

## GANDHI AND PALESTINE

*Vinay Lal*

### I

On 26 November 1938, Gandhi published in his journal *Harijan* a reasonably lengthy statement entitled simply, 'The Jews'. 'My sympathies,' he candidly stated, 'are all with the Jews', and yet he could not be blind 'to the requirement of justice. The cry for the national home for the Jews does not make much appeal to me. The sanction for it is sought in the Bible and the tenacity with which the Jews have hankered after return to Palestine. Why should they not, like other peoples of the earth, make that country their home where they are born and where they earn their livelihood?' Gandhi had penned these reflections on 20 November in response, as he wrote in the opening paragraph, to 'several letters' asking him to declare his 'views about the Arab-Jewish question in Palestine and the persecution of the Jews in Germany'. Earlier that month, in a single night of terror crystallised as *Kristallnacht*, SA storm troopers, often joined by German civilians, went on a systematic and unchecked rampage in Nazi Germany and parts of Austria against Jewish homes, shops, businesses, and synagogues, thereby signaling their determination to put into place a policy of annihilationist horror that would lead eventually to the 'Final Solution'. A quarter of the Jewish male population of Germany was, on the single night of 9–10 November, dispatched to concentration camps.

Gandhi's statement of 20 November has had, barring its contemporary reception, a largely fugitive existence – until recently, that is. A number of prominent theologians and Zionists, among them Judah Magnes, Hayim Greenberg, and Martin Buber, sought to engage Gandhi in a dialogue on his interpretations of Jewish history and Jewish aspirations for a homeland, but the events of World War II and the Holocaust appeared to have vastly outpaced Gandhi's views. Even many of Gandhi's admirers perforce had to admit that he was incapable of understanding the nature of evil, and his two letters to Hitler,

both of which begin with the salutation 'Dear Friend', are generally construed as unmistakable evidence of his naivety and an outlandish idealism hopelessly at odds with the unforgiving world of realpolitik. Neither letter ever reached the intended recipient; both were suppressed by the Government of India, exercising its prerogative of wartime censorship. In his missive of 23 July 1939, Gandhi urged Hitler, the one person capable of putting an end to the madness that was on the horizon, to listen to the appeal of someone who had 'deliberately shunned the method of war not without considerable success'. His second letter, written on Christmas Eve 1940, begins with an acknowledgment of the fact that the very salutation with which Hitler is addressed was likely to provoke consternation among Gandhi's friends and ridicule among his adversaries: 'That I address you as a friend is no formality. I owe no foes. My business in life has been for the past thirty-three years to enlist the friendship of the whole of humanity by befriending mankind, irrespective of race, colour or creed.' Gandhi did not believe that Hitler was the monster he was made out to be, but nevertheless many of your acts, he tells Hitler, 'are monstrous and unbecoming of human dignity' — among these acts are the 'humiliation of Czechoslovakia, the rape of Poland and the swallowing of Denmark'.

A man may not be a monster, but his acts may be monstrous: that Gandhi held to such a view should come as no surprise to those familiar with Gandhi's insistence, in Christian parlance, that one is enjoined to hate the sin, not the sinner. British rule in India was abominable, but Gandhi was prepared to believe that there were Englishmen to whom the cause of Indian freedom was dearer than it was to many Indians. What should surprise us, however, is that the British proscribed Gandhi's letters to Hitler: if non-violence is as impotent in the face of fascism as is universally believed, why cower in fear of a non-violent activist? If truth alone triumphs, why shouldn't Gandhi's letters have been allowed to test the mettle of a man made out to be a monster? Or did the British find unpalatable, even sinister, Gandhi's claim, in his second letter to Hitler, that the difference between 'British Imperialism' and 'Nazism' was only one of 'degree'. Did Churchill suppose that this assessment from the man he once mocked as a 'half-naked fakir' was calculated to embolden Hitler? If so, one must suppose that the power of Gandhi's word was feared far more than the British were ever willing to admit.

Interesting as are all these considerations, there is the matter of Gandhi's statement on 'The Jews'. It is not only Gandhi's supposed naivety, and the

brute but still unproven fact of Hitlerism and fascism triumphing over non-violent action, that would condemn his statement to obscurity for some years. There has been for some time a relatively widespread view that Gandhi was not a particularly learned man. By this it is meant not merely that he had neither the time nor the inclination for intellectual or artistic pursuits as such, but also that he was uninterested in scholarly debates and was wanting in intellectual curiosity. On the related subjects of Judaism, Jewish history, and the history and politics of Palestine, Gandhi is thought to have been alarmingly ignorant. Once before, as the Ottoman Empire was being dismembered and Gandhi was to become the spokesperson for the ill-fated Khilafat campaign, he had ventured to voice briefly his opinion on Jewish claims to a homeland in Palestine. From early 1921 until the second half of 1937, however, there was barely a squeak from Gandhi on the question of Palestine, though the Arab revolt of 1936 had put the country into a state of acute unrest. The revival of his interest in the question of Palestine in 1937 owed much to circumstances to which I shall allude in due course.

In very recent years, however, Gandhi's statement of November 1938 on 'The Jews' has found a fresh lease of life: if the Mahatma has had to be assassinated repeatedly, he also continues to take rebirth in the most unexpected ways. Nathuram Godse, a staunch Hindu and Gandhi's assassin, would not have been amused. Indeed, it would not be too much to say that, in varying intellectual circles, Gandhi's pronouncement on Palestine has now been crowned as a model of judicious reasoning, intellectual perspicacity, and moral probity. In part, this has to do with the general reassessment of Gandhi that has been taking place over the last decade: if every constituency loved to hate him at one time or another, many of those same constituencies have now declared their admiration for his principled adherence to moral standards amidst the ruins of politics. Even analytical philosophers, who were wont to treat vexed debates on secularism, religion, and the public sphere as cognitive puzzles, have turned to Gandhi. But the resuscitation of Gandhi's views on Palestine owes at least as much to the fact that, in the more than six decades since the founding of Israel and the *nakba*, the dispersal and dispossession of the Palestinians, all competing views have been tested and found severely wanting. When asked by Reuters' special correspondent in May 1947, 'What is the solution of the Palestine Problem?', Gandhi replied: 'It has become a problem which seems almost insoluble.' That Gandhi had arrived at this estimate so early into the dispute is,

if disconcerting, equally a sign of his awareness that the conflict could not be resolved within the ambit of what we might call 'normal politics'. Here, as has happened so often, many of the advocates of non-violent resistance have appealed to various publics with the argument that, since all other remedies have failed, it is time that non-violence was given its just dues in the marketplace of opportunity.

## II

It is, however, far more than weariness with the unending cycle of violence that should compel us to turn to Gandhi's pronouncement on 'The Jews'. Let this much be said as well: just as it is doubtful that news of the atrocities of Kristallnacht had reached Gandhi in Segaoon, an obscure village in the heartland of India where he had ensconced himself a few years before, so it is reasonably clear that he would have, while deploring the oppression to which the Jews had been subjected, seen little reason to alter his views. His statement was written with full awareness of the extent of the depravity to which the Nazi regime had sunk. One must not suppose that, writing in November 1938, Gandhi had a premonition – any more than did others – of the gross evil that was about to unfold, and that consequently he may have been more receptive to the Jewish case had he written his article when the mass slaughter of Jews had commenced in the concentration camps at Auschwitz, Treblinka, Bergen-Belsen, and elsewhere. Quite to the contrary, Gandhi had condemned the Nazi regime in the strongest possible terms in his article: the 'German persecution of the Jews', he wrote, 'seems to have no parallel in history. The tyrants of old never went so mad as Hitler seems to have gone. And he is doing it with religious zeal. For he is propounding a new religion of exclusive and militant nationalism in the name of which any inhumanity becomes an act of humanity to be rewarded here and hereafter.' Gandhi's article of 1938 should, then, be taken as the summation of his views on Jewish claims to a homeland in Palestine, and the case for or against him, for those who are invested in the zero-sum logic of adversarial politics, rests with this article.

Gandhi commences his article, as I have noted, with the observation that his 'sympathies are all with the Jews'. His closest European associates and friends in South Africa were nearly all Jews, and it is only with a touch of exaggeration on his part that he describes some of them as having become his 'life-long

companions'. Gandhi's at one time flourishing legal practice in Johannesburg was ably managed by Sonia Schlesin, a Jewish woman of Lithuanian origin. The journalist Henry Polak, who had arrived in South Africa from Britain and had begun to work on the *Transvaal Critic*, a newspaper entirely typical in its open display of racism towards Indians and Africans, was slowly drawn to Gandhi. Their friendship blossomed, and Polak would go on to serve as editor of *Indian Opinion*, the first of several newspapers founded by Gandhi; he moved into Phoenix Settlement, similarly the first of Gandhi's several extended experiments in communal living, and the two lived, so Gandhi wrote in his autobiography, 'like blood brothers'. It is Polak who effected one of the most transformative moments in Gandhi's life when he slipped a copy of Ruskin's *Unto This Last*, into his hands as he was about to commence a train journey; Gandhi would later render it into Gujarati as 'Sarvodaya', or 'Welfare for All'. Hermann Kallenbach completed the all-important Jewish triumvirate: an architect of Lithuanian German stock, he was an unlikely candidate as a disciple or even friend of Gandhi. Well built and athletic, Kallenbach was devoted to sports; but his distinction resides perhaps in the fact that he was the first of many men and women of substantial means who felt mesmerised in Gandhi's presence. They shared lodgings together in Johannesburg, and the intimacy of their friendship can be surmised from their long and unusual correspondence, where Gandhi was signified as the 'Upper House' and Kallenbach as the 'Lower House'. The onset of World War I, which saw Gandhi leave for India and Kallenbach interned on the Isle of Man as a German citizen, led to an agonising separation that would last until May 1937, when Kallenbach arrived in India as an emissary of the Jewish Agency charged with garnering the support of Gandhi and the Congress leadership for the aspirations of Jewish people in Palestine. When Kallenbach died in 1945, the *Indian Opinion* declared that among Gandhi's associates he was known as 'Hanumana': 'As Hanumana was to Shri Rama so was Mr. Kallenbach to Mahatma Gandhi.'

'In South Africa', as Gandhi had once remarked in 1931, 'I was surrounded by Jews.' His statement of November 1938 establishes his credentials in this respect, and at once points to two considerations that Gandhi sought to bring to the attention of his readers. First, no one could say that Gandhi had no proximity to Jews, or that he was unaware of the peculiarities of their history. 'Through these friends,' Gandhi writes, 'I came to learn much of their age-long persecution. They have been the untouchables of Christianity.' Let us

leave aside for the present the parallel, which Gandhi describes as 'very close', that he draws between the treatment of Jews by Christians and the treatment of Untouchables by Hindus. The history of Jewish suffering, Gandhi appears to be suggesting, is not known to him merely as an abstraction, as a factotum gleaned from some encyclopaedia; rather, this suffering is, so to speak, writ large on the faces of his Jewish friends. And, yet, since friendships can be blinding, it is perforce necessary that 'the more common universal reason' should also nudge him towards 'sympathy for the Jews'. Secondly, to the extent that Gandhi had close friendships with Jews, he was duty bound to subject his sympathy for them to the rigorous test of justice. Sympathy should not be confused with partiality; and so we come to that formulation which we have encountered before: 'The cry for the national home for the Jews does not make much appeal to me.'

In advancing a case against Jewish claims to a homeland in Palestine, Gandhi dwells on the ethics of 'belonging'. Thus he argues, 'Palestine belongs to the Arabs in the same sense that England belongs to the English or France to the French.' This does not appear to be a morally compelling argument, particularly in view of Gandhi's recognition of the Jewish invocation of a biblical sanction to claim Palestine for the Jews. Does priority of arrival or origin confer unqualified and exclusive rights of possession to land? We know, to take one example, that native Americans were invariably stripped, one should say robbed, by white Europeans of their lands, but the same white Europeans have, for generations since then, used the priority of their 'arrival' to disenfranchise later immigrants and draw up hierarchies of true-blood 'Americans'. On the other hand, how would Gandhi have assessed the postcolonial rejoinder, encountered among formerly colonised immigrants to England or France who were confronted with the ugly face of racism, that 'we are here because you were there'? If Gandhi might now appear to be in some difficulty, he at once puts a different inflection on the notion of belonging. 'It is wrong and inhuman to impose the Jews on the Arabs', he writes, adding: 'What is going on in Palestine today cannot be justified by any moral code of conduct. The mandates have no sanction but that of the last war.' Palestine can only be turned into a 'national home' for the Jews by reducing the 'proud Arabs' to nought, which would be 'a crime against humanity'.

If one had to ask how precisely the Jews were being imposed on the Arabs, the answer lies, in the first instance, in that torrid history which commences

with a promise made by a now obscure British foreign official, known only as the author of the Balfour Declaration, that the British Government viewed 'with favour the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people' and would rightly endeavour to 'facilitate the achievement of this object, it being clearly understood that nothing shall be done which may prejudice the civil and religious rights of existing non-Jewish communities in Palestine, or the rights and political status enjoyed by Jews in any other country.' That the Balfour Declaration promised not Palestine to the Jews, but a national home in Palestine, was a distinction which would be overlooked. But that any declaration was at all possible owed everything to the prerogatives that Britain and France, triumphant nations at the height of their power and ambition, exercised in carving out spheres of influence in the Middle East. Much later, Nehru echoed the idea already implicit in Gandhi's suggestion that a Jewish homeland would be an 'imposition' on the Arabs: 'British imperialism played its hand so cleverly that the conflict became the conflict between Arabs and Jews, and the British Government cast itself in the role of umpire.' (Some might contend that the role of Britain in the creation of Israel has been exaggerated: anti-Semitism was rampant in the British Foreign Office, to be sure, but one can just as convincingly argue that American Protestantism accommodates both deep-rooted anti-semitism and unstinting support for Israel as an oasis of Western democracy and civilisation in the desert of Muslim-dominant states.) Jewish immigrants, pouncing upon the Balfour Declaration as a licence to stake a vigorous claim to a Jewish homeland, would begin to pour into Palestine. 8,000 Jewish immigrants had arrived in 1923; two years later, the number rose to 34,000. The numbers might have been sustained in the second half of the 1920s but for the worldwide depression; however, the economic recovery of the 1930s, and the onset of anti-semitism, led to a resurgence of Jewish immigration into Palestine. In 1935 alone, 61,800 Jews arrived in Palestine; and from constituting less than one-tenth of the population at the eve of World War I, the Jewish community numbered about one-third of the population at the eve of the World War II. In contemporary times, the parallel that comes to mind is the reterritorialisation of Tibet, as a matter of deliberate state policy, by the Han Chinese.

Having declared his opposition to a Jewish 'national home' in Palestine, even as he characterises Germany as a country that has shown 'how hideous, terrible and terrifying it looks in its nakedness', Gandhi proposes what appears to be

an anodyne if indisputably reasonable solution: 'The nobler course' of action, he argues, 'would be to insist on a just treatment of the Jews wherever they are born and bred. The Jews born in France are French in precisely the same sense that Christians born in France are French.' That this is not a sentiment Gandhi had struck upon at a moment's notice is amply clear from his statement on Zionism released to the Jewish Agency a year earlier, where he gives it as his opinion that 'the Jews should disclaim any intention of realising their aspiration under the protection of arms and should rely wholly on the goodwill of Arabs.' Jews were to wait for a home in Palestine until such time as 'Arab opinion' was 'ripe' for that possibility: 'And the best way to enlist that opinion, is to rely wholly upon the moral justice of the desire and therefore the moral sense of the Arabs and the Islamic world.'

If mere insistence on just treatment were enough, the world would have had no need for liberation movements, anti-colonial struggles, or agitations for social justice. How does one calibrate the difference between insistence, persuasion, and coercion? And if 'insistence' is to be more than insistence, as a persistent, forceful, and articulate expression of sentiments, then we have to question the measure of insistence. Gandhi's own life amply suggests that he had an expansive conception of the insistent struggle for rights, and his *satyagraha* campaigns, especially in India, went well beyond what is ordinarily understood by the term 'insistence'. But there were mitigating circumstances that, in Gandhi's judgment, had diminished whatever moral case could be advanced on behalf of Jewish aspirations. Jewish dependence on British arms had greatly eroded the credibility of Jewish nationalists, who had nothing but the naked strength of British imperialism to press their demands. What impressed Gandhi even more was what he took to be a distinct and salutary aspect of Jewish history, one that should have emboldened rather than demoralised them. Who else but the Jew could claim the world as his or her own? If Jews were desirous of having a national home, were they willing to disavow their rightful claims over all the lands where they had put down some roots? Balfour himself had given it as his firm opinion that the creation of a Jewish home in Palestine was not to be construed as a signal that the rights of Jews in other states could as a consequence be abrogated. 'If the Jews have no home but Palestine,' Gandhi asks, with perhaps a greater awareness of the xenophobia and exclusivism that informs nation-state politics than he is commonly granted to have displayed, 'will they relish the idea of being forced to leave the

other parts of the world in which they are settled? Or do they want a double home where they can remain at will? This cry for the national home affords a colourable justification for the German expulsion of the Jews.' That the demand for Palestine as a national homeland would make Jews vulnerable was, even then, the lesser part of the problem. The supreme tragedy of Jewish history, Gandhi might well have argued, was that the Jews seemed incapable of recognising that they alone could will an escape from the tyranny of the nation-state narrative.

### III

At this juncture, before entering into a consideration of the response to Gandhi's statement on 'The Jews' by enlightened Jewish opinion, it would do well to probe the reasons that may have informed Gandhi's thinking on the notion of a Jewish homeland. He treasured his long association with numerous Jewish friends, and in the concluding part of his statement, invoking Cecil Roth's book *The Jewish Contribution to Civilisation*, he called to mind the innumerable ways in which the Jewish people had enriched 'the world's literature, art, music, drama, science, medicine, agriculture', and the like. On the other hand, while he could not claim similarly close friendships among Arab intellectuals or public figures, he commanded a large following in the Arab world where developments in India were closely monitored. When Gandhi was set free on 25 January 1931, an editorial in *Al-Ahram* invited Egyptians to celebrate the occasion as 'the day of Gandhi, the day of India, the day of freedom'. A few weeks later, on 10 March, another editorial in *Al-Ahram* posed the questions that were on the nationalist agenda in the Arab world: 'India and Egypt: does the Indian question affect the Egyptian question?' The query was answered unequivocally in the affirmative: 'At close inspection one finds that British policy in Egypt and India is the same. As a result, the events in Egypt in 1919 affected India and British reaction here is the same as there. Similarly, just as the British course of action was contingent upon our course of action, so too does the same apply to India.' The editorialist opined that the British were inclined to 'look at the Orient as a single entity'. We should not be surprised, then, that when Gandhi halted in Suez on his way to London in the fall of 1931 to attend the Round Table Conference as the emissary of the Indian National Congress, a committee was there to receive him when his ship docked at Port Said. The 7 Septem-

ber edition of *Al-Ahram* gave over the entire front page to Gandhi's visit with these headlines: 'An hour with Gandhi on board the ship. Gandhi's message to Egyptian nationalists. Gandhi warns that the Civil Disobedience campaign will resume if conference fails.'

It is reasonable to assume that, given the supreme importance that Gandhi attached to the question of Hindu-Muslim relations in India, he would not have been unimpressed with the necessity of cultivating close ties with the 'Muslim world'. Indeed, nearly all commentators take it as axiomatic that his views on a Jewish national home were profoundly shaped by the imperative to sustain friendly Hindu-Muslim relations and even, as the demand for Pakistan began to gain adherents, keep India undivided. On 4 July 1937, Hermann Kallenbach, who had been reunited with Gandhi in India after more than twenty years, carried a message for the Zionist leadership at the Jewish Agency offering the services of the Congress in facilitating a 'direct conversation between Arabs and Jews only.' The 'Mubammadan population of India, being 70,000,000,' the letter concludes, 'is by far the most important in the world. The intervention of some of their leaders with a view to reach conciliation, may have far-reaching results. What do you think about it?' Once before, when it was put to Gandhi that his attachment to the Khilafat cause seemed to go well beyond his desire to see 'justice on the Khilafa', Gandhi had admitted: 'Attaining of justice is undoubtedly the corner-stone, and if I found that I was wrong in my conception of justice on this question, I hope I shall have the courage to retrace my steps. But by helping the Mahomedans of India at a critical moment in their history, I want to buy their friendship.'

Had Gandhi, then, surrendered to political compulsions in opposing a Jewish homeland in Palestine, or at least, as shall be seen shortly, a homeland that apparently could not be brought about except as a consequence of the imposition of British imperial interests? Could it be that if the demand for a Jewish homeland, whether taken to be as contiguous with undivided Palestine or to be carved out of it, were to be conceded, it would strengthen the hands of those in India who clamoured for the vivisection of India? Of course, one could have argued from the other end of the political spectrum: if a section of Muslims in India were prepared to wage a struggle for the creation of a homeland where their interests would allegedly be better and more equitably represented, by what right could they deny the same privilege to Jews in Muslim-dominated Palestine? To Jewish leaders the logic of the Muslim posi-

tion might have seemed inescapably pragmatic: while in India they professed to speak as a victimised minority, albeit a sizable minority, in Palestine, speaking from a position of strength, they rejected the claims of another minority.

Even a minimal familiarity with Gandhi's worldview suggests why the cold calculations that doubtless informed the views of many of his contemporaries and subsequent commentators are unlikely to have entered into his deliberations on the Jewish question. This is apart from the consideration that the Jewish minority in Palestine cannot be said to have an isomorphic relationship with the Muslim minority in India: not only were Muslims in India both numerically and proportionately a much greater part of the whole population, but they also had a significantly different relationship to 'Hindus' than did Jews among Christians. The language of 'majority' and 'minority' belongs to an enumerative universe rather than to the fuzzy world in which Jews were non-Christians but nevertheless not a statistical aggregate that we describe as a 'minority', much as the Muslims of India, even when they were not part of a ruling elite, were never simply a 'minority'. It is doubtful that Gandhi had any use at all for this modern form of political arithmetic; indeed, everything in his political and ethical views militated against those crass considerations that have led to the frightening, indeed ethically numbing, normalisation of politics. The confession that he had wanted to 'buy' the 'friendship' of Muslims was in fact an admission that he had once lapsed from his own standards of ethical conduct in politics, and Gandhi's other writings on the Khilafat affair point to the indubitably more apposite conclusion, namely that his support for the restoration of the Khilafat was not even remotely predicated on the idea that Indian Muslims were therefore obliged to reciprocate the favour, for example by supporting the ban on cow slaughter. If we are to understand why Gandhi found himself unable to support the idea of a national Jewish home in Palestine, we shall have to abandon altogether the easy comforts of the view that, try as he might, he could not overlook the political expediency of furnishing support to Indian Muslims, especially at a time when the demands for separation had greatly accelerated. True, Gandhi had often declared that no cause was as dear to him as the solidarity of Muslims and Hindus, and he had gone so far as to say: 'I do not want *swaraj* without Hindu-Muslim unity.' But Hindu-Muslim unity purchased through sheer submission to naked political calculations could not be the grounds for *swaraj* either.

Let me turn, then, to the considerations that, in my judgment, weighed heavily with Gandhi. However inconsistent this argument appears to be with his repudiation of Jewish claims to a national home, it must be recognised that Gandhi perceived himself as an advocate of Zionism. Not only is Gandhi's understanding of Zionism distinctly at odds with the predominantly political connotations carried by the term today, but he also framed his views around Zionism at a time when Zionist aggression, in the shape of the nation-state of Israel, did not exist. Gandhi differentiated between spiritual and material Zionism, not unlike the distinction made by Martin Buber between Prophetic Judaism and Jewish Nationalism. 'Zionism in its spiritual sense is a lofty aspiration', Gandhi was to state in an October 1931 interview with the *Jewish Chronicle*, and he went on to elaborate: 'By spiritual sense I mean they should want to realise the Jerusalem that is within. Zionism meaning reoccupation of Palestine has no attraction for me. I can understand the longing of a Jew to return to Palestine, and he can do so if he can without the help of bayonets, whether his own or those of Britain.' An unpublished statement on Zionism made by Gandhi to the Jewish Agency around 4 July 1937 sheds some further light on this matter, and stands as a reminder that the intervening six years, during which time Palestine — caught between an Arab revolt on the one hand, and, on the other hand, vigorous Jewish self-assertion which saw the Haganah transformed into a well-armed militia and the creation of a Jewish terrorist strike group, the Irgun Zvai Leumi — had been thrown into a state of extraordinary turmoil, did not occasion a change of heart on Gandhi's part. As Gandhi wrote, 'Assuming that Zionism is not a material movement, but represents the spiritual aspirations of the Jews, the introduction of Jews in Palestine under the protection of British and other arms, is wholly inconsistent with spirituality.' Renouncing the use of arms, Jews were to 'rely wholly on the goodwill of Arabs'; but Arabs were not to construe this statement as indicative of Gandhi's repudiation of the idea of a Jewish homeland. 'No exception can possibly be taken', Gandhi warned, 'to the natural desire of the Jews to found a home in Palestine. But they must wait for its fulfilment, till Arab opinion is ripe for it.' As for the Jews who were already settled in Palestine, their abandonment of arms was calculated to earn them the goodwill of the Arabs and render their position safe. Anticipating that his position would be brushed aside as the wishful thinking of an idealist committed to non-violence, Gandhi concluded: 'My opinion is based purely on

ethical considerations, and is independent of results. I have no shadow of doubt that the existing position is untenable.'

Their spiritual aspirations, Gandhi advises the Jews, need not be manifested in the shape of a nation-state in Palestine, even if their desire to live for this fulfilment is understandable. Taken in summation, however, Gandhi appears to summon some further reasons for his inability to support the Jewish case. If Hindus, Muslims, Sikhs and others were to be left to resolve their differences amongst themselves, precisely the same position had to be advocated apropos Jews and Arabs in Palestine. Zionism as a material movement, backed to the hilt by the force of arms and sustained by an imperial power, could only exist in an adversarial position vis-à-vis the Arabs. 'As the idea of Muslim nationalism was fabricated with British encouragement in India,' Nehru had once written, 'so also the idea of Zionism was fabricated by British Imperialism in Palestine.' Gandhi was unlikely to ever put the matter so starkly, but nevertheless he shared the view that Jewish claims would crumble without British support. Gandhi's long experience of British rule in South Africa and India had made him deeply suspicious of imperial powers, and he was convinced that Jewish aspirations for a homeland were morally untenable if they could not be sustained without the massive militarisation of Palestine. More than seven or eight decades after Gandhi shared his reflections with his readers, one is struck by the prescience with which he seems to have anticipated the relationship that Israel would forge with the United States, Britain's successor as the dominant imperial power in the region.

We should deliberate, as well, on Gandhi's understanding of social relations between religious communities in India and his invocation of the history of non-violent resistance in South Africa. In his attempt to explain the plight of Jews and the course of action open to them, he draws on two, perhaps tendentious, parallels. First, in commencing with a brief account of his life-long association with Jews, he adds this characterisation of them: 'They have been the untouchables of history. The parallel between their treatment by Christians and the treatment of untouchables by Hindus is very close.' One might, of course, legitimately question Gandhi's understanding of how precisely 'religious sanctions' were used to suppress untouchables in India and Jews under Christian rulers; one might also point to the fact that, unlike the Jews, the untouchables were not in search of a homeland. Indeed, the Jews were an

eminently diasporic people, but Gandhi would not have been unsettled by the many differences that underlie the histories of the Dalits and the Jews.

In 1932, Gandhi had resisted, with a fast unto death, an attempt, as he saw it, to provide Dalits with a corporate political identity that placed them outside the fold of Hinduism; and as he had drawn a parallel between Dalits and Jews, one might understand why he would have been similarly resistant to attempts to cast Jews as possessed of a distinct political identity that could only find its expression in a national homeland in Palestine. The far more interesting question to ask is whether Gandhi read Judaism through the experience of Christianity, and whether he may not tacitly have accepted some of the assumptions that historically shaped Christian interpretations of Judaism.

Whatever the merits or otherwise of the parallel that Gandhi was to draw between Jews and Dalits, I cannot but believe that he would also have had in mind the larger history of social relations between religious communities in India and, in particular, the unusual history of Jews in India. 'The Palestine of the biblical conception is not a geographical tract', he says in his statement of 1938. 'It is in their hearts.' Some Jews, he stresses, 'claim to be the chosen race', and they are to prove it so 'by choosing the way of non-violence for vindicating their position on earth.' Yet perhaps they were also the 'chosen race' because it was their singular experience to claim the entire world as their own: 'Every country is their home including Palestine not by aggression but by loving service.' Scholars of Jewish history are struck by the near singularity of India in the worldwide Jewish experience, but Gandhi would have embraced their history in India as a model for Jews around the world. We may underscore these words, 'Every country is their home', and turn to their history in India, one country where they faced no persecution; moreover, much as adherents of many other religions have found, Jews could openly practise their faith and signal their own distinct contributions to the making of Indian civilisation. Perhaps the leading scholar of Indian Jewish history, Nathan Katz, has written that 'Jews navigated the eddies and shoals of Indian culture very well. They never experienced anti-semitism or discrimination.' He goes on to describe in what respect India could have served as a model for the world: 'Indian Jews lived as all Jews should have been allowed to live: free, proud, observant, creative and prosperous, self-realised, full contributors to the host country.'

The history of Jews in India apart, Gandhi took notice on more than one occasion of the travails of Indians in South Africa. Let me thus turn to that

other parallel which surfaces in his pronouncements on Jewish aspirations, most emphatically in his statement of 1938: when Gandhi counsels the Jews to engage in mass non-violent resistance, he argues that Jews 'have in the Indian *satyagraha* campaign in South Africa an exact parallel. There the Indians occupied precisely the same place that the Jews occupy in Germany. The persecution had also a religious tinge. President Kruger used to say that the white Christians were the chosen of God and Indians were inferior beings created to serve the whites.' No one was persuaded by this comparison; equally, no one had a more poignant response to Gandhi than Martin Buber. Not only was Buber one of the most revered Jewish theologians of his times, he was held in high esteem as a humanist philosopher by his contemporaries. His principal biographer admits that Buber admired Gandhi 'more than any living person in public life', and consequently his copious response to Gandhi, a letter written from Jerusalem on 24 February 1939, takes on additional significance. For weeks, wrote Buber, he had agonised over his response, reading and re-reading every line in Gandhi's statement; he made repeated pauses, 'sometimes days elapsed before short paragraphs', in order that he might test his knowledge and way of thinking.

'Jews are being persecuted, robbed, maltreated, tortured, murdered. And you, Mahatma Gandhi,' writes Buber in a tone of equal parts astonishment and admonishment, '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. There the Indians occupied precisely the same place, and the persecution there also had a religious tinge. There also the constitution denied equality of rights to the white and the black races including the Asiatics; there also the Indians were assigned to ghettos ...' Nothing that Gandhi had said about Indians in South Africa seemed to have any bearing on the position of Jews in Germany. Was not Gandhi aware, Buber asked, 'of the burning of synagogues'? Did he know or not know what 'a concentration camp is like and what goes on there', of 'its methods of slow and quick slaughter?' Only ignorance could explain the 'tragi-comic utterance' that had emanated from Gandhi's mouth when he had dared to compare the two situations. Surely Gandhi knew that the 150,000 Indians in South Africa were nourished on the hope that there were 200 million of them in India, but how did Gandhi overlook the fact that the Jews had nothing like a Mother India to which they could look for succour,



spiritual repose, and material assistance? Last, but not least, was Gandhi not able to comprehend that nothing in the experience of humankind could have prepared one for a regime of the type encountered in totalitarian Germany? 'And do you think perhaps', asks Buber, 'that a Jew in Germany could pronounce in public one single sentence of a speech such as yours without being knocked down?'

An indefatigable letter writer and master of the epistolary art, not one to flee or wither from criticism, Gandhi never replied to Buber's letter; and he did not do so for the simple reason that it never reached him. Nevertheless, we can be certain there is nothing in Buber's letter that would have taken Gandhi unawares, or over which he had not already pondered a good deal. I have argued that Gandhi remained singularly unimpressed throughout his life with arguments that hovered around ideas of majority and minority, and similarly he would have found it impossible to agree with the suggestion that Mother India was even remotely a guarantee of political or social entitlements to Indians in South Africa. Evictions of Indians from Kenya and Uganda in the late 1960s and early 1970s, or the repeated coups that have driven out Indians from Fiji in the last two decades, are only a few instances that one can summon of the sheer impotence of India on the world stage — and that at a time when India has been a sovereign power, not a nation living under the impress of colonial rule. But such arguments would be churlish, given the moral gravity of Buber's charges; the more compelling task is to see in what manner Gandhi may have anticipated Buber's criticisms. Thus, from Gandhi's standpoint, the parallel is not exact — but only because, contrary to Buber's reasoning, Indians in South Africa were uniquely handicapped. The 'Jews of Germany', writes Gandhi in his statement of 1938, 'can offer *satyagraha* under infinitely better auspices than the Indians of South Africa. The Jews are a compact, homogeneous community in Germany. They are far more gifted than the Indians of South Africa. And they have organised world opinion behind them.' This is not the voice of anti-semitism, pointing to the Jews' alleged 'control' over world banking, financial institutions, or influential policy-making institutions; rather, Gandhi was speaking from his awareness that German Jews were highly educated, capable of mobilising public opinion, in every respect a 'compact, homogeneous community'. The Indians in South Africa, as Gandhi would narrate at length in *Satyagraha in South Africa*, were largely uneducated and hopelessly divided. Buber himself was inclined to see German Jewish culture as the apotheosis of

Western civilisation, and Gandhi was not amiss in wondering how poor and unlettered Indians, many of them indentured labourers, could stack up against members of a community disproportionately influential in the world of letters, arts, and the sciences? Why had people with vision, courage, and tenacity not arisen from within the community of German Jews to lead their people? If the experience of Indians in South Africa was no Sunday picnic, Gandhi was also quite clear that a non-violent response, well before anti-semitism would be transmuted into organised killing on a mass scale, might have mobilised opinion in Germany against the rise of National Socialism.

Other Jewish commentators, all admirers of Gandhi but troubled if not tormented by what they took to be his inexplicable injustice to the Jewish people, would step into the debate. These rich exchanges do not call for a vindication of one position or another. They can be read, perhaps more productively, as contributions to an eloquent, ethically informed, and philosophically subtle disquisition on the multiple meanings of home and dispossession. We often make a home and dispossess others by our act. The home that we long for, when realised, suddenly loses all its attractions. Our home might come to burden or haunt us, creating other forms of dispossession. Our actual home may well be elsewhere than the home in which we live. We may be at home in not being at home at all, and the home that we call home may have no relation to the home that is in the heart. The home that we turn over to our guests at long last begins to look and feel like a home. The home that is not ours takes shape as a home in the mind of the honoured guest. That home with which we draw a boundary to keep out others becomes more than a marker of territory, helping shape conceptions of the outside and the inside, the other and the self, the alien and the familiar. That home which keeps out others is evidently a home to some and not a home to others. We may, like the reluctant exile, gain a political home and lose our cultural home. We may have several homes, and yet feel dispossessed; or we may have no home at all, and feel that the world is at our fingertips. The only home truth is that the politics of home and dispossession is not to be unravelled by the homilies with which nationalisms are created, nurtured, and exploited.

## IV

One of the many ways in which Gandhi's life might be interpreted is to view him as a man who, in the last analysis, felt himself at sea in the world. In this respect, though he was not in the quest for a homeland, he most likely saw himself as akin to the Jews. His life offers fleeting impressions of someone who, even as his feet were firmly planted on the ground, was curiously unmoored. For much the greater part of his adult life, Gandhi was bereft of a family home, sharing not even an extended family type home that was overwhelmingly the norm in his lifetime. He shared his life not merely with Kasturba and their sons but with dozens and often hundreds of inmates in communes and ashrams. If, for instance, the notion of home implies the idea of a private sphere, Gandhi displayed not merely indifference to the idea of privacy but was inclined to see it as a species of secrecy and thus deception. Again, though his life in both South Africa and India is associated with cities such as Durban, Johannesburg, and Ahmedabad, as well as cities such as Delhi and Bombay which he visited on hundreds of occasions, he never felt at home in the city. The worldview of cities remained distant to him until the very end, and it is surely apposite that a city took his life. It cannot be an accident that, having vowed not to return to Sabarmati Ashram until India had been delivered from the shackles of colonial rule, Gandhi went on the Dandi March and then drifted around for a few years until he settled upon Wardha in central India. In early April 1936, he set himself up in the desperately poor and mosquito-infested village of Segaoon, which then had a population of less than 700. Segaoon was without roads, telephones, and postal service; no medical clinic graced this village where typhoid and malaria were rampant; and it is from here that Gandhi plunged body and soul into what was dearest to him, namely the constructive programme. Segaoon had the virtue only of being, it is said, the dead centre of India, home to everything and nothing. Moving beyond the family, the village, and the city, we must contend with the ultimate irony: if Gandhi was the chief architect of the Indian independence struggle, it is also, to my mind, indubitably the case that he was never at home with the idea of the nation-state. No nationalist was less invested in the nation-state that he had helped to forge.

The fate of the Jews interested Gandhi for all the reasons – the persecution of a gifted minority, the nature of pluralism in modern societies, the accom-

modation of religious difference – that others might have been animated by in their narrative, but also because the story of this great diasporic people brought home to Gandhi with visceral intensity the problems of being at home in the world, of feeling at home while being dispossessed, and of being homeless while possessed of a home. It is fitting, as I have argued, that his intellectually most engaging interlocutor on the 'Jewish Question' should have been Martin Buber, a Zionist who was a dissident within Zionist circles, a devout Jew who migrated to Israel but was never entirely comfortable with Jewish nationalism. There have, however, been in more recent times other extraordinary Jewish lives which appear to exemplify Gandhi's idea of a spiritual Zionism that cannot be fully reconciled with the idea of a Jewish national homeland in Palestine, and in closing I would like to point to the illustrious, indeed luminous, life of Marek Edelman. Deputy Commander of the ill-fated Warsaw Ghetto Uprising, and a true inheritor of traditions of Jewish radicalism bequeathed by the likes of Rosa Luxembourg, Edelman passed away in 2009 – on 2 October, the birthday of Mohandas Gandhi. Poland had, before the war, the largest Jewish population of any state in Europe. Few of its three million Jews survived the concentration camps; fewer still were those who offered opposition to the Germans and lived to tell the tale. Edelman was among that singularly microscopic minority.

Poland was overrun by the Germans within days; and so commenced World War II. Within months, the Jewish neighbourhood of Warsaw had been transformed into a ghetto, bounded by barbed wire and brick walls; and something like 480,000 Jews were confined to that space. The ghetto, Edelman wrote in a pamphlet marking the forty-fifth anniversary of the uprising, increasingly felt the 'breath of death'. Reports of mass executions of Jews circulated, but as Edelman put it cryptically, 'The ghetto did not believe'. The stories were too horrible to be plausible. On 19 April 1943, the day the Warsaw Ghetto Uprising commenced, only 60,000 Jews were left alive in the ghetto. Many years later, Edelman would contest attempts to elevate the number of resistance fighters beyond 220: while it might have been comforting to believe that more of the ghetto's residents had been prepared to enter into a struggle that was doomed from the outset, pitting young, emaciated, hungry, poorly equipped and ill-trained men against a much larger force of German soldiers armed with artillery and machine-guns, Edelman's own resolute fidelity to the truth would not allow him to enhance the numbers. In the three weeks during which the

resistance fighters held out, Commander Mordechai Anielewicz was killed; Edelman made good his escape, living to take part in the equally futile Warsaw Uprising of 1944.

Having survived the war, Edelman went on to have an eminently successful medical career, becoming one of Poland's most renowned cardiologists. I would like to believe that it is no accident that he treated diseases of the heart. His fellow survivors of the Warsaw Ghetto made their way to Israel, but Edelman alone found himself unable to abandon one of the most tragic homes of European Jewry. To leave Poland would have been tantamount to cutting away a piece of himself. In later life, Edelman was among the most prominent Jewish figures, and a survivor of the Holocaust, to embrace the view that Israel's conduct towards the Palestinians was uncomfortably reminiscent of the Nazi repression of Jews. Edelman became a vigorous critic of the occupation: thinking, no doubt, about the massively unequal forces that were pitched in battle during the Warsaw Ghetto Uprising, he recognised as well the enormous disequilibrium of power between the Palestinians and the state of Israel. But, as his letter of August 2002 addressed to 'all the leaders of Palestinian military, paramilitary and guerrilla organisations', and 'to all the soldiers of Palestinian militant groups', makes amply clear, Edelman was equally critical of their easy and heady embrace of violence. 'We were fighting with a hopeless determination,' the letter states, 'but our weapons were never directed against the defenceless civilian populations, we never killed women and children. In a world devoid of principles and values, despite a constant danger of death, we did remain faithful to these values and moral principles.' It is men such as Marek Edelman who, Gandhi would have said, are the true repositories of Jewish history, and whose lives provide an intimation of what it will take to resolve the question of Palestine.

## MUSLIM DOGS

*Barnaby Rogerson*

It was a packed London underground train, so social interaction was already set at a glacial minimum – the standard non-communication of a late-morning English commuter crowd. In through the sliding door strolled a caricature from Hollywood central-casting of a potentially threatening Muslim male – a tall, big youth, with a thick beard, black boots, camouflage trousers and a vest with big swirling Arabic calligraphy tattooed all over his rippling biceps. There was a noticeable intake of breath and a scattering of nervous glances between neighbours, as if to mime 'bomber alert', and various glances which seemed to be sussing out the chance of subtly moving into a different carriage at the next stop without looking too offensive.

Then suddenly I noticed a total mood change. Even the pair of uptight middle-aged ladies, sitting rigidly beside the door with their blue-rinsed hair, silk shirts and cardigans, were smiling and their heads were bobbing about in happy animation. They even seemed to be greeting this man – an unheard of action in an English train and especially bizarre to a stranger, let alone a bearded Muslim. What could possibly have happened? Then I saw what had caused this dramatic sea-change. The young man was very gently coaxing a dog onto the train. Most of the passengers moved over to make room (which they would never have done for a mere human) and then they began to talk, even to ask direct questions of the young man. For his well-groomed dog Husky had a damaged back leg. Within minutes the story of the dog and its 'nice young owner' was buzzing around the carriage. The two of them had just returned from a veterinary clinic where he had been told that the operation to correct the dog's leg – which was a genetic fault not an accident – would cost hundreds and hundreds of pounds. I am pretty sure that if anyone had started a collection then and there, there would have been some handsome contributions, especially when the young man explained to the old ladies that the tattoo on his forearm meant 'in the name

Parvin Paidar's essay 'Encounters between Feminism, Democracy, and Reformism in Contemporary Iran' is in Maxine Molyneux and Shahra Razavi (editors), *Gender Justice, Development, and Rights* (OUP, 2002); Fadia Faqir's 'Female and Fighting' appeared in *Critical Muslim 1: The Arabs are Alive* (Hurst, London, 2011) pp. 105–111; as did Merryl Wyn Davies's 'On Saudi Women Drivers', pp. 254–258. See also Samia Rahman, 'The Race of Women', *Critical Muslim 2: The Idea of Islam* (Hurst, London, 2012), pp. 57–74. Thomas Lippman's article on Saudi lingerie shops appeared in the *New York Times* (January 2012) and may be found here: [http://www.nytimes.com/2012/01/22/opinion/sunday/saudi-women-break-a-barrier-the-right-to-sell-lingerie.html?\\_r=0](http://www.nytimes.com/2012/01/22/opinion/sunday/saudi-women-break-a-barrier-the-right-to-sell-lingerie.html?_r=0)

### Iberia's New Muslims by Marvine Howe

For a more detailed reportage of Muslim communities in Spain and Portugal see Marvine Howe, *Al-Andalus Rediscovered: Iberia's New Muslims* (London, Hurst, 2012). For statistical information on Spanish Muslims, see Gema Martin Munoz, *Muslims in Spain: A Reference Guide* (Madrid: Casa Arabe-IEAM, 2009). The essay by Abdennur Prado, 'New Islamic Thought in Al-Andalus Today' appeared in *Islam in the Kingdom of Spain* (Bubai, Al Mesbar Studies and Research Center, 2011, in Arabic).

The conclusion of Islamic feminist conferences, as well as Laure Rodriguez Quiroga's report of Carbova TV, can be found at [webislam.com](http://webislam.com). The website for the Islamic Community of Lisbon can be found at: [www.comunidadeislamica.pt](http://www.comunidadeislamica.pt). Islamic Junta's education website, which offers course on Islam, culture, halal production, and gender relations, is at: [www.educaislam.com](http://www.educaislam.com). Clara Teixeira's profile of Zeinal Abedin Mohamed Bava appears in *Visao*, Lisbon, 27 March 2008.

### Reconquista 2.0 by Jordi Serra del Pino

The Balaguer programme can be downloaded from: <http://www.tv3.cat/videos/3991571/Balaguer-una-ciutat-musulmana-per-descobrir>

On Catalonia's independence aspiration, see Matthew Tree, 'A country can exist quite happily without a state of its own' in *the Guardian*: <http://www.guardian.co.uk/travel/2012/nov/23/barcelona-catalonia-spain-culture-independence>

### Gandhi and Palestine by Vinay Lal

This essay first saw light as the S. K. Bose Memorial Lecture, delivered at St Stephen's College, Delhi, 19 February 2011. I am grateful to Alok Bhalla, K. P. Shankaran, and many members of the audience for their thoughtful questions, and would especially like to thank Daniel Neuman for his probing questions and comments.

*The Collected Works of Mahatma Gandhi* (New Delhi: Government of India, Ministry of Information & Broadcasting, Publications Division), published over three decades, is the standard source for Gandhi's writings. The entire set of 100 volumes [often cited as CWMG] is available online in pdf at [www.gandhiserve.org](http://www.gandhiserve.org). Gandhi's statement on 'The Jews', published in the *Harijan* on 26 November 1938, is in Vol. 74, pp. 239–242; for his two letters to Hitler, see CWMG 76:156–57 and CWMG 79:453–54. The most detailed biography remains D. G. Tendulkar, *Mahatma: Life of Mohandas Karamchand Gandhi*, 8 vols. (new ed., New Delhi: Ministry of Information & Broadcasting, Publications Division, 1962), though it is barely analytical. Gandhi's response to the Reuters correspondent in 1947 is to be found in Vol. 7, p. 390; information on Sonia Schlesin is in Vol. 1, pp. 60, 71, and 139, though Tendulkar underestimated the significance of Gandhi's Jewish connections. Those of Gandhi's pronouncements which have the largest bearing on the subject matter of this essay have been put together by E. S. Reddy, 'Gandhi, the Jews, and Palestine', at [http://www.gandhiserve.org/information/writings\\_online/articles/gandhi\\_jews\\_palestine.html](http://www.gandhiserve.org/information/writings_online/articles/gandhi_jews_palestine.html)

The Khilafat issue is one among several on which Gandhi is commonly thought to exhibit vulnerability. His autobiography, available in a few dozens editions, ought to be the first source for his views: see espe-

cially Part V, Ch. 36. For an assessment of one national pastime in India, see Vinay Lal, 'The Gandhi Everyone Loves to Hate', *Economic and Political Weekly* (4 October 2008), pp.55-64.

There is a growing literature on Gandhi's views on Palestine, Arabs, and the Jews. The most useful works include Gideon Shimoni, *Gandhi, Satyagraha and the Jews: A Formative Factor in India's Policy Towards Israel* (Jerusalem: The Hebrew University, 1977), and Simone Panter-Brick, *Gandhi and the Middle East: Jews, Arabs and Imperial Interests* (London: I. B. Tauris, 2008). There are shorter articles of much interest, such as Yunan Labib Rizk, 'Gandhi in Egypt', *Al Ahram Weekly*, 716 (19-25 December 2002).

Martin Buber's letter to Gandhi of 1939 is widely available. It has been published in Martin Buber, *Pointing the Way: Collected Essays*, ed. and trans. Maurice Friedman (New York: Harper & Row, 1957), pp.139-47; as well as *The Letters of Martin Buber: A Life of Dialogue*, eds. Nahum N. Glatzer and Paul Mendes-Flohr, trans. Richard & Clara Winston and Harry Zohn (New York: Schocken Books, 1991), pp. 476-86. The former volume also contains Buber's essay from 1930, 'Gandhi, Politics and Us'. The Jewish Virtual Library [www.jewishvirtuallibrary.org] carries the entire text of Buber's letter, as well as the essays of his other Jewish interlocutors, Hayim Greenberg and Judah L. Magnes; the same texts are available at www.gandhiserve.org. Maurice Friedman, *Martin Buber's Life and Work*, one-volume edition (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1988), may be consulted profitably. Arthur Hertzberg, ed., *The Zionist Idea: A Historical Analysis and Reader* (New York: Atheneum, 1976), is still quite useful.

Nathan Katz, *Who are the Jews of India?* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2000), is among the leading scholars of Jewish Indian history; his views echo those of Joan G. Roland. Hanna Krall, *Shielding the Flame: An Intimate Conversation with Dr Marek Edelman, the Last Surviving Leader of the Warsaw Ghetto Uprising*, trans. Joanna Stasinska and Lawrence Weschler (New York: Henry Holt & Co., 1986), is enthral-

ling. A brief estimate of Edelman is to be found in Paul Foot, 'Palestine's Partisans', *Guardian* (21 August 2002), and the text of his letter to Palestinian commanders is at: <http://1humanity.blogspot.com/2009/10/marek-edelmans-legacy-israels-most.html> (accessed 30 August 2011).

### Muslim Dogs by Barnaby Rogerson

For more on Muslim dogs see *The Superiority of Dogs over many of Those who wear Clothes* by Ibn al-Marzuban, translated and edited by G.R. Smith and M.A.S. Abdel Haleem (Aris & Phillips, London, 1978); and Javad Nurbakhsh, *Dogs From a Sufi Point of View* (Khaniqahi-Minatullahi publications, 1978).

### The Writing on the Wall by Boyd Tonkin

Books mentioned in this essay include Elias Khoury, *Gate of the Sun* (Vintage, 2006); Marvine Howe, *Al-Andalus Rediscovered* (Hurst, London, 2012); and Radwa Ashour, *Granada* (Syracuse University Press, 2003). There are several editions of Washington Irving's *Tales of the Alhambra* and *El Divan del Tamarit* by Federico Garcia Lorca; for an English version see *The Tamarit Poems: A Version of Divan Del Tamarit*, translated by Michael Smith (Dedalus, Dublin, 2002)

Abu al-Baqa al-Rundi's 'Lament for the Fall of Seville' can be found here: <http://www.muslimphilosophy.com/ip/abubaqa.htm>. Other Andalusian poets, including ibn Zamrak and ibn Jakh of Badajoz, can be found in Cola Franzen, *Poems of Arab Andalusia* (City Lights Book, San Francisco, 1989). For more on Sheikh Abdelqadir as-Sufi, particularly his early life in London and Norwich, see Ziauddin Sardar, *Desperately Seeking Paradise* (Granta, London, 2004).