhi: Allen Lane.

REFERENCES

Desai, A and G Vahed (2015): *The South African Gandhi: Stretcher-Bearer of Empire*, New Delhi: Navayana Publishing Pvt Ltd.

Gandhi, Rajmohan (2015): "Independence and Social Justice: The Ambedkar-Gandhi Debate," *Economic & Political Weekly*, 11 April, Vol 50, No 15.

Gandhi, M K (1928): *Satyagraha in South Africa* (translated by V G Desai), Ahmedabad: Navajivan Publishing House.

— (1958 onwards): *The Collected Works of Mahatma Gandhi (98 volumes)*, New Delhi: Publication Division, Government of India.

Lelyveld, Joseph (2011): *Great Soul: Mahatma Gandhi and His Struggle with India*, New Delhi: HarperCollins Publisher.

Mandela, Nelson (1995): "Gandhi the Prisoner," *Mahatma Gandhi 125 Years: Remembering Gandhi, Understanding Gandhi, Relevance of Gandhi*, B R Nanda (ed), Michigan: Indian Council for Cultural Relations and New Age International Publisher.

Nauriya, Anil (2006): *The African Element in Gandhi*, New Delhi: National Gandhi Museum (Electronic Version).

Power, Paul F (1969): "Gandhi in South Africa," *The Journal of Modern African Studies*, Vol 7, No 3.

Roy, Arundhati (2014): "The Doctor and The Saint" (Introduction) of *Annihilation of the Caste* by B R Ambedkar, New Delhi: Navayana.

Stone II, J H (1990): "M K Gandhi: Some Experiments with Truth," *Journal of Southern African Studies*, Vol 16, No 4.