



The South African Gandhi: Stretcher-Bearer of Empire

Antoinette Burton, Faisal Devji, Mrinalini Sinha, Jon Soske, Ashwin Desai & Goolam Vahed

To cite this article: Antoinette Burton, Faisal Devji, Mrinalini Sinha, Jon Soske, Ashwin Desai & Goolam Vahed (2018) The South African Gandhi: Stretcher-Bearer of Empire, *Journal of Natal and Zulu History*, 32:1, 100-118

To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.1080/02590123.2018.1447537>



Published online: 30 Jul 2018.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



View Crossmark data [↗](#)

BOOK FORUM

The South African Gandhi: Stretcher-Bearer of Empire. By ASHWIN DESAI and GOOLAM VAHED. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2016. 343 pp. ISBN 978-0804797177.

Introduction: South African Gandhis Now and Then

ANTOINETTE BURTON*

University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign

The publication of Ashwin Desai and Goolam Vahed's *The South African Gandhi* sent me bounding back into an earlier moment in post-apartheid history. Their title echoes and recasts an important book of the same name, published in 1995 by the writer, academic and activist Fatima Meer (1928–2010). Her book, produced by Madiba Press for the Institute for Black Research at the University of Natal, is subtitled 'An Abstract of the Speeches and Writings of M.K. Gandhi, 1893–1914'. That book – at over 1200 pages, it's a tome, really – is an invaluable compendium of primary documents related to Gandhi's experience in South Africa. There are five sections and 23 parts distributed within them, covering topics from 'Gandhi on Women' to 'The Journalist' to 'The Personal Gandhi' to 'Letters to the Nephews'. Each of the 23 parts has chapters with introductory comments from a range of figures: Meer herself, Hassim Seedat, Saths Cooper, Winnie and Nelson Mandela, to name a few. Though I can't pretend to have read it all, let alone to have studied it deeply, I love this volume. It's a treasure trove of documents and voices upon which anyone studying the 1890s and after – whether they work on South Africa, empire or global history – should depend. Returning to it now after many years' distance, I am even more deeply impressed by and indebted to it. What a feat of collation, what a beehive of activity between two covers. And what a monument to what anti-apartheid workers and thinkers like Meer thought was urgent in the first months and years after 1990. I own a copy of the second edition, which was issued as soon as 1996.¹

What did the 'stretcher-bearer of empire' question look like in the mid 1990s among folks like Fatima Meer? There it is: Section Three, Part 12, 'The Stretcher Bearer' (no hyphen). The table of contents announces two chapters that are dedicated to the subject: one called 'The Anglo Boer War – 1899' (no hyphen here either) and one called 'Stretcher-Bearers during the Bambatha Resistance – 1906' (note the hyphen there). Meer writes the introductory

*Email: aburton@illinois.edu

1. F. Meer, ed., *The South African Gandhi: An Abstract of The Speeches and Writings of M.K. Gandhi, 1892–1914* (Durban: Madiba, 1996).

ISSN: Print 0259-0123/Online 2521-8875

© 2018 Antoinette Burton

<http://www.tandfonline.com>

note to both chapters. She opens Chapter 23 with the claim that ‘Gandhi, at thirty-one, was a loyal British subject and when the Anglo-Boer War broke out, felt duty-bound to respond to the call of Empire and urged Indians to volunteer their services’.² Documents 298–311, the majority culled from Gandhi’s *Collected Works*, detail his correspondence with British officials and the stretcher-bearers themselves, offering up a picture that ratifies Meer’s servant-of-empire image. In Chapter 24, titled ‘The Stretcher-Bearer during the Bambatha Resistance – 1906’, Meer is a more active editor. She devotes considerable space to laying out the origins of the Volunteer Corps and to Gandhi’s recurrent convictions that despite ‘the disparaging view’ that whites had of Indians, the latter should show their willingness to defend empire. Gandhi is quite precise in his formulation: Indians should, specifically, act ‘in defence of Natal’ in order to show that they are ‘capable of appreciating the duties of citizenship’ and because it would ‘bring in some political advantage’.³ Here and in Documents 312–28 that follow, Meer reconstructs Gandhi’s emphasis on the necessity of serving the empire regardless of whether the rebellion was justified; the evolution of his view on the legitimacy of the term ‘rebellion’; his sympathy for the ‘innocent’ wounded Zulus in his care; and his conviction that what was unfolding – Zulu resistance, British retribution, Indian care-giving – was ‘the law of God’. She quotes from primary sources to do so, but she also does all this interpretive work before the official documents’ section begins.

Meer concludes her introductory note by observing that:

It was during the Zulu rebellion, that it came to him like a flash, that in order to serve the people completely, he would have to give up his worldly attachments. Within months of de-listing, he took the vow of celibacy and began developing his philosophy of satyagraha.⁴

This is quite a remarkable arc: from a table of contents which promises ‘Stretcher-Bearers [plural]’ of the Bambatha resistance to a chapter led by ‘*The Stretcher-Bearer*’ (singular). That minor difference announces a major conceptual framework: Gandhi becomes a fledgling satyagrahi who has shed the collectivity of his Indian comrades as a result of stretcher-bearing. Typographical error? If it is, it’s an uncanny echo of the work of print culture, its machinery and mobility, in the making of the Indian Ocean Gandhi whose histories Isabel Hofmeyr has so evocatively illustrated.⁵

In Meer’s *South African Gandhi*, then, these chapters take us from the hyphenated servant of empire to the singular figure of Indian nationalism in under forty documents and in the space of seven short years (1899–1906). It’s a reconfiguration enabled, in Meer’s view, by proximity, even intimacy, with Zulu bodies, whose role in the making of the South African Gandhi is, apparently, utterly pivotal.

Meer’s observation is quite matter-of-fact. Nor is this section of her *South African Gandhi* part of a larger argument about the role of Africans in the making of Gandhi or about race and Gandhi’s story. What follows immediately on (‘Part Thirteen: The Health Worker’) is, for all intents and purposes, a non sequitur. The stretcher-bearer history she materialises

2. *Ibid.*, 743.

3. *Ibid.*, 763.

4. *Ibid.*, 766.

5. I. Hofmeyr, *Gandhi’s Printing Press: Experiments in Slow Reading* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2013).

doesn't move the volume forward except perhaps chronologically; it's the basis of an almost passing comment about the origins of satyagraha but no more. If this kind of rhetorical manoeuvre – one that gestures toward the foundational role of Africans in the making of Gandhian politics/practice without further comment – was possible in the mid-1990s, that moment is long gone. This is not to say that Meer was uninvolved in or dispassionate about the racialised politics of Afro-Indian solidarity in pre- or post-apartheid South Africa (that is surely the subject of another tome). But the essays collected in the forum below mark out some of the fractious territory upon which debates about Gandhi *tout court* now take place. A battleground, by any other name.

Broadly speaking, Faisal Devji, Mrinalini Sinha and Jon Soske each weigh in on the viability of the book's claims that Gandhi's 'tactics were shaped in crucial ways by a conservative defence of class, race and caste privilege'.⁶ Beyond that, I don't wish to rehearse the comments and response that ensue here. In many ways, they speak for themselves – thoughtfully, rebarbatively, tentatively, peevishly, and graciously, sometimes all in the same essay. Saints and sinners, hucksters and undertakers, haters and lovers emerge across these pages. What follows is, effectively, a multidirectional hermeneutics of suspicion set in motion by unresolved narratives of race and empire – narratives which continue, not incidentally, to fail utterly at coping with the histories of women, gender and sexuality which shaped this tense and tender interracial world of men. Whether we accept the terms of the debate as such, we need, I think, to recognise them as just that: terms that orient us toward race and empire as explanatory categories in part because of what they appear to index in the present conjuncture, wherever we live that now. Citing Meer as I have done is thus no mere ludic romp through the type-settings of an earlier iteration of Gandhi's South Africa. It is, I hope, a critical reminder of the politically contingent character of all representational forms, history prime among them. It's also a sign that 'the South African Gandhi' is indebted to, and produced by, any number of historical presents with the capacity, in turn, to provoke a range of affective responses. Here, those add up to the good, the bad and the ugly.

Author Biography

ANTOINETTE BURTON is Professor of History and Bastian Professor of Global and Transnational Studies at the University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign, USA. Her most recent publications include *The Trouble with Empire* (2015), *Africa in the Indian Imagination* (2016) and *An ABC of Queen Victoria's Empire* (2017). She is currently at work on an anti-imperial bestiary with Renisa Mawani.

6. A. Desai and G. Vahed, *The South African Gandhi: Stretcher-Bearer of Empire* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2016). Originally published by Navayana (Delhi, 2015).

The Undertaker

FAISAL DEVJI*

St Antony's College, University of Oxford

Gandhi's worst enemies have always been his best friends. They have turned his ideas about non-violence into an anodyne prescription for world peace, and made of the Mahatma its patron saint. One reason why this endeavour has been so successful is because those who are opposed to Gandhi have been unable to resist his own moralistic narrative and thus failed to do more than merely hate him. Whether it was the Mahatma's British opponents, or his Hindu, Muslim and Dalit ones, all accused him of hypocrisy or self-delusion. And this thoroughly moralistic criticism, supplemented by accounts of his 'real' and apparently cynical aims, has remained the stock in trade of Gandhi's self-professed antagonists to this day.

There are two problems with such an analysis: one has to do with the fact that critics have been seduced by the Mahatma's own concern with his inner life, and sought to demonstrate how his acts belied his words. This is a strategy that is rarely deployed in the study of any other politician or thinker, and apart from making a moral exception of him, does little to invalidate Gandhi's ideas considered in their own right and beyond his intentions. The second problem with this approach is that it takes all those who have been impressed by Gandhi to be either fools or knaves. This, too, is not an adequate way of understanding the great historical transformations that are linked with the Mahatma's name, however misconstrued they may have been by his contemporaries.

Some among his critics even end up playing into the logic of Mahatmahood, by trying to replace Gandhi with some other, equally sacred figure, like his bitter enemy, the Dalit leader Dr Ambedkar, who can only be posthumously insulted by being put in Gandhi's place. But *Stretcher-Bearer of Empire* does not fall prey to this sort of compromised criticism, in which the Mahatma wins even as Gandhi loses. In a series of short and bracing chapters, it subjects Gandhi's South African career to examination and concludes that he was as much an imperial as national thinker. While not a wholly novel argument, it is pursued in great detail, and has the merit of making the Mahatma far more interesting than the anti-colonial saint to whom we have become so used.

Because Gandhi is not treated primarily as a thinker of the future, however, what we get is a discussion of how unprogressive he was compared with many of his contemporaries. This might be true, but it is not very interesting, and doesn't tell us why the future Mahatma's ideas would be considered so revolutionary even by fairly astute observers. In other words we are not given the opportunity to engage with Gandhi's thought and its consequences, since he is reduced to a mere 'reactionary', whose career therefore becomes inexplicable apart from an account of chicanery. This is an accountant's view of history, in which virtue is already known, with one's task to discover whether a client has diverged from it.

*Email: faisal.devji@sant.ox.ac.uk

© 2018 Faisal Devji

In fact the book is less about Gandhi and more about his supporters, especially the sanctimonious and nationalistic historiography represented most recently by Ramachandra Guha's *Gandhi Before India*.¹ In attacking this scholarship, the authors perform a capital service, allowing us to recover a Gandhi beyond moralism. Also crucial is how the authors, for practically the first time, let us hear the divergent voices of the Mahatma's Indian supporters in South Africa, who were very often also his critics, and who for a writer like Guha merely constitute an undifferentiated mass lacking independent ideas. Similarly, Gandhi's European backers are deprived of the apostolic sanctity that Guha so frequently imparts to them.

The occasionally tragic tone of the narrative, whose authors feel compelled to criticise a figure they were brought up to revere, is both moving and attractive in its lack of sanctimony. But demonstrating Gandhi to be a racist, casteist and imperialist does not get us very far, because too often it makes out the Mahatma's career and reputation to be the result of an immense fraud, a mode of historical explanation more familiar on the extreme right. Let me repeat that such an account is unable to account for the consequences and thus future of Gandhian non-violence. It becomes a mere takedown, necessary, perhaps, but not very productive for thinking either about Gandhi's time or our own.

As with so many of his critics, the authors remain too close to some received vision of non-violence and so are unable to move their analysis beyond its stereotypes. Having recognised him to be an imperial rather than national thinker, they might have considered how the Mahatma made sense of the emerging international arena created by these empires to become himself one of the earliest 'global' figures. Instead they simply lapse into anti-colonial attitudes of horror. Having understood he was not a pacifist, they could have made something intellectually more coherent of Gandhi's admiration of war as a site of non-violence. Instead they simply see it as hypocritical. They remain lumbered with the saint even while exposing the sinner.

The saint's hold on his critics is such that they are unable even to deploy conventional historiographical methods to understand him. Thus it doesn't occur to so many of those who accuse Gandhi of racism that his attempts to distinguish and differentiate Indians from Africans in South Africa were part of his job as a lawyer for the Gujarati trading class. In a legal order increasingly defined by racial hierarchy, these men had little option but to fight the discrimination to which they were subjected in the racial terms recognised by the law. The same thing happened in other parts of colonial Africa, with Arabs or Shirazis deploying similar strategies to those of the Indians in seeking to be placed 'above' Africans.

Once Gandhi leaves South Africa, such 'racist' invocations cease and are replaced by far more favourable views, for instance the chapters that begin his 1924 book *Satyagraha in South Africa*, which were explicitly meant to show Indians how much better the Zulu were to them in terms of cleanliness, manliness and virtue. And if Gandhi chose not to fight the cause of anti-racism on a broader platform while in South Africa, this was because he consistently refused to speak for others unless invited to do so. He thought that to universalise a view by imposition was to fall prey to an imperialist desire. For while any struggle might possess a universal potential, in Gandhi's opinion it could only inspire rather than instruct others.

Now Gandhi may well have been mistaken in his views, but surely the task of scholarship is to take what he said seriously and understand his actions in their light. And yet the only

1. R. Guha, *Gandhi Before India* (London: Penguin, 2013).

light by which his critics see the Mahatma emanates from the halo they would like to dismantle. So they see him as being insufficiently anti-racist or anti-imperialist, as if his views were defined by such conventional pieties to begin with. What would such accounts look like if they seriously attended to the Mahatma's views about how the British Empire might transform itself into a global site for liberalism bereft of nationality as much as ascribed majorities and minorities? Gandhi didn't think such an order a moral one, but saw it as the only real possibility for the empire's self-transformation.

And what might a history look like that took seriously Gandhi's ideas about how war might provide an opportunity for non-violence, by making the incalculable possible as a kind of miracle beyond the plans that defined an instrumental politics of violence? A war whose very excesses shook the instrumentalities of politics? However eccentric such opinions, they move historical narrative beyond the tired verities of non-violence peddled by writers like Guha, and thus allow us access to a quite novel vision of Gandhi and his times. The problem with *Stretcher-Bearer of Empire* is that it continues to be enthralled by these verities, even and especially when it seeks to overturn them. The difference between its authors and Guha is that while the latter imagines Gandhi being true to these clichés, the former think he betrayed them.

Let me end with a confession. As a member of the Stanford University Press editorial board that approved this book for publication, I could have prevented its appearance. I didn't because I thought it revealed more about Gandhi's life among South Africa's Indian community than most accounts, though a lot more needs to be done on this front to displace the racially defined focus of writers like Guha on his White interlocutors. It was also clear after my review of the manuscript was sent to the authors, that they weren't interested in making the Mahatma into something more than a cardboard cut-out. In the circumstances I decided to approve publication and even endorsed the book on its cover. This was a deliberately Gandhian act on my part, to give credit where it was due and forgive the rest. I hope the irony is not lost on the authors.

Author Biography

FAISAL DEVJI is Reader in Modern South Asian History and Fellow of St Antony's College at the University of Oxford. He works on political thought and is the author of books on militancy, humanity as a political category and anti-romantic nationalism. His book *The Impossible Indian: Gandhi and the Temptation of Violence*, was published by Harvard in 2012.

Hating the South African Gandhi Properly

MRINALINI SINHA*

University of Michigan

One must have tradition in oneself, to hate it properly. (Theodor W. Adorno)¹

Ashwin Desai and Goolam Vahed's book is premised on two propositions.² First, that the much-touted metamorphosis of the young Mohandas into the Mahatma (Great Soul), a title that now attaches to him almost as a first-name, did not occur in the period 1893–1914, the 21 formative years that he spent in South Africa (24–8). Second, that despite the great reverence for Gandhi among such anti-apartheid leaders as Nelson Mandela, he does not deserve to be included in the pantheon of anti-apartheid fighters because his 'strategy on racial separation and hierarchy was in quick step with the segregation ideology of the emerging South African state' (305). The authors rest their case about Gandhi's 'unsavoury past' (76) on his contributions to four major campaigns in South Africa. With each, they demonstrate his commitment to the project of the British Empire and his often-conservative defence of class, race, caste, and gender hierarchies throughout his South African years. The authors do acknowledge a change in Gandhi's attitude towards empire, but only some years after he left the shores of Africa; and, likewise, they do recognise a shift in Gandhi's language towards the end of his time in South Africa when he eventually eschewed the derogatory term 'kaffir' in referring to Africans (304). But it is not entirely clear whether the authors would admit to much of a transformation in Gandhi's stands even well past his South African years. For example, Desai and Vahed offer a quote from Gandhi from 1920 in India in defence of caste (272–3), but not his subsequent rejection of caste, even in its 'ideal' form that he had until then defended while fighting the inequities of 'untouchability', beginning with his 1935 article 'Caste Must Go'.³ Similarly, the authors quote Gandhi's advice in 1939 against a joint non-European front in South Africa (302–3), but not the shift in his view on this score by 1946. Indeed, the constant change as well as sometimes contradictory pronouncements of Gandhi during his 78 years, the bulk of which was lived in public

*Email: sinha@umich.edu

© 2018 Mrinalini Sinha

1. T. W Adorno, *Minima Moralia: Reflections from Damaged Life* (1951). Translated from the German by E.F.N. Jephcott (London, New York: Verso), 52.. My title, of course, echoes Theodor Adorno's aphorism in the epigraph. For useful elaborations on Adorno's critical method, see N. Lazarus, 'Hating Tradition Properly', *New Formations*, 38 (1999); S.M. Agnani, *Hating Empire Properly: The Two Indies and the Limits of Enlightenment Anticolonialism* (New York: Fordham University Press, 2013). I am also echoing V. Lal, 'The Gandhi Everyone Loves to Hate', *Economic and Political Weekly* (4 October 2008): 55–64.
2. For the sake of full disclosure, I would like to acknowledge that I serve on the Editorial Board of the 'South Asia in Motion' Book Series (edited by Thomas Blom Hansen) at Stanford University Press in which Ashwin Desai and Goolam Vahed's book appears. However, I was not involved in any aspect of the process.
3. *Harijan*, 16 November 1935, in *Collected Works of Mahatma Gandhi* (New Delhi: Publications Division, n.d), vol. 62, 121–2. Also see N. Kolge, *Gandhi Against Caste: An Evolving Strategy to Abolish the Caste System in India* (New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 2017).

and extensively documented, not least in his own writings and re-writings, poses somewhat of a challenge to the serious scholar who tries to take a measure of the man. Yet, as serious scholars, we must.

The South African Gandhi, with its tight focus on the South African years, and its historiographical move of placing Gandhi squarely in the context of the broader history of South Africa, rather than just the history of Indians in South Africa, is well placed potentially to provide a fresh evaluation of the man – not in the by-now familiar teleology of ‘the-man-before-the-Mahatma’, but in its particular historical South African context. Yet this is precisely where the book falls short. It ends up trading, as one reviewer puts it, the ‘extreme of deification for the extreme of condemnation’.⁴ The authors make no bones of the fact in the book that the contemporary invocations of Gandhi in South Africa – where he ‘merges into Albert Luthuli into Nelson Mandela and the seamless thread of African and Indian holding hands across the boundaries of race’ (27) – prompts their historiographical intervention. In his blog, ‘Writing “The South African Gandhi”’ at the *Huffington Post*, Desai insists that contrary to the cardboard cut-out figure of Gandhi, their co-authored book aims to present a ‘more rounded figure of the man’. ‘No’, Desai avers, ‘Gandhi never was a saint. Not even close.’⁵ Few serious scholars could object to that. When the book characterises Gandhi as a ‘racist’, albeit one who fought against discrimination (269), presumably only against Indians, and, even more importantly, as ‘not one of apartheid’s first opponents but as one of its first proponents’ (107), however, it gives pause. No wonder, then, some academic reviews, even when otherwise sympathetic, caution that the book is driven by ‘an agenda’,⁶ goes a ‘little far’,⁷ and presents a ‘homogenized image of Gandhi’.⁸ There is, indeed, already plenty in Gandhi’s invocation of racial hierarchies between Indians and Africans during his South-African activism (attested to in great detail in the book as well as in earlier scholarship) to be troubling, without, as the authors feel compelled to do in the book, stacking the deck. *The South African Gandhi*, in its rush to find easy answers, thus ends up doing a disservice precisely to the hopes for a nuanced consideration of Gandhi’s relationship to the cause of Africans in South Africa.

Consider the following example. Reflecting on the fact that the report in Gandhi’s newspaper, the *Indian Opinion*, on the moderate Indian nationalist leader Gopal Krishna Gokhale’s visit to John Langalibalele Dube, Gandhi’s neighbour at Phoenix Farm and President of the South African Native National Congress (SANNC), on 10 November 1912 does not explicitly mention Gandhi as among those present, the authors ask: ‘Was Gandhi embarrassed by this visit? Was *Indian Opinion* reluctant to give exposure to a rival’s enterprise?’ (167). The authors, however, give no reason for their speculation about Gandhi’s supposed embarrassment. The *Indian Opinion*, after all, had as early as 5

4. C.R. Di Silvo, ‘Book Review’, *South African Historical Journal* 68, 4 (2016), 672–4.
5. A. Desai, ‘Writing “The South African Gandhi”’, Blog post, 2 December 2015, *Huffington Post*, https://www.huffingtonpost.in/ashwin-desai/writing-the-south-african_b_8224498.html, accessed 29 November 2017.
6. T. Weber, ‘Book Review’, *American Historical Review* (October 2017): 1359–60
7. P. Landau, ‘Book Review’, *H-Empire* (May 2017): 1–4
8. H. Singh, ‘Racial Inequality, Coolie, and Collective Mobilization: Gandhi in South Africa’, *Economic and Political Weekly* (2 April 2016): 32–5.

September 1905, identified Dube as an African ‘of whom one should know’ and had since then covered, admittedly sporadically, developments at Dube’s Ohlange institution. Just months prior to Gokhale’s visit, the *Indian Opinion*, had noted ‘Our friend and neighbor, the Reverend John L. Dube, Principal of the Ohlange Native Industrial School, has received the high honor of being elected the first president of the newly inaugurated Inter-State Native Congress’ (10 February 1912). And a year later the paper would write in support of Dube’s opposition to the ‘Natives Land Act’ of 1913 calling it an ‘act of confiscation’.⁹ Why, then, might Gandhi have been ‘embarrassed’, according to the authors, to mention his visit to Dube in 1912?

The clue, perhaps, lies in the book’s underplaying of any connections between Gandhi and African political leaders as well as any evidence that *Indian Opinion* might provide of Gandhi’s support for ‘native’ struggles and against the dispossession of Africans. Desai and Vahed summarily dismiss the evidence drawn from the Molteno Archives that shows a greater degree of personal cordiality between the residents of Phoenix and Ohlange than might be assumed from the more distant political relationship between Gandhi and Dube (46).¹⁰ One might be forgiven for assuming from the book that Gandhi had never heard of many of his African contemporaries: Dr Walter Rubusana; Dr Abdullah Abdurrahman; John Tengo Jabavu; Alfred Mangena; Pixley Seme; and Henry Selby Msimang. Msimang recalled that while working at Pixley Seme’s office in Johannesburg he frequently consulted with Gandhi in his office, which was located just opposite theirs.¹¹ Commenting on the protest of African women against the pass laws, which preceded the involvement of Indian women during Gandhi’s 1913 movement, the authors write: ‘The struggles of African women against their being forced to carry passes, were somehow seen to be separate and probably not worthy of support’ (185). Yet the *Indian Opinion*, in fact, had reported on the protest favourably on 5 July 1913, and provided it front page coverage again on 2 August 1913 under the banner, ‘Native Women’s Brave Stand’.¹² Vahed may be right that the citation of a few reports to the contrary in *Indian Opinion* would not change much the overall picture in the book of Gandhi’s South African years.¹³ But an engagement with the nature of the relationship between Gandhi and his African contemporaries, however limited this was, as well as with his commentaries on various developments affecting Africans, admittedly few and far between, would have made for a richer basis for evaluating his South African years.

The conundrum is precisely this. Gandhi repeatedly used arguments of the racial and civilisational superiority of Indians over Africans in pleading his case for the former, often in the

9. The references and quotations are from A. Nauriya, ‘Gandhi and Some Contemporary African Leaders from Kwa-Zulu-Natal’, *Natalia*, 42 (2012): 45–64; esp. 51, 55.
10. C. Corder and M. Plaut, ‘Gandhi’s Decisive South African 1913 Campaign: A Personal Perspective From the Letters of Betty Molteno’, *South African Historical Journal*, 66, 1 (2014): 22–54.
11. See Nauriya, ‘Gandhi and Some Contemporary African Leaders’, 60.
12. Cited in G.M. Presbey, ‘Gandhi’s Many Influences and Collaborators’, *Comparative Studies of South Asia, Africa and the Middle East*, 35, 2 (2015): 360–9, esp. 366. For a fuller account of the newspaper’s coverage, see U.S. Mesthrie, ‘From Advocacy to Mobilization: *Indian Opinion*, 1903–14’, in L. Switzer, ed., *South Africa’s Alternative Press: Voices of Protest and Resistance, 1880s–1960s* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 99–126.
13. G. Vahed, ‘The Past in the Present: Writing the South African Gandhi’, *Journal of Labor and Society*, 20 (2017): 107–27.

most cringeworthy language; he strenuously petitioned against Indians being treated the same as ‘natives’; and, almost to the very end of his life, remained unconvinced of the wisdom of a joint non-European front in South Africa. Yet, from fairly early in his sojourn in South Africa, at least since his visit to the Trappist monastery at Mariannhill in 1898, where he was struck by the remarkable absence of ‘colour distinctions’, Gandhi at times also commented quite sensitively on the exploitation of Africans. This included his prescient speech at the Young Men’s Christian Association in Johannesburg on 18 May 1908, that imagined a future in which ‘all the different races comingle and produce a civilization that perhaps the world has not yet seen’.¹⁴ These two strands in Gandhi, as Nishikant Kolge has astutely observed, were ‘contradictory rather than evolutionary’.¹⁵ Desai and Vahed are, indeed, right to reject a simple explanation of the gradual ‘evolution’ of Gandhi’s views, apart, of course, from his subsequent eschewal of ‘kaffir’. This huge contradiction in Gandhi’s relationship with Africans has yet to be adequately explained. The other aspects of Desai and Vahed’s case against Gandhi’s leadership in South Africa – his adherence to the project of the British Empire and his tendency of putting the brake on popular mobilisation – will be familiar to scholars who focus on his Indian years, even though recent scholarship is also beginning to re-evaluate the meaning of the salience of Empire in Gandhi’s politics as well as of Gandhi’s relationship to mass politics.¹⁶ By simply turning the tables on Gandhian hagiography and tarring Gandhi as ‘one of the first proponents’ of apartheid, *The South African Gandhi* misses a valuable opportunity that only the South African context can provide for understanding a continuing puzzle at the heart of Gandhi’s South African years. A more thoroughgoing critique, perhaps, would come from a willingness to engage the full terms of Gandhi’s relationship with Africans without covering over its contradictions to expose the untenability of its own logic. The outcome of such an immanent critique might be unexpected; but that, at least, would be hating the South African Gandhi properly.

Author Biography

MRINALINI SINHA is the Alice Freeman Palmer Professor of History at the University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, USA, and Professor (by courtesy) in the Departments of English and of Women’s Studies. She is a scholar of colonial India and of the British empire. Her monographs, include *Colonial Masculinity: The ‘Manly Englishman’ and the ‘Effeminate Bengali’ in the Late Nineteenth Century* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1995) and *Specters of Mother India: The Global Restructuring of an Empire* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2006). She is the past-President of the Association for Asian Studies.

14. Quoted in A. Nauriya, *The African Element in Gandhi* (New Delhi: National Gandhi Museum, 2006), electronic version.
15. N. Kolge, ‘Was Gandhi a Racist? His Writings in South Africa’, *Economic and Political Weekly* (30 January 2016): 88–93. His argument on this point is in contrast to that in R. Guha, *Gandhi Before India* (New Delhi: Penguin, 2013).
16. For some examples, see F. Devji, *The Impossible Indian: Gandhi and the Temptation of Violence* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2012); K. Mantena, ‘Another Realism: The Politics of Gandhian Nonviolence’ *American Political Science Review*, 106, 2 (2012): 455–70; M. Sinha, ‘Premonitions of the Past’, *Journal of Asian Studies*, 74, 4 (2015): 821–51.

Myth and the Archive: Reading Mandela's Gandhi

JON SOSKE*

McGill University; University of the Witwatersrand

On 9 June 1993, Nelson Mandela delivered a speech at the unveiling of a statue in Pietermaritzburg that commemorated Gandhi's refusal to leave a first-class train compartment on the request of a white traveller. His subsequent ejection from the train became narrated (first and foremost by Gandhi himself) as a turning point in his life. According to Gandhi, this direct confrontation with racial prejudice provoked his first act of non-violent resistance: his refusal to abandon his seat. After outlining Gandhi's early struggles against Indian disenfranchisement, Mandela described his attempt to build Hindu–Muslim unity through the Indian Congress and a 'non-exploitative way of life' on Tolstoy Farm. 'The Mahatma is an integral part of our history', Mandela enumerated, 'because it is here that he first experimented with truth; here that he demonstrated his characteristic firmness in pursuit of justice; here that he developed Satyagraha as a philosophy and method of struggle'. Allegorising liberation history as an illustration of these principles, Mandela asserted the centrality of Gandhi's ideas to the African National Congress (ANC): 'The Congress Movement was strongly influenced by this Gandhian philosophy', he stressed, 'It was a philosophy that achieved the mobilization of millions of South Africans during the 1952 Defiance Campaign which established the ANC as a mass-based organization'. In this narrative, Gandhi served as a model for a revolutionary strategy that transpired on multiple fronts, including through negotiation, 'in good faith and without bitterness'.¹

In their trenchant *The South African Gandhi*, Ashwin Desai and Goolam Vahed reveal how much of Mandela's portrait rests on myth and elision. Contrary to a hagiography that depicts Gandhi's nearly 21 years in South Africa as the period when he became a cosmopolitan, anticolonial revolutionary, Desai and Vahed show that Gandhi was committed to securing equal rights for South African Indians within empire. He thus calibrated both word and deed to establish Indian loyalty as British subjects. Moreover, this political strategy required that he either ignore or in certain cases support the brutal dispossession of the African majority, whom he saw as inferior to Indians in civilisational and racial terms. For many readers, these are still hard truths. Desai and Vahed deserve much credit for making them unavoidable. Any honest assessment of Gandhi will have to grapple with their book.

Yet it still seems worth reflecting on how Mandela and others, who knew at least the broad outlines of the South African Gandhi's views on empire and Africans, were nevertheless able to read him as an irreplaceable ancestor. What mode of reading allowed them to see Gandhi's campaigns as the direct predecessors to their own struggle? In their introduction, Desai and Vahed associate the ANC's use of Gandhi with the post-1994 moment of national reconciliation and the strategic pairing of historic icons – Mandela and Rhodes, Mandela and Gandhi – to

*Email: jon.soske@mcgill.ca

© 2018 Jon Soske

1. N. Mandela, 'Speech at the Unveiling of the Gandhi Memorial', 6 June 1993, <http://www.anc.org.za/content/nelson-mandelasspeech-unveiling-gandhi-memorial>, accessed 17 April 2018.

promote racial reconciliation. Gandhi's influence on the ANC, however, stretches back decades, certainly to the 1940s, if not before. To assert this influence was based on a myth only begs the question. Myth was one of the liberation struggle's forms of historiography. It configured past struggles as the precedent and archetype of future campaigns while presenting the struggle itself as an image of a nation in the process of becoming. Why was Gandhi such a powerful mythic figure? And why did his racist views not undermine his utility?

Part of the answer relates to the inversions of historical temporality. Mandela's generation of African political activists came to nationalist consciousness in the 1940s after Gandhi had become the globally recognised icon of the Indian independence struggle. They did not inherit the South African Gandhi directly. In many respects, India provided African intellectuals with a template for imagining nation beyond empire and settler civil society. Indian independence did not just negate the fact of foreign rule: it augured the possibility of a sovereign democracy in a polyglot, heterogeneous, and deeply-divided country whose leadership, moreover, claimed continuity with two non-Western civilisational traditions, Hinduism and Islam. In other words, India embodied self-determination beyond the West and its norms. When they followed Gandhi in the press, read his writings, or listened to stories of his South African campaigns, the Mandela generation associated him (whatever they thought of his various doctrines) with this possibility. The teleological conviction that particular struggles, such as those championing Indian rights alone, build toward and culminate in a broader nationalism likely underwrote their appropriation of Gandhi. At the same time, India and Gandhi – sometimes blurring, sometimes distinct – provided models with which to think about new forms of nation.²

Gandhi's earlier support for empire, moreover, may have not seemed so exceptional to radicals within the ANC: their organisation had voiced similar views from its founding in 1912 until its embrace of universal suffrage and African nationalism in the 1940s. Composed of a middle-class and entirely male elite, the early ANC advocated for the gradual extension of citizenship rights to qualified Africans and, not unlike Gandhi in 1903 and 1906, supported the British crown in both World Wars in the hope that victory would lead to 'equal rights for all civilized men'. Many statements by early ANC leaders about working class and 'tribal' Africans – the ANC's founding President John Dube referred to the 'ruck of the Native'³ – echoed Gandhi's condescending language. It would have been possible for Mandela's generation to imagine Gandhi's evolution as parallel to the ANC's own transition from a politics of imperial citizenship to a vision of national liberation. And unlike the ANC's founders, Gandhi wrote a searching and powerful critique of Western Civilisation, *Hind Swaraj* (1910) and – over 20 years before the ANC rejected the framework of imperial citizenship – came to oppose British rule after the 1919 Amritsar Massacre. By stopping in 1918, Desai and Vahed avoid the question of the South African Gandhi's relationship to his later, in some respects more radical, views.

As Desai and Vahed show, Gandhi's belief that Indians were more advanced than Africans underwrote his appeals for Indian equality with whites. He therefore never seriously

2. This paragraph draws on J. Soske, *Internal Frontiers: African Nationalism and the Indian Diaspora in Twentieth Century South Africa* (Athens: Ohio University Press, 2017).
3. F. Barchiesi, 'The Problem with "We": Affiliation, Political Economy, and the Counterhistory of Non-racism', in S. Walsh and J. Soske, eds, *Ties that Bind: Race and the Politics of Friendship in South Africa* (Johannesburg: Wits University Press, 2016), 147.

entertained the prospect of an alliance between the diaspora and the African majority. But it is also important to remark that few, if any, African figures believed that such an alliance was possible or even desirable during Gandhi's South African decades.⁴ Within the framework of liberal empire, the 'Native Question' and 'Indian question' were configured as separate problems. Indians could not, it was widely believed, ally with Africans without losing their right to representation both domestically and within empire by the Indian government. Furthermore, the majority of Africans and Indians opposed such an alliance, especially in Natal. There was nothing self-evident about African-Indian unity: it was a concept that had to be developed and fought for both outside and within the ANC and South African Indian Congress (SAIC). (Mandela opposed such an alliance, based on the racist equation of Indians with the stereotype of the exploitive merchant, until late 1951.) For the emergence of a sustained front of the oppressed, a new framework of politics was required. In the early 1940s, a new generation of Indian activists, the 'Radicals', won control of the SAIC and began to pursue closer collaboration with the ANC. In the last years of his life, Gandhi gave his support to these developments – a fact celebrated in the African press.⁵ It is evident, as Desai and Vahed contend, that Gandhi contributed to the institutionalisation of a sectorial politics within the Indian community based on a sense of racial superiority. It is equally true that many of the activists that challenged this legacy did so while invoking Gandhi's name and reworking the memory of his South African years.

My point is not that Gandhi's views were understandable in context. Nor do I wish to diminish the reactionary and overtly racist character of Gandhi's statements. Desai and Vahed have done exemplary work in stripping off the icon's varnish. Rather, my point is that key aspects of Gandhi's politics were shared, if in a different form, by the ANC and other black organisations historically. Whereas Gandhi's failures were part of a larger tradition within black politics, his idiosyncratic ideas – a philosophy of non-violent resistance, struggle as an ethical relationship between opponents, politics as experimentation with modes of self, a spiritual foundation of nationhood – provided resources for those who sought to reinvent this heritage. In this respect, his South African years offered an archive that could be read strategically through the angelic light of his later significance. Desai and Vahed are unquestionably correct in arguing that this archive must now be confronted in full. What would it mean to do justice to both modes of readings – to the empirical and the mythopoetic?

Author Biography

JON SOSKE is associate professor of history at McGill University and a foreign research fellow at the Centre for Indian Studies in Africa, University of the Witwatersrand. He is the author of *Internal Frontiers: African Nationalism and the Indian Diaspora in Twentieth Century South Africa* and co-editor of *Ties that Bind: Race and the Politics of Friendship in South Africa*.

4. Desai and Vahed acknowledge this resistance in their discussion of John Dube and Sol Plaatje. My further elaboration is that Dube and Plaatje, and the early ANC as a whole, shared Gandhi's investment in a politics of imperial citizenship and this informed their failure to pursue African-Indian collaboration.
5. Soske, *Internal Frontiers*, 87.

Authors' Response: The Untouchable Indian

ASHWIN DESAI* and GOOLAM VAHED*

University of Johannesburg; University of KwaZulu Natal

Growing up in the Casbah area of Durban meant growing up with Gandhi. There was the Gandhi Library, his portrait hung on the walls of many homes, platforms of Natal Indian Congress (NIC) meetings were adorned with his photograph, and his granddaughter Ela was a leading figure in the NIC. Apartheid school textbooks might have largely written Gandhi out of history but he was kept alive through the generations.

As historians, we met Gandhi while researching our book on Indian indenture. Gandhi of course looms large in the seminal 1913 strike. But as we searched through the archives we came to realise that writings on the strike overly foregrounded Gandhi and effectively wrote out the way in which the indentured acted outside and even against his leadership. In our subsequent work, we sought to situate this period within the broader expanse of South African history when Africans were replacing Indians on the mines and plantations as cheap labour. This was a period of heightened African dispossession and bloody repression. It was in this context that we returned to the archives to try and understand Gandhi's position on Africans and the struggles that they were engaged in.

In the midst of our work Ramachandra Guha published his biography of the South African Gandhi. We were flabbergasted. Guha's rendition of Gandhi as one of South Africa's first anti-apartheid fighters and a man who trespassed racial boundaries was not what we were finding in our research. In many ways, our response sought to balance Guha's work which either left out or underplayed evidence that contradicted his thesis that Mohandas left African shores a Mahatma. In retrospect, perhaps we should have stayed with our project that would have highlighted different voices among Indians, in particular the colonial-borns who had no intention of going back to India (something Gandhi insisted he would do) and sought rights as fully fledged South Africans. However, we have no misgivings as a major positive to emerge from our book is that in view of the way in which so-called 'progressive' scholars have sought to occlude, ignore or rationalise Gandhi's anti-African racism and his almost obsessive commitment to keeping African and Indian separate, it has opened up debate that is not only about the past but has echoes in the contemporary period.

Given that commentators in this forum place race at the centre of their discussion, this is where we begin. Faisal Devji claims that Gandhi's 'attempts to distinguish and differentiate Indians from Africans in South Africa was part of his job as a lawyer for the Gujarati trading class'. Why taking up cases on behalf of the trader class leads Gandhi to label Africans as lazy, uncivilised, and unhygienic, and call for more taxes to be heaped upon them, is not explained. Did Gandhi not see that calling for more taxes fitted snugly with the accelerated dispossession of African people? And does Devji not see any link between Gandhi's attitude to Africans and the ideas of Aryanism that he carried with him? The fact is that Gandhi

*Corresponding author. Emails: vahedg@ukzn.ac.za; agdesai@uj.ac.za

supported White rule not only on ideological grounds, but so that Indians could garner a few extra rights and privileges.

Gandhi's time in prison provides a cameo of his approach to Afro-Indian relations. As Hofmeyr shows, it is here in 1909 (not 1893!) that Gandhi's activism crystallises in wanting Indians inside and outside prison 'not to be classed as native [...] "I have made up my mind to fight against the rule by which Indians are made to live with Kaffirs and others"'.¹ Gandhi petitioned the authorities to be given the same privileges as 'white' prisoners. He saw 'a boundary that could not be crossed and that is a line marked by the native.' Furthermore, those Indians who enjoyed the company of 'Natives', were 'addicted to bad habits'. For Gandhi, a line had to be drawn between the savage (Africans) and the civilised (Whites and Indians).²

Sinha is critical of our portrayal of Gandhi's relationship with Africans, writing that the problem 'lies in the book's underplaying of any connections between Gandhi and African political leaders'. Is this really the case? Taking the relationship between Dube and Gandhi as an example, we point to the lack of *meaningful* contact between them on page 46 of *The South African Gandhi*, citing the 'serious' work of Isabel Hofmeyr, Joseph Lelyveld and Heather Hughes, as well as the contrary views. What Sinha needs to contend with though is Hughes' contention that the presenting of close collaboration between Gandhi and Dube is born of political expediency and the need to forge non-racialism in the post-apartheid period rather than on the empirical evidence. Surely Sinha as a 'serious' scholar cannot be relying on a huckster like Anil Nauriya³ whose attempts to show close collaboration between Gandhi and Africans, while ignoring all the evidence to the contrary would make even Gandhi cringe, given the latter's compulsive attempts to 'distinguish and differentiate' Indian from African.

We are wont to remind Sinha that racists like Jan Smuts and Cecil John Rhodes had nice things to say about Black people. They even broke bread with (selected) Black people. In his 1929 Oxford lectures, Jan Smuts held that the African, while not 'essentially inferior' was also not 'a brother'. Gandhi's time in South Africa was witness to one of the bloodiest periods of Empire's brutal repression of Africans. Not a jot of protest from him. In defending the British Empire to make his case for Indians, Gandhi put himself in the invidious position of even wanting to take up arms to defend imperial rule. To highlight that Gandhi might have here and there said some nice things about Africans' right to the land is rendered meaningless by his acceptance of the right of the White minority to hold exclusive political power.

Sinha needs to confront this ideology of racial superiority and imperial loyalty that characterised Gandhi's outlook in South Africa as it shaped his political strategies. We must question why Devji and Sinha are reluctant to address the founding ideology of racial superiority. Maybe it has to do with what they accuse us of: an ideological bias that seeks to present an anti-racist Gandhi by avoiding or making light of his keenness to show common cause with British subjugation and dispossession of Africans while in South Africa. Maybe it has to do with our own histories, having lived through apartheid

1. I. Hofmeyr, 'The Idea of "Africa" in Indian Nationalism: Reporting the Diaspora in *The Modern Review* 1907-1929', *South African Historical Journal*, 57, 1 (2008): 60-81, 76.
2. *Ibid.*
3. A. Nauriya, 'Gandhi and Some Contemporary African Leaders from KwaZulu-Natal,' *Natalia*, 42 (2012): 45-64.

and witnessing the fragility of Afro–Indian relations in contemporary South Africa. Mimi Sheller reminds us that ‘we tell histories not only of the places we belong to or the bodies we have, but according to the times we inhabit and the pasts that inhabit our bodies’.⁴ The political stakes of where we speak from affects what we have to say, and how.

Sinha also believes that we do not reflect adequately on Gandhi’s rejection of race and caste in his later years. This is not a charge we care to refute for our book’s focus is on the South African Gandhi and we do not claim to offer a systematic examination of his evolving views, which, in any case, remain highly contested in the Indian context. The disputation between Perry Anderson⁵ and his detractors, for example, attests to the ongoing debates about Gandhi and caste. This debate is far from settled.

Devji does not dispute much of what we have to say but finds it all rather uninteresting as our approach ‘doesn’t get us very far’. Does his approach make us see further? He might feel that it does but the ‘evidential’ platform on which his theory supposedly opens up new vistas is built on wobbly facts. In his book *The Impossible Indian*, for example, he claims that

the Mahatma’s sense of nationality was portable and by the same token free from any claim to autochthony [...] Gandhi conceived of his practices as being universal enough to be derived from non-Indian sources. He thus took the suffering of Boer women in British concentration camps as the model for satyagraha.⁶

Devji’s de-linking of this argument from the actual historical circumstances is remarkable. Gandhi supported the British in their prosecution of this war and his silence on the Boer concentration camps means that this later injunction should be interpreted with scepticism. In fact, in the very *satyagraha* that Devji relies on, Gandhi makes clear his unwavering allegiance to Empire when he states that

the authorities may not always be right, but so long as the subjects owe allegiance to a state, it is their clear duty generally to accommodate themselves, and to accord their support, to acts of the state [...] Our ordinary duty as subjects, therefore, is not to enter into the merits of the war, but when war has actually broken out, to render such assistance as we possibly can [...] Even today I do not see any reason for modifying them.⁷

Thompson tells us that, all evidence must be approached with ‘attentive disbelief’.⁸ So it is with Gandhi.

And what of the 20,000 Africans who also died in concentration camps? Were they not also brave? Why did they not melt the hearts of the British? And why are they not an example of *satyagraha*? The Mahatma’s ‘sense of nationality’ may have been

4. M. Sheller, ‘Historical Temporality and Generational Identity: Of Standoffs and Stalled Time’, *Small Axe*, 19, 1 (2015): 169–77, 177.
5. P. Anderson, *The Indian Ideology: With Replies to Questions and Criticisms*. Second Enlarged Ed. (New Delhi: Three Essays, 2015).
6. F. Devji, *Impossible Indian: Gandhi and the Temptations of Violence* (London: C Hurst & Co Publishers Ltd 2012).
7. M.K. Gandhi, *Satyagraha in South Africa*. Translated from the Gujarati by Valji G. Desai (Triplicane, Madras: S. Ganesan, 1928), 108.
8. E.P. Thompson, 1995. *The Poverty of Theory: or an Orrery of Errors* (London: Merlin Press, 1995), 38.

‘portable’ but it was circumscribed by his attitude that placed African below Indians in the racial hierarchy. Possibly because of a lack of proper understanding of the history of the war, Devji commits the same erasure as Gandhi – making Africans invisible and their suffering and tactics and strategies not worthy of consideration. After all, there is a genealogy for this. Passive resistance comes imbued with a sense of Indian superiority and African inferiority. Witness one of Gandhi’s lieutenants, A.M. Cachalia, in 1908:

Passive resistance is a matter of heart, of conscience, of trained understanding. The natives of South Africa need many generations of culture and development before they can hope to be passive resisters in the true sense of the term.⁹

Cachalia’s views are not an exception but are revealed in the thoughts of people like Manilal Gandhi, who was reported to have stated at an ANC conference in 1951 that Africans’ ‘impulsive natures and lack of civilization’ meant that they were not ready to embark on a defiance campaign,¹⁰ and Ranajit Guha,¹¹ in relation to the Mau Mau in Kenya who wrote that Africans turned to saints and prophets to ‘mediate’ their anti-colonial resistance because their ‘consciousness proved far too feeble to cope with its own project and left it to be completed by the intervention of a superior wisdom’. Following the Defiance Campaign of 1952, Durban-based African journalist Jordan Ngunane warned that the

treatment meted out to African leaders and African contributions by important sections of the Indian press at times does little to cement Afro-Indian relations [...] The impression is being sedulously created that the African leaders of the struggle are juniors to their Indian counterparts.¹²

Arguably Devji’s most contentious claim is that Gandhi ‘consistently refused to speak for others unless invited to do so’. Has Devji not read Ambedkar? Gandhi not only insisted that he spoke for the Dalits; he also imposed a name on them. In the textile union he set up in 1920, for example, no worker was allowed to be in the leadership or be present in negotiations with bosses.¹³

In Devji and Sinha’s hands, one can see how Gandhi becomes *The Untouchable Indian*; he was inspired by White Boer women in concentration camps but supported the British in the war; his work as a lawyer forced him to ‘distinguish and differentiate’ while he begged for guns to put down African resistance; he refused to speak for Africans because he was not invited but was happy to call for more oppressive laws against them; his theory of nationality was portable but he rejected any joint delegations with Africans and Coloureds; he was a fighter against racism but was always ready to acknowledge the right of Whites to

9. Quoted in R. Guha, *Gandhi before India* (London: Allen Lane, 2013), 309.

10. *Ilanga Lase Natal*, 20 January 1952, cited in J. Soske, “‘Wash Me Black Again’: African Nationalism, the Indian Diaspora, and Kwa-Zulu Natal, 1944–1960” (DPhil diss., University of Toronto, 2009), 217.

11. R. Guha, *Elementary Aspects of Peasant Resistance in Colonial India* (London: Duke University Press, 1999), 273.

12. *The Graphic*, 6 February 1953.

13. A. Roy, ‘Introduction: The Doctor and the Saint’, in B.R. Ambedkar, *Annihilation of Caste: The Annotated Critical Edition*, edited by S.Anand. (New Delhi: Navayana, 2014), 11–99, 59.

hold exclusive power and defend the racist system against Black insurgency. Devji and Sinha read off Gandhi from the things he wrote, often long after events took place and present them as historical fact. Remember Churchill's adage, 'History will be kind to me for I intend to write it'.

Unlike Devji and Sinha who hum and haw and seek to occlude Gandhi's racism, Soske unambiguously pronounces that Gandhi's 'political strategy required that he either ignore or in certain cases support the brutal dispossession of the African majority, whom he saw as inferior to Indians in civilisational and racial terms'. But Soske does pose a challenge: 'key aspects of Gandhi's politics were shared, if in a different form, by the ANC and other black organizations historically.' While we do allude to this in our book (302–4), we could have pursued this aspect more concretely.

We would contend though that there was a seminal time in our history when there was a possibility of a path-breaking alliance. Gandhi's response to that opportunity goes to the heart of Sinha's critique of the 'book's underplaying of any connections between Gandhi and African political leaders'. As 1910 and the inauguration of the Union of South Africa loomed, there was the real possibility that 'non-whites' would be denied any political rights. In this context, African and Coloured South Africans forged a common purpose in a joint delegation to London, led by W.P. Schreiner, the White former Prime Minister of the Cape, to plead their case to the British government. It was a historic moment. Gandhi also proceeded to London but refused to countenance joining this delegation.¹⁴ On the cover of Martin Plaut's book is a haunting photograph of the African, Coloured and White delegation in London. Only Gandhi is missing, holding out for a separate deal with Westminster for Indians, hoping to ingratiate himself by standing aloof from the other racial groups.

The response to our book by Indian South Africans has been filled with anger that bordered on hysteria. Many wrote to newspapers openly admitting to not having read the book but disagreeing with it nonetheless. Invitations to conferences and social functions have been withdrawn. Against this background the responses of Devji, Sinha and Soske are most welcome in allowing us to reflect on our work, rather than fending off accusations of betraying a community and inciting African violence against Indians. More importantly, temporality is crucial and we write at a particular time in which there are insistent calls for the de-colonisation of the curriculum in South Africa. In this context, our work plays a role in forcing a rethink of this period in our history as it exposes the ways in which many liberation luminaries were implicated in the project of Empire and the sowing of racial division. We are compelled to confront narratives that write of the 'unbreakable thread'¹⁵ of non-racialism, interrogate why Afro-Indian relations remain fraught to the present, and acknowledge the long history of African chauvinism that runs through the ANC and which is finding contemporary resonance as the promises of 'liberation speak' fail to meet realities on the ground.

14. M. Plaut, *Promise and Despair: The First Struggle for a Non-Racial South Africa* (Johannesburg: Jacana, 2016).

15. J. Frederikse, *The Unbreakable Thread: Non-Racialism in South Africa* (Johannesburg: Ravan Press, 1990).

Author Biographies

GOOLAM VAHED teaches in the Department of History at the University of KwaZulu Natal. He writes on various aspect of the history of Indians and Muslims in South Africa, and on cricket. His most recent work is *Chota Motala: A Biography of Political Activism in the KwaZulu-Natal Midlands*, publication forthcoming by the University of KwaZulu-Natal Press.

ASHWIN DESAI is Professor in the Department of Sociology at the University of Johannesburg. His research interests include sport, political economy, and social policy. His latest work on the close relationship between politics and cricket in South Africa, *Reverse Sweep: The Story of Cricket in Post-apartheid South Africa*, was published by Jacana in 2017.