

Are we Jews merely a persecuted people asking for mercy, or have we a message which we want both to proclaim and to carry out? Are we conscious of THE YOKE which our Father placed upon us?... This conversation between Jews and Gandhi is the first between Israel and India. This is a significant moment in our eyes.³⁸

Quite surprisingly, in the Hebrew edition of these letters, which they printed, they were blunter and wrote that "it is a time of great disagreement."³⁹

Buber ended his letter emphasizing his careful approach:

I have been very slow in writing this letter to you, Mahatma... Day and night I took myself to task, searching whether I had not in any one point overstepped the measure of self-preservation allotted and even prescribed by God to a human community, and whether I had not fallen into the grievous error of collective egotism.⁴⁰

The Israeli scholar Gideon Shimoni argued that it was uncharacteristic of Gandhi not to respond to this kind of letter, and, hence, he assumed that he unfortunately had not read them at all.⁴¹ Corroboration for this can be found in Magnes's correspondence with Gandhi's secretary, in which he expressed his disappointment as well in the fact that in his conversation with his Jewish biographer Louis Fischer on this subject, Gandhi had no recollection of the subject.⁴²

In their response to Gandhi, Buber and Magnes did not object to the satyagraha principle itself, but argued that the extreme circumstances in Germany did not enable following this path and such a course of action would not yield positive results but, rather, mass killing. According to them, Gandhi did not understand the fundamental differences between German evil and the past situation in South Africa. Buber emphasized that he read everything Gandhi had written about South Africa, and that what happened to the Indians there was incomparable—quantitatively or qualitatively—with what was happening to the Jews under Hitler's regime. Buber, who himself escaped Germany just a few months before, points to the difference between the two regimes and mentions his five-year personal experience under the Nazi regime: Buber claims that it was not possible that any kind of Jewish leadership similar to Gandhi's leadership in South Africa could arise. His words are worth quoting at length, as it reflects Buber's own experience:

Jews are being persecuted, robbed, maltreated, tortured, and murdered. And you, Mahatma Gandhi, say that their position in the country where they suffer all this is an exact parallel to the position of Indians in South Africa at the time you inaugurated your famous "Force of Truth" or "Strength of the Soul" (Satyagraha) campaign... Now do you know or do you not know, Mahatma, what a concentration camp is like and what goes on there? Do you know of the torments in the concentration camp, of its methods of slow and quick slaughter?⁴³

Buber writes with pain about his five-year experiences under Hitler's regime:

And do you think perhaps that a Jew in Germany could pronounce in public one single sentence of a speech such as yours without being knocked down? Of what significance is it to point to a certain something in common when such differences are overlooked?... In the five years I myself spent under the present regime, I observed many instances of genuine Satyagraha among the Jews, instances showing a strength of spirit wherein there was no question of bartering their rights or of being bowed down, and where neither force nor cunning was used to escape the consequences of their behaviour. Such actions, however, exerted apparently not the slightest influence on their opponents. All honour indeed to those who displayed such strength of soul! But I cannot recognise herein a parole for the general behaviour of

German Jews that might seem suited to exert an influence on the oppressed or on the world. An effective stand in the form of non-violence may be taken against unfeeling human beings ...There is a certain situation in which from the "Satyagraha" of the strength of the spirit no "Satyagraha of the power of truth can result. The word "Satyagraha" signifies testimony. Testimony without acknowledgment, ineffective, unobserved martyrdom, a martyrdom cast to the winds—that is the fate of innumerable Jews in Germany. God alone accepts their testimony God "seals" it... Such martyrdom is a deed—but who would venture to demand it?⁴⁴

In hindsight, after the Holocaust's horrors were revealed, it is obvious that one cannot refute Buber's rejection of Gandhi's comparison.

Buber's stand is clear: The crucial issue is the question of circumstances. Can satyagraha function under any given circumstances? Buber demands that the particular circumstances of any matter shall be discussed and considered. Personally, he does not reject Gandhi's non-violence philosophy; he would rather wish to accept it, but he refuses to accept it blindly.⁴⁵

Buber continues, in one of the most important paragraphs, and admits that despite the decades-long persecution of the Jews, there is no non-violence doctrine in Judaism. The Jewish solution for eliminating violence is found in the Hebrew prophets' doctrine of morality and justice, which serves as a barrier against violence:

We do not want force. We have not proclaimed, as did Jesus, the son of our people, and as you do, the teaching of non-violence, because we believe that a man must sometimes use force to save himself or even more his children. But from time immemorial we have proclaimed the teaching of justice and peace; we have taught and we have learned that peace is the aim of all the world and that justice is the way to attain it. Thus, we cannot desire to use force. No one who counts himself in the ranks of Israel can desire to use force.⁴⁶

Magnes's Letter

Judah L. Magnes defined himself as a pacifist. He understood the fundamental differences between Gandhi's approach (according to which "he fears not death," which enables one a different sphere of action) and between Jewish law (which consecrates life). Still, he emphasized as well that Jews have a very long history of martyrdom and no one should teach them about suffering:

But as to the Jews—I do not know if there is deeper and more widespread history of martyrdom. ..If ever a people was a people of Non-violence through century after century, it was the Jews. I think that they need learn but little from anyone in faithfulness to their God and in the readiness to suffer while they Sanctify His name.⁴⁷

Even if the Jews would like to implement satyagraha, they should need a practical leader. Magnes emphasizes rightly that Gandhi was a very practical leader and that all the satyagraha campaigns were well planned ahead with careful consideration for public, media, and political attention. The situation in Germany was completely different and lacked the possibility of receiving any public attention: "The streets are the same. Business goes on as usual, the casual visitor sees nothing... life is snuffed out like a candle, and no one sees it or knows that the light is out," Magnes wrote.⁴⁸

Magnes had a crisis with his pacifism and therefore distinguished between fighting for good and fighting against evil. According to his opinion, fighting for good is wrong, but fighting against evil as manifested in the Nazis was justified, as it was a no-choice situation:

The question gives me no rest, and I am sure there are many like myself. Like you I do not believe in any war. I have pledged myself never to take part in a war... There can be no war for something good. That is a contradiction in terms. The good must be achieved through totally different means. But a war against something evil?... For us it would thus become, not a righteous war, nor to use your term, a justifiable war, but a necessary war, not for something good, but because no other choice is left us against the greatest evil. Or do you know of some other choice? ⁴⁹

As mentioned above, Gandhi did not respond to Buber's and Magnes's reservations, but he did reply Hayim Greenberg, the editor of the *Jewish Frontier*, an American Zionist Socialist newspaper, who was also one of Gandhi's admirers. Greenberg, too, rejected Gandhi's comparison between the circumstances of the German Jews to that of the Indians in South Africa, and stressed that the satyagraha fighters in South Africa never encountered a moral abomination like the one extant in Nazi Germany:

We Are Treated as Subhumans: We Are Asked to be Superhuman", Hayim Greenberg had said: "...the spiritual leader of young India blames us for not exhibiting the heroism of militant pacifism in those lands where Jews are persecuted."⁵⁰

As part of his response, which Gandhi published together with some parts of Greenberg's letter, Gandhi complimented Greenberg on his writing.⁵¹ He explained that the publication of his views did not emanate from his desire to criticize the Jews, but rather, because his Jewish friends pressured him to write and he could not abstain from expressing his beliefs. Gandhi accepted the basic claim that a Jewish leader could not act in Nazi Germany for more than five minutes before being killed, but, in his opinion, this did not undermine the expediency of non-violence, and its effects should be examined in the long run:

It is highly probable that, as the writer says, "a Jewish Gandhi in Germany, should one arise, could function for about five minutes and would be promptly taken to the guillotine". But that will not disprove my case or shake my belief in the efficacy of ahimsa. I can conceive the necessity of the immolation of hundreds, if not thousands, to appease the hunger of dictators who have no belief in ahimsa. Indeed the maxim is that ahimsa is the most efficacious in front of the great himsa. Its quality is really tested only in such cases. Sufferers need not see the result during their lifetime.⁵²

Gandhi adhered to his position, and none of the information about what was happening in Germany could dissuade him from his belief that non-violent resistance was right and just. According to Gandhi's satyagraha, the nature of any man was good. Another fundamental aspect was that there was a substantial difference between the evil and the doer of evil, therefore, eventually Hitler, or any evil doer, must respond to "proofs of love":

Even so I do not despair because Herr Hitler's or the German heart has not yet melted. On the contrary I plead for more suffering and still more till the melting has become visible to the naked eye.⁵³

Moreover, Gandhi even accused the Jewish people of never having tried to act according to the satyagraha principle. As evidence, he presented world Jewry's demand that the Western countries should unite against Germany and wage a general war against it, and wrote:

Jews, so far as I know, have never practiced non-violence as an article of faith or even as a deliberate policy. Indeed, it is a stigma against them that their ancestors crucified Jesus. Are they not supposed to believe in eye for an eye and tooth for a tooth? Have they no violence in their hearts for their oppressors? Do they not want the so-called democratic powers to punish Germany for her persecution and to deliver them from oppression? If they do, there is no non-violence in their hearts. Their violence, if it may be so called, is of the helpless and the weak.⁵⁴

A week later Gandhi wrote following the same line, during a discussion with Christian missionaries arguing the Jews to pray for their prosecutors:

It is true that the Jews have not been actively violent in their own persons. But they called down upon the Germans the curses of mankind, and they wanted America and England to fight Germany on their behalf. If I hit my adversary, that is of course violence, but to be truly non-violent, I must love him and pray for him even when he hits me.⁵⁵

Upon reading this accusation, Gandhi's Jewish friend Henry S. L. Polak was outraged and expressed his resentment emphatically. He demanded that Gandhi shall provide proof for his claim.

Gandhi wrote in his article "no apology" that every newspaper he encountered contained descriptions of suffering Jews who asked the nations to fight on their behalf.⁵⁶

In January 1939, when Kallenbach was already 68 years old, he returned to India but soon after his arrival there he contracted malaria. Due to his illness and the fact that Gandhi was busy and away from the ashram most of the time, Kallenbach had almost no influence during this visit apart from his success in arranging a meeting between Gandhi and Avraham Sohet and Yehuda Nedivi, a clerk from the Tel Aviv municipality who was visiting Indian Jewry at the time. In order to strengthen his argument, Gandhi claimed that even Kallenbach, his partner in the South African struggle and a person who had believed wholeheartedly in non-violence at the time, could not love Hitler. He asked—if Kallenbach can't love the Nazis how will other Jews be able to?

I happen to have a Jewish friend living with me. He has an intellectual belief in non-violence. But he says he cannot pray for Hitler. He is so full of anger over the German atrocities that he cannot speak of them with restraint. I do not quarrel with him over his anger. He wants to be non-violent, but the sufferings of fellow Jews are too much for him to bear. What is true of him is true of thousands of Jews who have no thought even of 'loving the enemy'. With them as with millions 'revenge is sweet, to forgive is divine'.⁵⁷

That quote is a very interesting one, as one can only imagine Kallenbach sitting in Gandhi's ashram at that time, while this dilemma was tearing him apart.

Polak did not despair and repeated the demand that Gandhi should either provide proof or apologize. Polak wrote Gandhi and sent his letter also to Kallenbach, writing that "He [Gandhi] really must retract what he has said."⁵⁸ As in the days in South Africa, Polak was more assertive and self-assured and was not afraid to contradict Gandhi as Kallenbach was.

You shock me, to use a favorite expression of your own, I asked for bread and you have given me a stone...I counted for exactly the opposite of what you state.⁵⁹

Gandhi sent his two loyal secretaries, Pyarelal Nayar and Mahadev Desai, to find proof in the newspapers that the Jews' demanded starting a war against Germany, but they did not find any. To Gandhi's credit, it should be noted that, as a result, he published a "withdrawal" and added: "I must withdraw it without any reservation. I only hope that my observation has not harmed any single Jew."⁶⁰

Shimoni claims that this was an instructive incident, as it demonstrated Gandhi's distorted image of Judaism, which consisted mainly of perceiving Judaism via a Christian Protestant outlook, and which was the basis of Gandhi's attitude to Zionism and the Holocaust. However, it is clear that this was not a case of malevolence or anti-Semitism. Gandhi was consistent in his approach and viewed non-violence as a condition and the most important element of satyagraha. This advice was not given to the Jews alone: He gave the same advice to Czechs, the English, and Indians and other European nations in his article titled "How to Combat Hitlerism." Gandhi wrote:

And I doubt if the Germans of future generations will entertain unadulterated pride in the deeds for which Hitlerism will be deemed responsible... As against this imagine the state of Europe today if the Czechs, the Poles, the Norwegians, the French and the English had all said to Hitler: "You need not make your scientific preparation for destruction. We will meet your violence with non-violence. You will, therefore, be able to destroy our non-violent army without tanks, battleships and airships." It may be retorted that the only difference would be that Hitler would have got without fighting what he has gained after a bloody fight.⁶¹

As mentioned, Gandhi was not always consistent in his pacifist doctrine, but this lack of consistency was not unusual considering many aspects of Gandhi's personal and political views and was not unique to his view on Hitler and the situation of European Jewry under the Nazi regime.

Gandhi's Letters to Hitler

Before this discussion continues to view what Gandhi said after the horrors of the Holocaust were revealed, we should examine what he wrote in his two letters to Hitler as a naïve effort to prevent the forthcoming war. Yet, Gandhi was far from being naïve, and his actions emanated from his profound belief in non-violence and the principles of satyagraha, according to which one must do everything possible to be considerate of one's enemy and understand him in situations of conflict. The first letter was written on July 23, 1939. In this letter, which Gandhi hesitated to send even before it was concealed by the British censure, Gandhi wrote:

Dear Friend,
Friends have been urging me to write to you for the sake of humanity. But I have resisted their request, because of the feeling that any letter from me would be an impertinence. Something tells me that I must not calculate and that I must make my appeal for whatever it may be worth. It is quite clear that you are today the one person in the world who can prevent a war which may reduce humanity to the savage state. Must you pay that price for an object however worthy it may appear to you to be? Will you listen to the appeal of one who has deliberately shunned the method of war not without considerable success? Anyway I anticipate your forgiveness, if I have erred in writing to you. I remain, your sincere friend,⁶²

These letters were naturally used by many of Gandhi's critics, from all sides of the political spectrum as evidence of his lack of political realism. How can one be so gullible as to write the Fuehrer in an attempt to convince him of the value of a non-violence doctrine? Gandhi's attempt to persuade Hitler of the efficiency of non-violence may attest to his lack of political realism. Still, at the time, even though the winds of war were already blowing strongly, the war had not yet broken in the European arena. When the letter was written, about five weeks before the war began as Germany invaded Poland on September 1, 1939, there were still those who hoped to prevent it. The main issue was that even if Gandhi understood that

his steps were in vain, according to the principles of satyagraha he had no alternative but to send that letter. This is a central principle in Gandhi's satyagraha. In the same manner, Gandhi's addressing Hitler as a "dear friend" should also be understood according to satyagraha. Gandhi addressed him in the same way he addressed other leaders with whom he struggled against, such as was the prominent South African General and Gandhi main rival Jan Smuts (1870-1950) when he was in South Africa. It should also be noted that one of the important principles that Gandhi adopted from the Bhagavad-Gita is that the efficacy of an action should not be one of the considerations made during its preparation, and, hence, he had to write Hitler without evaluating the possible results of his act.

Gandhi's second letter to Hitler was a public one and was published in the press on Christmas Eve, 1940, when the German forces were at the peak of their success and when Britain stood alone in the battle against Hitler. At the beginning of the letter, Gandhi explains why he calls Hitler "Dear Friend," but nevertheless makes it clear that Hitler's deeds are not to his liking and he is defiantly more critical:

Dear Friend,

That I address you as a friend is no formality. I own no foes. My business in life has been for the past 33 years to enlist the friendship of the whole of humanity by befriending mankind, irrespective of race, colour or creed. We have no doubt about your bravery or devotion to your fatherland, nor do we believe that you are the monster described by your opponents. But your own writings and pronouncements and those of your friends and admirers leave no room for doubt that many of your acts are monstrous and unbecoming of human dignity, especially in the estimation of men like me who believe in universal friendliness.⁶³

Gandhi explained to Hitler in the letter that India's situation was unique and that India opposed British imperialism no less than it did the Nazis. In his opinion, if there was any difference between the conquering countries, it was only in the extent of the oppression. Regardless, he is not willing to be assisted by the Germans in order to hurt the British. He wrote: "But we would never wish to end the British rule with German aid." (This, as mentioned above, is in contrast to Subash Chandra Bose and his many Indian supporters, who called for an armed rebellion and operated with the aid of the Nazis and the Japanese.) Gandhi does address Hitler to persuade the latter; "I, therefore, appeal to you in the name of humanity to stop the war. You will lose nothing by referring all the matters of dispute between you and Great Britain to an international tribunal of your joint choice." But his words seem to be equally directed to Indian and British readers.⁶⁴

According to Gandhi, non-violence can defeat even the sharing of power among the strongest forces in the world, and any victory achieved via violence will be defeated by a different, stronger force. "If not the British, some other power will certainly improve upon your method and beat you with your own weapon."⁶⁵ That prediction came true.

Gandhi's Silence after the Holocaust

One of the enigmas in this narrative is Gandhi's silence during the following years and mainly after 1945, when the scope of the calamity of the Jewish people became known. As Gandhi predicted, even with his lack of political realism, the bloodiest war the world had ever known ended in a general massacre of the Jews. On few occasions in which he did speak of the matter, he stressed the "constraints" and hinted that none of his words would satisfy Zionism.⁶⁶ He reiterated his position that the return of Jews to their homeland must be done with the agreement of the Arabs and not at their expense, and he objected to the Jews' "terrorist" acts.⁶⁷ One of the main reasons for his silence on the subject of the Holocaust might have been that he no longer had any personal obligation to Kallenbach, who passed away in South Africa in March 1945. Gandhi's only reference to the

extermination of the Jews during the Holocaust appears in a biography written by the Jewish American journalist Louis Fischer and has vast importance:

I mentioned the subject to Gandhi in 1946 when Hitler was dead. 'Hitler', Gandhi said, 'killed five million Jews. It is the greatest crime of our time. But the Jews should have offered themselves to the butcher's knife. They should have thrown themselves into the sea from cliffs...it would have aroused the world and the people of Germany... As it is they succumbed anyway in their millions.'⁶⁸

Gandhi's belief in non-violence was unshakeable, but he did not repeat his argument that it was possible to melt "Hitler's heart of stone" by satyagraha. Did he comprehend that satyagraha could not work against the Nazis? I believe it is certain that the answer is negative and that nothing would have changed Gandhi's moral stand. In my opinion, in this expression, Gandhi had a different direction. He covertly accused the Jews with the same accusation many Jews in the *yishuv* did (the settlement of Jews in Palestine and all over the world accused them of the crime of inaction and of acting like "lambs going to the slaughter house." Albeit, retrospectively, it is easy to perfunctorily invalidate Gandhi's enraging argument: Was a Jewish non-violent movement and "cooperation" with the Nazi oppression at the mid-1930s possible? Can we imagine that the Jews would refuse to wear the "Yellow Star"? Can we imagine that they would refuse to obey the orders? Is it possible at all?

In respect to the Holocaust, there is a strong doubt as to whether the method of non-violence could have been effective against such monstrous evil forces, which differed from anything Gandhi knew, or whether satyagraha could only succeed against regimes in which civil and humane law and order existed or against "British gentlemen" with reasonable human consciences.

After the Holocaust, many survivors and Jewish leaders spoke about the concept of *kiddush hahyim* (sanctification of life) as the real value of *kiddush Hashem*. The meaning is that the struggle and the ability to survive the concentration camps and the ghettos, under the oppression of the Nazi extreme evil regime, was an act of *kiddush hahyim* and the real victory over the Nazis. Another aspect is the ability to preserve human dignity. This concept emphasizes the huge and unbridgeable gap in relation to the attitudes toward life and death in Gandhi's world and in the Jewish world.

But we have to remember that Gandhi would not be Gandhi—the Mahatma would not be the Mahatma—if he could not hold to these ideas. Or does one accept his satyagraha methods as an alternative option for dealing with common power politics or does one consider it ridiculous, odd, hallucinatory, and enraging as many people do?

The Holocaust, as I wrote in the beginning of this article, can serve as a test case for Gandhism in general.

Nowadays, when we know more about the Holocaust, Gandhi's argument is still enraging, but, in my opinion, it is one that cannot be dismissed without being heard. The Holocaust, being the most extreme event of manslaughter, emphasizes the dilemma and questions if satyagraha can be an effective measure under such circumstances. That question shall remain open.

Notes

¹ *Harjan*, November 26, 1938

² Martin Buber and J. L. Magnes, *Two Letters to Gandhi* (Jerusalem: Rubin Mass, April 1939). See Gideon Shimoni, *Gandhi, Satyagraha and the Jews* (Jerusalem: The Leonard Davis Institute for Intentional Relations, 1977). Shimoni's article is very substantial and helpful, and I, as others, am in his debt.

³ M. K. Gandhi, *Satyagraha in South Africa* (Madras: Ganesan, 1928).

⁴ *Harijan*, 26 November 1938.

⁵ See Gandhi, chapter XII, "Satyagraha v. Passive Resistance," in *Satyagraha in South Africa*.

⁶ Bayblon Talmud, *Sanhedrin*, 74a.

⁷ *Book of Leviticus*, 18:5 and the Talmud interpretation in BT, *Yoma* 85b.

⁸ Maimonides, *Mishne Tora*, *Hilchot Yesodei Hatora*, 5, 1-2.

⁹ See for example, Gandhi's newspaper *Young India*, 23.3.1921.

¹⁰ On this fascinating subject see Francies Schmidt, "Between Jews and Greeks: The Indian Model," in *Between Jerusalem and Benares*, ed. Godmann Hananya (Albany: State University of New York, 1994), pp. 41-53. This story is based on the famous story about Alexander the Great who encounters two Indian sages in North India known as Calanus and Mandanis. Mandanis refused to follow Alexander but Calanus agreed and eventually burned himself alive on the pyre before the king's eyes. There are different Greek traditions about the story and the way that Calanus's death was viewed—positively or negatively. But it had a very strong impact on how India was perceived in the Greek and later in Roman world. Flavius knew about this myth from the various sources like Philo of Alexandria.

¹¹ Josephus Flavius, *War of the Jews*, trans. G. A. Williamson, part II, chapter VI (London: Penguin, 1977), 323-88.

¹² *Ibid.*, pp. 387-88.

¹³ Central Zionist Archive, A125/84.

¹⁴ Central Zionist Archive S25.3229; The Arab Bureau – secret, 10.7.1936.

¹⁵ Shimon Lev, *Soulmates: The Story of Mahatma Gandhi and Hermann Kallenbach* (Hyderabad: Orient BlackSwan, 2012).

¹⁶ Sharret to Kallenbach, 5 July 1936, Kallenbach Archive.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*

¹⁸ Kallenbach to Sharett, 25 July 1936, Kallenbach Archive.

¹⁹ Cf. Lev, *Soulmates*.

²⁰ Nehru to Olsvanger, 25 September 1936, *Central Zionist Archive*, S25.3583.

²¹ On the history of the Israel-India relationship, see P. R. Kumaraswamy, *India's Israel Policy* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2010).

²² Olsvanger Diary, 19 September 1936. *Central Zionist Archive*, S25.3583.

²³ Kallenbach to Simon Kallenbach, 31.4.1937, Kallenbach Archive.

²⁴ *Complete Works of Mahatma Gandhi (CWMG)* by the GandhiServe Foundation, vol. 71, p. 404, undated but before 3 July 1937. For more information on the electronic and online edition of the complete works see the website sponsored by New Delhi: Publications Division, Government of India, which is 98 volumes: <http://www.gandhiserve.org/e/cwmg/cwmg.htm>

²⁵ For further reading on Gandhi and Zionism see Lev, *Soulmates*.

²⁶ *Harijan*, 26 November 1938.

²⁷ This was the common name of the Jewish settlements in Palestine prior to Israel's independence

²⁸ *Harijan*, 26 November 1938.

²⁹ Hayim Greenberg, *Ein Roie* (Heb.) (Jerusalem: Mossad Bialilk, 1958), p. 234.

³⁰ *Harijan*, 26 November 1938.

³¹ *Harijan*, 26 November 1938.

³² *Ibid.*

³³ Gandhi to Kallenbach, 26 November 1938, *CWMG XCVI* (Supplementary Volume Six) (New Delhi: Ministry of Information and Broadcasting, Government of India, 1994), p. 296.

³⁴ Kallenbach to Nehru, 21 December 1938, Kallenbach Archive.

³⁵ Margaret Chatterjee, *Gandhi and His Jewish Friends* (London: Macmillan, 1982), pp. 113-15.

³⁶ Quoted in Jawaharlal Nehru's letter to Subash Chandra Bose, 3 April 1939, In *Selected Works of Jawaharlal Nehru*, First Series, ed. S. Gopal (New Delhi: Orient Longmann, 1972), Vol. 9, p. 537.

³⁷ *Jewish Advocate*, 2 December 1938.

³⁸ Buber and Magnes, *Two Letters to Gandhi*, p. 1.

³⁹ In their response, Buber and Magnes also related in detail Gandhi's negative attitude to Zionism and to the violent struggle in Palestine, but I focus here mostly on the issue of the German Jews and Nazism.

⁴⁰ Buber and Magnes, *Two Letters to Gandhi*, p. 21.

⁴¹ Shimon, *Gandhi, Satyagraha and the Jews*, p. 47.

⁴² Louis Fischer, *The Life of Mahatma Gandhi* (London: Granda, 1982; reprint 1984), pp. 431-36.

⁴³ Buber and Magnes, *Two Letters to Gandhi*, p. 2. One can argue that Gandhi actually knew about "concentration camps" from his experiences during the Boer War. He also witnessed the horrible and cruel treatment of the Zulus during the Zulu rebellion in 1906. These experiences were decisive elements in his decision to take upon himself the full vow of *bramahcharya* (celibacy).

⁴⁴ Buber and Magnes, *Two Letters to Gandhi*, pp. 2-3.

⁴⁵ Falk Avner, "Buber and Gandhi," in *Quest for Gandhi*, ed. G. Ramachanran and T.K. Maedevan (New Delhi: Gandhi Peace Foundation, 1970), p. 145.

⁴⁶ Buber and Magnes, *Two Letters to Gandhi*, p. 19.

⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 26, 28.

⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, 25.

⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 30-33.

⁵⁰ *Harijan*, 22 May 1939. See also Greenberg, *Ein Roie* (Heb.), pp. 232-40.

⁵¹ *Harijan*, 22 May 1939.

⁵² *Ibid.*

⁵³ *Harijan*, 2 January 1939.

⁵⁴ *Harijan*, 17 December 1938.

⁵⁵ *Harijan*, 24 December 1938.

⁵⁶ *Harijan*, 18 February 1939.

⁵⁷ *Ibid.*

⁵⁸ Polak to Kallenbach, 20 March 1939, Kallenbach Archive.

⁵⁹ Polak to Gandhi, 20 March 1939, cited in Shimon, *Gandhi, Satyagraha and the Jews*, p. 55. The expression is according to Mathew 7:9. Lord Samuel and Sir Philip Hartog wrote to Gandhi. Gandhi quotes parts of their letters, see *Harijan*, 27 May 1939. Both argued that in case of war, the Jews would be the first to suffer. Hertog wrote: "Indeed such a war would bring further misery to the hundreds of thousands of Jews still in Germany as well as untold suffering to millions of other innocent men and women."

⁶⁰ *Harijan*, 27 May 1939.

⁶¹ *Harijan*, 20 June 1940.

⁶² CWMG, Vol. 76, 23 July 1939, p. 156.

⁶³ CWMG, Vol. 79, 24 December 1940, p. 79.

⁶⁴ *Ibid.*

⁶⁵ *Ibid.*

⁶⁶ Thus during the visit of Hugo Bergman's delegation to the Inter-Asian Convention in 1947 Gandhi detailed an off-the-record conversation with Sydney Silverman, a Jewish British

Labour politician. Cf. Shimoni, *Gandhi, Satyagraha and the Jews*. Also see, Central Jewish Archive S25.7485.

⁶⁷ Ibid., conversation with Sydney Silverman. Also for Gandhi's attitude toward Zionism, see Lev, *Soulmates*.

⁶⁸ Fischer, *The Life of Mahatma Gandhi*, p. 435.