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Abstract

Mahatma Gandhi (1869-1948) was favourably impressed by the political movement in Egypt in the early years of the twentieth century while he was still in South Africa. He was particularly impressed by Egypt’s nationalist leader Mustafa Kamil Pasha whose death occurred more than a hundred years ago in February 1908 in Cairo. Many aspects of the policy adopted by Mustafa Kamil Pasha’s Nationalist Party were appreciated by Gandhi at a time when he was contemplating civil resistance against the South African regimes. In subsequent years, Gandhi would remain a keen observer of Egyptian political developments; just as he admired Zaghloul Pasha, the great leader of the Wafd Party. Egyptian leaders too would take inspiration from Gandhi. Some of the specificities of the Egyptian movement which influenced Gandhi are explored in this lecture. An attempt is made also to examine the interface or symbiosis between Gandhi and Egypt. This has some contemporary resonance in the winds of change now sweeping across the North African region.

The Suez Canal was opened in 1869, the year of Gandhi’s birth. Thus it was from the north-eastern ports of Egypt that Gandhi had his first acquaintance with the African continent. The young man had sailed from India in September 1888 and turned nineteen during the voyage. He reached
London shortly before the end of October and joined the Inner Temple; he would be called to the Bar three years later. He started work on a Guide to London, meant for the benefit of future Indian students. When this work was completed is not known for certain but from its completed form one can glean that on the sea voyage to Europe through the Suez route one had to be ready for colder weather after Port Said. Though Egypt was then legally speaking part of the Ottoman Empire, it had been under Anglo-French influence since 1879 and under British occupation since 1882, that is, some six years before Gandhi’s ship docked at its ports.  

From at least January 1904 Gandhi had been considering the possibility of jail-going in protest against repressive legislation in South Africa against Asians.\(^{(2)}\) More than two years later a resolution was passed giving notice of this prospect at a mammoth meeting of Indians in Johannesburg on September 11, 1906. \(^{(3)}\) Already moving along the path of peaceful protest, one African impetus that Gandhi received along his way was surely Egypt. The movement for Home Rule in Egypt was gathering strength in 1907 and the movement clearly impressed him. Given the legal framework within which British Indians had to operate within South Africa, it was not yet possible for Gandhi either to disown the British Empire or to do without the, albeit, verbal support that the Government of British India could be called upon to provide to British Indians working in territories abroad. Even so, Gandhi’s comment on the Egyptian movement was as succinct as it was portentous, providing another early indication of the way his mind was working:

“Messages in the papers indicate that an agitation for Home Rule is going on in Egypt. Large meetings are being held and resolutions passed by the Egyptians in order to gain political power by driving out Lord Cromer.\(^{(4)}\) Writing strongly on the subject, the London Times says that the movement should be suppressed. We do not believe it likely that it can be stopped thus. There are some brave persons among the Egyptians; and education is widespread. If the movement continues long enough, we believe that the British will grant self-government to the Egyptians. In keeping with British traditions it has first to be shown that people who make demands are prepared to die for them. It is not enough to go on making verbal demands. The British follow this rule in their own country and that is how they endure.” \([\text{Indian Opinion, March 9, 1907, The Collected Works of Mahatma Gandhi, (CW), Vol 6, Publications Division, Ministry of Information and Broadcasting, Government of India, New Delhi, 1958-1994, pp. 359-360}]\)

Although Gandhi did not actually repudiate the Empire until after his return to India, he was already speaking of freedom. In the following month, on the occasion of the Colonial Conference he made a comparison between India and the “Colonies”, pointing out that while the bulk of Indian revenues were appropriated by Britain, in the “Colonies”, (that is countries colonised by white settlers) it was the reverse: Britain provided the capital and “the profit was consumed by the Colonies”. \([\text{Indian Opinion, April 27, 1907, CW, Vol 6, p. 437}]\). In an article written in Gujarati he set forth the reason...
for this difference and the lesson it contained for India: “They can stand up to England. If we become as strong as they, we too shall get justice…. But speaking does not mean mere shouting. It must be accompanied by kicking. The way we can kick in South Africa or in India is to go to gaol. If we do not help in the oppression that is being perpetrated on us, we shall be free. It is only when the axe is fitted with a wooden handle that it can cut wood.” (Idem). Here Gandhi had set out not only the course of action that would be initiated in South Africa in the months and years to come but also the basis of the policy of non-violent non-co-operation that he would later adopt in India in the struggle for Indian freedom.

During his first incarceration in South Africa, Gandhi was kept in a Johannesburg prison and released at the end of January 1908. Pre-occupied though he was, especially since September 1906, with the struggle in the Transvaal, Gandhi’s interest in developments elsewhere did not flag. When Egypt’s leader Mustafa Kamil Pasha (1874-1908) died in February 1908 in Cairo, Gandhi paid high tributes, carried in four successive issues of his journal. (Indian Opinion, March 28, April 4, April 11, April 18, 1908, CW, Vol 8, pp. 166-167, pp. 174-176 pp 187-188, and p. 199). Mustafa Kamil was in fact five years younger than Gandhi and only 34 at the time of his death. In his tribute to Mustafa Kamil, published on March 28, Gandhi noted that the thoughtful leader had made “a number of speeches to the people of Cairo and Alexandria between 1895 and 1907” and that people belonging to “all classes of society, from prince to pauper, thronged to hear him speak”. (CW, Vol. 8, 167) “Whenever any section of society had a grievance against the [British] Government, they would besiege the offices of Luwa (Mustafa Kamal Pasha’s paper) and clamour for his intervention or guidance”. (Idem) In the tribute published on April 4, Gandhi referred to various works by Kamil Pasha and noted also that he had started two journals, (Al) Luwa, mentioned above, and, before that, Al Madrasa, “famous for its trenchant and original writing”. (CW, Vol 8, p.175) “Mustafa Kamal Pasha’s efforts”, Gandhi wrote, “were addressed to the task of stemming the tide of blind contempt for Egyptians, which had risen in the wake of British rule”. (Idem) Gandhi noticed that Kamil Pasha’s “writings and speeches appear to be inspired by the principles of the great Italian patriot, Mazzini”.(Idem) According to Gandhi, Kamil Pasha believed that “Turkey would not stand in the way of Egypt’s independence”.(Idem) Quite evidently, Kamil Pasha believed that his real adversaries were the British. Gandhi observed: “He was a fearless man and would not give up his campaign. The occupation of the Sudan by the British and other similar events dealt a cruel blow to [the hopes of] Egyptian independence. But the Pasha remained undaunted” (Idem). In the third article, published in the following week, on April 11, Gandhi recorded graphically the public grief in Egypt on Kamil Pasha’s demise; he referred also to the moving funeral, reproducing some of the verses from the funeral dirge composed by Ismail Pasha Sabri, then Head of the Department of Justice. (CW, Vol 8, pp. 187-188) And in the article published on April 18, Gandhi noted that the object of the Nationalist Party (Al Hizb al Watani) founded by Mustafa Kamil was “to see that the administration was entrusted to the people’s representatives, who would be responsible to a sovereign parliament constituted on the European model; also, Egypt should enjoy complete freedom (from
British control) in its internal administration. (CW, Vol 8, p.199) Gandhi added significantly: “The British Government cannot stop the Nationalist Party because the party is wise enough not to encourage acts of violence.” (Idem) This was a precept that Gandhi could never have forgotten. A few months later, Gandhi’s paper carried in Gujarati “a spirited address”, occupying several pages, that the Pasha had delivered in Alexandria on October 22, 1907. (Indian Opinion, June 27, July 4 and July 11, 1908) The speech was a passionate cry for Egyptian freedom and for the establishment of an Egyptian Parliament. Kamil Pasha was in effect telling the British to “Quit Egypt”. It was a call also for people to educate themselves and to use their knowledge for the benefit of those less fortunate than themselves. Kamil Pasha made repeated references to the 1906 incident involving British repression at Denshawai, Egypt, just as Gandhi would in later years in India refer repeatedly to the Jallianwala Bagh Massacre of 1919. Would the British like their own country taken over by a foreign power? Kamil Pasha wanted to know, referring also, in terms that would be most familiar to Indians, to the economic and financial drain of wealth from Egypt, and the condition of the peasantry. The charter of demands put forward by him is meaningful even a century later though seeking freedom and some reformatory measures at the same time: Freedom and Democracy, Parliament, Relief on Debts, Freedom to criticise the Government, Education, especially for the poor, including night classes for workers. Urban renewal, Security of life and property, Freedom to maintain relations with other countries.... He refuted allegations that any section of people would not be treated as Egyptians. All those who reside in the country would be treated as Egyptians. But he wanted to impart religious education, if only to teach his compatriots to live in harmony with others. Kamil Pasha concluded his oration by asking his people to be ready to sacrifice their lives for their country.

George Bernard Shaw had set out an elaborate account of the “Denshawai Horror” in his “Preface for Politicians” (1906) to the play “John Bull’s Other Island” (1907). According to Shaw, in mid-June 1906 some English officers out on a pigeon-shoot got into a nasty scrap with villagers injuring some of them and inducing retaliatory thrashings. This infuriated the British authorities and ultimately resulted in four persons being hanged, two being sentenced for life, one for 15 years and six to 7 years, three for a year with “hard labor and fifty lashes” and five to 50 lashes. It is not clear whether Gandhi was familiar with this work by Shaw, but eighteen months after publishing Kamil Pasha’s speech, Gandhi referred appreciatively to G.K Chesterton’s protest against the Denshawai incident. In Chesterton’s words, when a “few harmless peasants at Denshawai had objected to the looting of their property; they were tortured and hanged.” (Indian Opinion, January 22, 1910, CW, Vol 10, p.134). In his article Gandhi, in words that may have contemporary Egyptian resonance, criticised the system “in which a few men capture power in the name of the people and abuse it. The people are deceived because it is under cover of their name that these men act.” (Ibid, p.135).

By now Gandhi saw clearly also the process of the emergence of a new South African nation and that Indians would ultimately need to prepare themselves to participate in that larger process. Referring to the indignities
and harsh treatment that some “Colonial-born” Indian passive resisters, including Joseph Royeppan, David Andrew and Samuel Joseph, had recently undergone and bravely withstood in Diepkloof prison in the Transvaal, Gandhi wrote: “We trust that the lead given by Mr Royeppan will infuse a new spirit into the colonial-born and other Indians who have their work cut out before them if they wish to take part in the making of the future South African nation.” (Indian Opinion, May 7, 1910 CW, Vol 10, p. 244) The same issue of the journal informed its readers that some publications of Gandhi’s press in South Africa, the International Printing Press, had, according to the Bombay Government Gazette of March 24, been “forfeited to His Majesty for the reason that they ‘contain matter declared to be seditious’” (CW, Vol 10, p. 245) These included Gandhi’s Hind Swarajya (Indian Home Rule), Mustafa Kamel Pasha’s Speech, being a Gujarati translation of a speech delivered shortly before the Egyptian leader’s death, and the “Gujarati rendering” (by Gandhi) of John Ruskin’s Unto This Last and Plato’s Defence of Socrates.

These were times when African intellectuals, like their Indian counterparts, were at pains to point to past or outstanding accomplishments of their respective peoples in a bid to assert their civilisational achievements. Gandhi’s Indian Opinion, in its issue of October 21, 1911 carried extracts from an article, “The Coloured Man in Art and Letters”, by Duse Mahomed, the famous author of “In the Land of the Pharoahs”. Duse Mahomed was an Egyptian of Sudanese origin, then living in London from where he brought out the African Times and Orient Review. In his article Duse Mahomed had referred to many authors of mixed blood, saying that “a race capable of producing a Poushkin, a Dumas, and a Dunbar in letters, and a Coleridge Taylor and a Marion Cook in music, can neither be lacking in high intellect and artistic temperament nor devoid of that dash of creative genius without which literature is debased to the level of nonsensical drivel and music degraded to a flaccid medley of conventional sounds”. As Indian Opinion noted of the various personalities mentioned, all had African blood in them. Paul Laurence Dunbar (1872-1906), the famous African-American author, “was of pure African lineage” while the others were of mixed blood. According to information culled from Duse Mahomed, Alexander Dumas was said to have “descended from an African grandmother in Haiti”, Alexander Pushkin “had an Ethiopian grandmother”, Samuel Coleridge-Taylor (1875-1912) was “the son of a West African doctor”, and Will Marion Cook (1869-1944) had “both maternal and paternal African forbears”. It was significant that these materials from an intrepid Egyptian author appeared in Gandhi’s Indian Opinion at a time when racism was on the rise in South Africa and elsewhere.

II

Gandhi left South Africa in July 1914, reaching England in the first week of August just as the World War began. It was on December 18, 1914 that Egypt was unilaterally declared a British Protectorate. On the following day Gandhi would sail for India. It was clear now that Britain intended to strengthen its hold over Egypt. In the course of the struggles which lay ahead after his return to India in January 1915, Gandhi would make references every now and then which suggested various African sources of inspiration and
empathy toward African aspirations. One of his pre-occupations in April 1916 was to seek the release from internment of Mohamed Ali and Shaukat Ali, the two famous brothers who had been held in May 1915 for publishing in their journal an article entitled “Choice of the Turks” which had, inter alia, demanded the British evacuation of Egypt. [Letter to Mohamed Ali, April 14, 1916, CW, Vol 91 (Supplementary Volume 1) pp. 106-107] Mohamed Ali would later, in 1923, be President of the Indian National Congress. In a speech on November 3, 1917 at the Gujarat Political Conference in Godhra, Gandhi publicly repeated his appeal to the Government on behalf of Mohamed Ali and Shaukat Ali (CW, Vol 14, p. 51).

In March 1919 Gandhi called for a protest against the Rowlatt legislation sought to be introduced by the colonial regime in India. The legislation which envisaged arbitrary detention, and trials without effective legal assistance, cutting off pleadings and appeals, was a serious assault on democratic rights. Among the various activities chosen as part of the protest, a country-wide hartal or strike was held on April 6; a further programme was envisaged including, in Gandhi’s words, that “laws regarding prohibited literature and registration of newspapers may be civilly disobeyed”. (The Bombay Chronicle, April 8, 1919, CW, Vol 15, p. 192). Of the four prohibited works chosen for dissemination by the Gandhi-led committee organising the protest, three were Gandhi’s own and the fourth was The Life and Address of Mustafa Kamal Pasha, which had been printed in Gandhi’s press in South Africa. (Idem) As we saw from his writings in South Africa, Gandhi had much admiration for the Egyptian leader to whom he had paid high tribute upon his death in February 1908. (Indian Opinion, March 28, April 4, April 11, April 18, 1908, CW, Vol 8, pp. 166-167, pp. 174-176 pp 187-188, and p. 199).

British administrators in India seriously mulled in April 1919 the possibility of deporting Gandhi, along with some others, to Burma. But one of the considerations that made them hesitate was that in Egypt “recent doings show deportation might cause general conflagration”. Presumably the precedent they feared was the aftermath of the arrest of Zaghloul Pasha (1860-1927) in March 1919, and his subsequent deportation from Egypt to Malta: “Within a few days all Egypt had flared up in revolt”. That is, but for the experience of public protest in Egypt, British repression in India might have been harsher still!

Zaghloul and three of his colleagues were arrested in April 1919 and three of his colleagues were arrested on March 8, 1919. The arrest and the exile to Malta were a kind of riposte “for insisting that the Egyptian delegation (Wafid) to the Versailles Conference be recognised, so that it could demand that Egypt be accepted as an independent national state”. Students went on strike the day after the arrest and they were “followed by members of the Egyptian Bar” on March 11, 1919. The feeling had been growing in Egypt that Britain intended to introduce full-scale colonialism upon Egypt and scholars have also concluded “That Britain planned somehow to integrate Egypt fully into the imperial system was now becoming clear.” A peasant insurrection began in Egypt almost immediately at least partly because of a regime of starvation-threatening non-availability of food, high consumer prices and unfavourable procurement policies induced by British war impositions. Hundreds of peasants were imprisoned in Egypt by the middle of March.
Events in India had also been moving to a head. Since February 1919, Gandhi had been speaking of a civil resistance campaign (satyagraha) over the Rowlatt Bills and a Satyagraha Pledge was signed by Gandhi and others on February 24, 1919, indicating that the proposed legislation, if signed into law, along with other laws to be specified would be civilly disobeyed.\(^\text{[ CW, Vol 15, pp. 101-2.]}\) The decision to observe a hartal on April 6, 1919 was announced on March 23, 1919. \(^\text{[ CW, Vol 15, pp. 145-146]}\) The Egyptian flare-up had occurred in the interregnum between the taking of this pledge and the announcement of the hartal in India.

The hartal in India on April 6, 1919 had a high degree of success. It was clearly not possible for Britain simultaneously to take on large-scale protests in India and a rebellious Egypt. The events in the two countries appear to have led initially to different yet not unconnected carrot-and-stick variants in imperial policy. In Egypt, it was announced by the new British representative, Allenby, on April 7 that Zaghloul would now be released and be given permission to proceed elsewhere.\(^\text{21}\) In more distant India subsequent events, including the massacre at Jallianwala Bagh, Amritsar on April 13, 1919, indicated that the Indian protests of the preceding fortnight had had the effect of unnerving the colonial administration. This incident, in which even according to official figures nearly four hundred unarmed civilians were shot dead in an enclosed park, galvanised Indian nationalist opinion still further in the same way as Denshawai had done in Egypt thirteen years earlier.\(^\text{22}\)

The rebellion that occurred in Egypt from March 1919 was initially characterised by some violence.\(^\text{23}\) But this was soon quelled; there then followed a change in approach in the struggle.\(^\text{24}\) Later, in December 1919, the British Government sent the Milner Commission to Egypt “to inquire into and report on the future status of Egypt”.\(^\text{25}\) One of the reasons for the boycott by Egyptians of the Milner Commission in 1919-20 had been that it comprised only Britishers although it “proposed to recommend a Constitution for Egypt, a task for which the Egyptians considered themselves fully as capable and more concerned”.\(^\text{26}\) The boycott met with “remarkable success”.\(^\text{27}\) Zaghloul, who had earlier been released, was taken to London in May 1920 and then, upon his not agreeing to British terms, was left to return to exile again.

There is, as we shall see from Gandhi’s remarks a few weeks later, evidence that he was watching some of these events in Egypt and drawing appropriate lessons. Boycott of Councils had by now featured on the political agenda in India. \(^\text{[ Navajivan, July 18, 1920, CW, Vol 18, p. 56]}\) The movement for non-co-operation with the British regime was launched in India from August 1, 1920. \(^\text{[ CW, Vol 18, p. 104]}\) This involved, inter alia, withdrawal from government institutions and, of course, included boycott of councils. \(^\text{[ CW, Vol 18, pp. 149-151]}\) Writing in Young India on September 22, 1920, Gandhi refuted and described as erroneous an argument made in the London Times about the Milner mission to Egypt: “It audaciously says that Lord Milner’s mission listened to the Egyptians only when they were ready to lift the boycott of the Egyptian council.” \(^\text{[ Young India, September 22, 1920, CW, Vol 18, p. 270]}\)

Gandhi was scrutinising imperial policy and events in North Africa fairly closely. Noticing in his journal a work by Dr Syed Mahmud relating to
England’s policy on Turkey (The Khilafat and England, published earlier in the year), Gandhi touched also on past developments in North Africa, including Egypt and present-day Tunisia and Libya, pointing to British complicity in the French occupation of Tunis, the Anglo-French partnership “in the financial spoliation of Egypt”, and “the treacherous dealings of England regarding Egypt, Tripoli and the Balkan War ...”. (Young India, September 1, 1921, CW, Vol 21, pp. 34-35) His disenchantment with the British Empire, particularly after the 1919 events in India and their aftermath, was now across the board.

Zaghloul Pasha had returned to Egypt in April 1921 to a popular welcome. There had been disturbances in Alexandria in May 1921 and in Cairo later in the year. In December Zaghloul was arrested again. This time the British blamed him for “incitement to disturbance”. Some violent incidents had continued to take place in Egypt. However, irrespective of the evidence, the British establishment was apt to hold the Wafd responsible. Seeing how the colonial rulers were prepared to utilise any acts of violence to discredit national struggles, Gandhi was at pains to emphasise that a peaceful struggle would impart to the Indian movement even greater strength than that which characterised its counterparts in Ireland, Russia or Egypt. (Navajivan, May 22, 1921, CW, Vol 20, p. 68) Gandhi strove to hold the Indian movement to strict standards; he would take these to a logical conclusion after the “rude shock” he would presently receive in the form of a breakout of violence in eastern India. (Letter to Members of Working Committee, February 8, 1922, CW, Vol 22, p. 350) Wary of violence and how the administration was prone to take advantage of it, Gandhi had written a year earlier: “It is to be wished that non-co-operationists will clearly recognize that nothing can stop the onward march of the nation as violence.” (Young India, February 9, 1921, CW, Vol 19, p.338) About this time a journalist, interviewing Gandhi on February 5, 1922, asked: “What do you think of the suggestion made in the Chronicle that an alliance of understanding should be come to with the leaders of suffering subject nations like Egypt and Ireland to fight the imperialism of the Western nations by non-co-operation propaganda?” (The Bombay Chronicle, February 7, 1922, CW, Vol 22, p. 339) Gandhi, who empathised with Egyptian and Irish aspirations, said: “I would love to see such an alliance but that will come in its own time. It is my humble opinion that we are not getting sufficiently advanced in the direction to form a useful alliance. I do not believe in paper alliances. They will come naturally when we are ready.” (Idem)

When in the first week of February 1922 there were incidents of organised violence in Chauri Chaura in the eastern part of the then United Provinces (now Uttar Pradesh), leading to the killing of about a score policemen at the hands of those claiming to participate in the movement, Gandhi initiated the process for suspending civil disobedience. (Letter to Members of Working Committee, February 8, 1922, CW, Vol 22, pp. 350-351)

At the end of February 1922, the British Government made, unilaterally, a Declaration abolishing the Protectorate in Egypt and declaring that country, at least nominally, as an independent sovereign state while simultaneously claiming and asserting special powers and privileges for itself. The unilateral nature of the declaration was partly dictated by the fact that there was no agreement on the reserved points. In less than a fortnight after the
Declaration with respect to Egypt, Gandhi was arrested in India. By the time of Gandhi’s arrest, Zaghloul had been deported to the Seychelles Islands.

There were by now some significant interconnections in the popular sentiment across continents, including some striking ones between India, Egypt and faraway West Indies. On Gandhi’s arrest in March 1922, the leading Jamaican and African-American activist, Marcus Garvey pointed out in a speech that in Jamaica in the Caribbean, the colonial authorities had “called upon the West Indian regiments to go out to India – the black soldiers who have always fought for them in their wars of conquest – to fight the Indians, and they refused to go.” Garvey attributed the West Indian troops’ reported refusal to be utilised for suppression of the Indian movement to the propaganda which his own organization, the Universal Negro Improvement Association, had been carrying on. Interestingly, in his speech Garvey affirmed one of the arguments that Gandhi, for his part, had been making against the use of Indian troops in Egypt and Mesopotamia. One of the declarations made in a famous manifesto drafted by Gandhi in October 1921, and signed by him along with other Indian leaders, was: “We, the undersigned, state it as our opinion, that it is contrary to national dignity for any Indian to serve as a civilian, and more especially as a soldier, under a system of Government, which has brought about India’s economic, moral and political degradation and which has used the soldiery and the police for repressing national aspirations, as, for instance, at the time of the Rowlatt Act agitation, and which has used the soldiers for crushing the liberty of the Arabs, the Egyptians, the Turks and other nations who have done no harm to India.” (Young India, October 6, 1921, CW, Vol 21, p. 235) In a Press interview a couple of months before his arrest, Gandhi had declared that “when India had full swaraj she could certainly not permit a single Indian soldier to leave India in order to coerce the brave Egyptians into submission to a foreign yoke”. (The Bombay Chronicle, January 18, 1922, CW, Vol 22, p. 213)

The British regime in India may have believed or hoped that Gandhi and his movement had been crushed with his arrest on March 10, 1922. But the struggle and also the developments in Egypt had an international impact as indicating that the world was “on the move towards liberation”. Britain soon realised that it would be difficult to pacify Egypt while keeping its most popular leader under detention. Zaghloul, who had been transferred from the Seychelles to Gibraltar in 1922, was released in March 1923, and in September 1923 he returned home. Elections were held in Egypt in January 1924, and on January 27, Zaghloul, whose Wafd Party swept the polls, assumed office as Prime Minister. These gains substantially would be reversed before the year was out.

Meanwhile in India, on February 5, 1924, that is about a week after Zaghloul had assumed office in Egypt, Gandhi would be unconditionally released. Towards the end of 1924, Gandhi was chosen to be President of the Indian National Congress (INC) which was to meet at Belgaum in South India in December. By the time the INC session took place, things had changed once again in Egypt, particularly in the previous month. In his presidential address at Belgaum, Gandhi spoke also about the ongoing repression in Egypt: “Egypt fares no better than we do. A mad Egyptian kills a British officer – certainly a detestable crime. The punishment is not only a detestable
crime, but it is an outrage upon humanity. Egypt has nearly lost all it got. A whole nation has been mercilessly punished for the crime of one man. It may be that the murder had the sympathy of the Egyptians. Would that justify terrorism by a power well able to protect its interests without it?" (Young India, December 26, 1924, CW, Vol 25, p 488) The remarks, reminiscent of Gandhi's criticism of the repression in that country in 1910, were a reference to the assassination in November 1924 of Major-General Oliver (Lee) Stack, Commander-General of the Egyptian Army and Governor General of Sudan. In the aftermath of the murder, British authorities undid many recent political advances in Egypt. Allenby, the British representative, escorted by a British Cavalry Regiment with "spears and swords raised", called on Prime Minister Zaghloul Pasha; impliedly holding the Egyptian government responsible for the assassination. Allenby departed after presenting Zaghloul with an ultimatum demanding, inter alia, an apology, an indemnity of 500,000 pounds to be paid by the following day, and the evacuation of Egyptian troops from Sudan which had been under the legal frame of a joint Anglo-Egyptian arrangement. Egyptian troops and officers were expelled from Sudan under Allenby's instructions to the Sudanese government, perhaps scotching forever any prospect of realization of the nationalist aspiration of unity of the Nile Valley. The British ultimatum virtually forced the resignation of Zaghloul Pasha who, as we have seen, had in January 1924 become the first Prime Minister of Egypt after the victory of his party in the parliamentary elections held under the new dispensation. Parliament was now dissolved and the arbitrary powers of King Fouad were also revived following the assassination. Indiscriminate arrests were made, including by British military authorities; Zaghloul's Wafd Party, which denied any connection with the assassination, was particularly targeted and its activities restricted. In the following year Allenby would be recalled from Egypt and one of the reasons for his recall is understood to have been the widespread resentment felt at the manner in which the British authorities had exploited the incident. Zaghloul is reported to have remarked of the assassination: "The bullets that were fired were not targeted at the chest of Sir Lee Stack; they were targeted at mine." This Egyptian experience, which Gandhi had followed closely enough to make a pointed reference to it in his Presidential address at Belgaum, could only have confirmed him in his disapproval of assassination as a means of accomplishing ostensible political objectives.

In 1928 the Simon Commission visited India "for the purpose of inquiring into the working of the system of Government"; but Indians were not represented on the panel. Gandhi had supported the boycott of the Simon Commission, saying in an appeal to the people of Bombay, where the Commission first landed: "I hope the boycott will pass peacefully and show the nation's strength of purpose." (The Bombay Chronicle, February 3, 1928, CW, Vol 36, p. 8) The boycott met with a very high degree of success. It will be recalled that nearly a decade earlier a similar Commission had been sent by the British Government to Egypt and Egyptians had not been represented on it. The Milner Commission was successfully boycotted by Egyptians. We have noted Gandhi's remarks with reference to the Milner Commission in 1920. It is quite possible that familiarity with this Egyptian experience spurred the Indian boycott of the Simon Commission, when it visited India for a similar
purpose. Indian youth spearheaded the boycott. Writing in another context a few months later, Gandhi reminded students that "...it is the students in Egypt who are in the forefront in Egypt’s struggle for real independence". (Young India, July 12, 1928, CW, Vol 37, p. 47) He expected Indian students “to do no less”. (Iadem) But there was no escape from hard preparatory work. In the following year, on the eve of Zaghloul’s second death anniversary, Gandhi cautioned a correspondent: “You do not seem to have understood the life of Zaghloul and Lenin. Both of them worked very hard at first and only then were they able to achieve what they did.” [Letter to Rudranath, August 21/22, 1929, CW, Vol 92, (Supplementary Vol II), p. 64]

III

The commencement of civil disobedience in India and Gandhi’s arrest in May 1930 were reported at length in the Egyptian Press which saw similarities between the Indian and Egyptian situations.36 In India there was some public discussion also about minority rights in relation to the Egyptian experience and Zaghlul Pasha’s offer to the Copts. (CW, Vol 46, pp. 61-62) Released from prison in January 1931, Gandhi left for Europe at the end of August to attend the Round Table Conference in London to discuss India’s constitutional future. On its way, Gandhi’s ship went through the ports of north-eastern Africa in September. Already espousing Indian independence, Gandhi had responded to a query from a correspondent a few months earlier to say: “Of course I wish the Egyptians full independence and all the prosperity that their ancient and fertile land deserves”. (Letter to Abdur Razzaq Malihabadi, May 8, 1931, CW, Vol 46, p. 121) Warm messages of greetings were exchanged between Gandhi and Mustafa Nahas Pasha (1879-1965), former Egyptian Prime Minister and the President of the Wafd party of Egypt37, Mohamed Mahmoud Pasha (1877-1941), leader of the Constitutional Liberal Party of Egypt, who had also served as Prime Minister, Satia Zaghloul Pasha (widow of Zaghloul Pasha38, the pre-eminent leader of the Wafd) and Cherifa Riaz Pasha (President of Women’s Saadist Committee).[CW, Vol 47, pp 400-401 and p. 403]. Referring to Gandhi, on “happy occasion crossing Egyptian waters”, Madame Zaghloul wished success to the “Indian cause”39. The way Gandhi and the Egyptian leaders greeted one another on this and successive occasions is reflected feelings of deep mutual regard. It is instructive to consider closely the exchanges that took place.

Nahas Pasha invited Gandhi to visit Egypt on his return journey. In his message of September 6, 1931, Nahas Pasha said: “In the name of Egypt who is now fighting for its liberties and its independence I welcome in you the foremost leader of that India who is also struggling to attain the same end and I convey to you my hearty wishes for a safe journey and a happy return. I also ask God to grant to you success in your quest, a success equal to the greatness of your determination. I hope to have the pleasure of meeting you on your homeward journey and trust that the land of the Pharoahs will then be favoured by your visit thus enabling the Wafd and the Egyptian nation at large to express to you whatever be the result of your journey both their appreciation of your noble achievements to promote the welfare of
your country and their reverence for the greatness of the sacrifice made by you in support of your principles. May God prolong your life and crown your endeavours with a victory far-reaching and abiding. Our representatives both at Suez and at Port Said will have the honour of conveying to you by word of mouth our welcome and our best wishes." (reproduced in CW, Vol 47, p. 400n)

Going beyond ordinary courtesy, the Egyptians were making an earnest attempt at reaching out to Gandhi and the Indian movement for freedom. To Nahas Pasha Gandhi wired to “sincerely thank” him and “to reciprocate the kind wishes”, adding that he would “be delighted to visit your great country if it is at all possible.” (Ibid., p 400) And similarly to Mohamed Mahmoud Pasha, saying that he would “love (to) visit your great country if possible on return”. (Idem) Gandhi replied to Madame Zaghloul Pasha, known as the “Mother of the Egyptians”, conveying to her his “respectful thanks” for her “kind affectionate message”. (Ibid., p. 401). In a speech addressed to Indians living in Egypt, Gandhi hoped that they were “so conducting themselves as to be of service to the country where they are earning their livelihood”. (Idem)

According to Yunan Labib Rizk, the late Egyptian historian, the Egyptians had organised an elaborate welcome for what was “tantamount to a state visit”: a delegation headed by the former parliamentary representative from Suez had been in place to greet Gandhi upon his arrival in Suez. In Port Said the Egyptian reception committee brought gifts, including a vessel of honey with a Quranic verse inscribed on it, “a large, grey camel-wool shawl ‘to protect the Indian leader from cold during his stay in the British capital’”, 20 litres of goat milk, and Egyptian dates, including a package of “the famous Egyptian red dates, known as zaghlul, ‘because of the significance of the name’”.

These were characteristic Eastern gestures of hospitality and affection. In a letter written on September 7 to Jawaharlal Nehru (1889-1964) who had stayed back in India, Gandhi remarked on the affectionate nature of the Egyptian messages (CW, Vol 47, p. 402). To the nationalists of Egypt, Gandhi said in a statement given to Al Ahram as his ship set sail toward the historic Alexandria: “Like us you are an ancient people. I hope you will not slavishly copy all that is Western. If I have understood the events of your country correctly real freedom for Egypt has still to come....” (September 6, 1931, CW, Vol 47, p. 397). Approaching Alexandria, Gandhi could not have forgotten also the famous speech that Mustafa Kamil Pasha had delivered in that city on October 22, 1907 which Gandhi had much admired and virtually reproduced – several pages in length – in his journal in South Africa in June and July 1908. From Alexandria, which he passed sometime between September 7 and 11, 1931, Gandhi wired Cherifa Riaz Pasha, President of the Women’s Saadist Committee to thank her for her good wishes. (Ibid., p. 403).

Gandhi’s passage seems to have caught something in the popular imagination in northern Africa, with the renowned Egyptian poet, Ahmad Showquie (1868-1932), composing a long poem of forty verses to mark the event. The poet had emerged as a major spokesman of Egyptian nationalism in the 1920s. Gandhi’s secretary, Mahadev Desai, records of this voyage through the North East African ports: “A number of Egyptian press correspondents saw Gandhiji on board the ship and a representative of Nahas Pasha met Gandhiji both at Suez and Port Said. A deputation of Indian
merchants in Cairo, mostly Sindhis, waited on Gandhiji both at Suez and Port Said, and gave him an address of welcome and pressed him to pay a visit to Cairo on the return journey." In a meaningful recollection which resonates with accounts that C F Andrews has left of colonial intent in East Africa, Desai continues: "I learnt definitely at Port Said that though no exception had been taken to this Indian deputation waiting on Gandhiji, the authorities were against granting permission to Egyptian deputations and it was with great difficulty that a single representative of Nahas Pasha could get the permission." Desai drew parallels between the way the Press was treated in India and in Egypt, quoting the Egyptians as saying: "The police are posted at our presses, the first proof copy has to be shown to them and they suppress the issue if they think it contains objectionable matter".

Desai recorded: "In spite of the strong press censorship, I may say that no less than twelve Egyptian papers -- three of them with a daily circulation of 40 to 50 thousand -- had special articles on Gandhiji, two issued special numbers, and all reproduced the telegrams and marconigrams sent to Gandhiji by Nahas Pasha, Madam Zagloul Pasha, Mahomed Mahmud Pasha and others." He concluded: "No wonder. Egypt is as impatient of the British yoke as we are, and wants Gandhiji to visit Egypt on his return.... The talks after the evening prayer have all been about non-violence, and the Egyptian friends who boarded the ship at Suez had an opportunity of listening to one such discourse." Al Ahram had "despatched its most important correspondent to Port Said" and Mahmoud Abul-Fath's interview with Gandhi "took up the entire front page" of the Al-Ahram edition of September 7 with the 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."

Abul-Fath has left a detailed account of his interview which he regarded as one of the most memorable hours of his life; other Egyptian papers which enthusiastically welcomed Gandhi included Misr, Al–Siyasa, Kawkab Al-Sharq, Al Balagh, and Al Diaa. Gandhi had a special resonance with the Egyptian press.

With Gandhi committed to Indian independence, and to full Egyptian independence, his commitment to all of Africa could also be no less. While in London, Gandhi was asked on October 31, 1931: "For some years Britain would continue certain subject territories like Gold Coast. Would Mr Gandhi object?". "I would certainly object", was Gandhi's reply (CW, Vol 48, p. 255). He continued: "India would certainly aspire after influencing British policy.... I do not want India to be an engine of oppression". (Idem) He spoke on this occasion about the exploitation of Zulus and Swazis, which he described as "radically wrong" (Idem).

Leaving England on December 5, 1931, Gandhi passed through France. Reaching Paris the same day, he addressed meetings and rested the night there before moving on to spend a few days in Switzerland and Italy. While in Paris, Gandhi spoke at some largely-attended meetings and also gave some press interviews. It would have been natural for the representatives of the French colonies living in Paris to be curious about what Gandhi had to say. We have at least one confirmation of the presence of North African and other such representatives at the meeting that Gandhi addressed at Magic
Soon he expected to be in North Africa, in Egypt if not in the directly Francophone areas. British authorities were already wary of Gandhi’s influence in Africa. More immediately too, there had been some, perhaps not unconnected, developments elsewhere in the neighbourhood of Egypt. British intelligence in Sudan reported: “There is no doubt that especially the younger element of the intelligentsia have a great admiration and sympathy for Gandhi, and that when the movement in India was at its height, they followed the news with keen interest. In private assemblies they discussed the efficiency of the boycott weapon and agreed that Gandhi had discovered in it the only weapon which the...East could employ effectively against imperialism. The influence of Gandhi and Indian politics can be unmistakeably seen in the Gordon College strike (of 1931) and attempted boycott of sugar by pupils”. Gandhi’s writings had a certain popularity in Sudan.

After attending to his remaining programme in Switzerland and Italy, Gandhi prepared to leave Europe for his onward journey home via Egypt. Embarking from the south-eastern Italian port of Brindisi on the sea voyage as a deck passenger, he noted that the “deck is no good, hence there will be inconvenience”. (Diary, 1931, December 14, CW, Vol 48, p. 466) The ship passed through Port Said and Suez. As we have seen, he had been invited by Mustafa Nahas Pasha and Mohamed Mahmoud Pasha, among others, to visit Egypt and had indicated that he would try to do so. (CW, Vol 47, p 400) Plans for the visit had to be dropped when the captain of the steamer notified that it was not to halt at Suez, where Gandhi would have had to re-board it had he disembarked at Port Said. In the event, the ship did halt at Suez. Earlier, Gandhi had reached Port Said at 11 in the morning on December 17 and, according to a Reuter report, was met by “several deputations, including one of the Wafdist”. (CW, Vol 48, p. 427) Mahmoud Fahmi El-Nuqrashi of the Wafd was to escort Gandhi to Cairo where elaborate functions were scheduled, including visits to Zaghoul Pasha’s mausoleum and the Pyramids at Giza and a tea party in Gandhi’s honour to be hosted by Nahas Pasha. Gandhi made a cryptic note on December 17: “Sindhis and Egyptians came to fetch me but as there was to be no halt at Suez, I could not go”. (Diary, 1931, CW, Vol 48, p. 467) On the next day, Gandhi’s ship sailed in the morning after the stopover at Suez and he recorded in his diary: “Left Suez at 5.30, Justice Holland, Lalkaka and others met me.” (Idem) The disinformation earlier given to Gandhi about the itinerary was seen as a colonial ruse, and one scholar would write that Gandhi “was prevented by a trick from visiting Egypt”. Dr Edmond Privat, a Swiss national then teaching at a Swiss university, and his wife Yvonne Privat, had been persuaded by Gandhi to accompany him to India on the ship from Brindisi. Privat, who had during the First World War advocated the cause of Polish independence, described what happened at the Egyptian port: “There are big crowds on the piers of Port Said and a big delegation invades the ship. But the police surround the boat, prevent the journey to Cairo and put a stop to the grand reception arranged over there”. The Egyptian historian sums up: “The Indian leader had no choice but to remain on board and deliver another message to the Egyptian people. He prayed for their success in realising full independence, towards which end
he urged that they would give careful study to the Indian cause in light of their own recent experiences. He also stressed that Egyptian women were an instrumental force in the struggle for independence and conveyed to women’s rights activist Ceza Nabrawi, who had accompanied the Wafd delegation to Port Said, his hope that the role of Egyptian women would become more prominent. Ceza Nabrawi and Huda Sha’rawi were the two prominent feminists of their time; Nabrawi had, along with Sha’rawi, made a gesture in 1923 of publically removing her veil.

In India, the redoubtable Abadi Bano Begum (1852-1924), popularly known as Bi Amman, had set a similar example some years earlier; Gandhi had also been suggesting the discarding of the purdah. (See, for example, Letter to Abbas Tyabji, June 21, 1927, CW, Vol 34, p. 35, where Gandhi suggests that Abbas Tyabji’s daughter Sohaila, settled in Lucknow after marriage, ought to help “by the sheer force of exemplary character” in the discarding of the purdah “in Lucknow and the neighbourhood.”)

As the ship entered the Suez Canal, Edmond Privat and Gandhi discussed the struggles ahead. Based on this conversation, Dr Privat has provided us with some extraordinary and thought-provoking insights into Gandhi’s mind and the vital place Africa occupied in his thoughts even as regards the future course for India. On relations between India and Britain, Dr Privat noted: “It is Gandhi’s dream to have a voluntary association between the two. If he still holds on to the link with Britain, as amongst equals, it is to save the coloured races. Canada dominates the English attitude towards America. Gandhi desires that India should similarly have her say in favour of the oppressed Africans. The liberation of his own country is only the first stage for him. He wishes them to use that power to deliver the others and to add... its moral conscience to the practical genius of the English. A united India would be able to put pressure like Canada under threat of separation. Imperialism and colonialism would have a decided enemy. For India, such an ambition demands a humane conduct. It has to win its cause by irreproachable methods and has to cure herself of her own faults.”

Repression was to mount presently. On returning to India in the last week of December 1931, Gandhi was again arrested in the first week of January 1932. As in many of his earlier imprisonments, Gandhi kept himself busy and, among other things, set himself to read; the books he had read by early February included Rothstein’s work Egypt’s Ruin. (Letter to Narandas Gandhi, February 3/8, 1932, CW, Vol 49, p. 77) Africa spoke to Gandhi in prison, through Egypt. Messages of sympathy carrying greetings from the Egyptian people came from Safia Zaghloul Pasha and Mustafa Nahas Pasha at the time of Gandhi’s fast in prison in September 1932. The fast had been undertaken, as Gandhi reiterated in a Press interview on September 20, 1932, “only against separate electorates, and not against statutory reservation of seats”, for the Depressed Classes; the fast was also intended to quicken the conscience of ‘caste Hindus’ so as to bring about a change in their attitude and also, similarly, of the British and to create an atmosphere in favour of eradicating untouchability. (CW, Vol 51, p. 117 et seq.) Gandhi wired back his thanks to Madame Zaghloul Pasha for a “loving inspiring message” (September 24, 1932, CW, Vol 51, p. 133). To Mustafa Nahas Pasha, Gandhi telegraphed, “deeply touched”, adding the hope that his fast might
“touch all faiths” and “bring them and us together in a living bond”; he referred to the “Egyptian blanket presented to me during last voyage” which “covers me during this struggle...”. (September 26, 1932, CW, Vol 51, p.142).

The warmth underlying the Egyptian messages had definitely inspired and touched Gandhi as they showed a deep interest in Indian events reflecting empathy with him in particular and a very sympathetic understanding of his point of view. Nahas Pasha had cabled on September 24: “Your resolve to sacrifice your own life, rather than tolerate any measure promoting disunion or caste prejudices amongst Indians has deeply stirred the heart of Egypt, which has, since the last decade, been linked with India by the holy bond of suffering for the same ideal of national self-expression and liberty. Egyptians of all sects and religions, united in love of the Fatherland, are confident that the great Indian people will unite in preserving Mahatma’s life by redeeming their sacred unity. All struggling nations of the East look up to India for fulfilling the noble ideal for which Gandhiji is giving up his life. In the name of Egypt and her people, I send you and the Indian people our brotherly love and heartfelt wishes for realization of ideals of truth, freedom and equality as embodied in the great example you are setting before the world.” (Reproduced in CW, Vol 51, pp 142n-143n)

Madame Zaghloul in her message, cabled a day earlier, had said: “Egyptian people, men and women, who have been following with brotherly sympathy heroic struggle India and her great chief Mahatma Gandhi for liberty are now watching with beating hearts Mahatma’s sublime act of self-sacrifice for sake of India’s unity and freedom. As one who had shared with my late husband joy of working for and obtaining sacred unity of Egyptian Christians, Mahomedans, Copts and also other communities of whatever religion or denomination, may I express my sincere hope that India’s people inspired by Gandhi’s sublime act of self-abrogation would unite in one great mass of brothers and patriots to save India’s liberation and save life of her great son whose life and work are patrimony of East and humanity at large.” (Reproduced in CW, Vol 51, p. 133n)

On this occasion Gandhi would remain in prison till the following May. He would then be re-arrested in August 1933 for a short spell. A year later, as he began to prioritise activities of social reconstruction, Gandhi announced his retirement from the Indian National Congress even though he would in the coming years continue to provide a guiding hand to the organisation.

IV

As things progressed in India towards the establishment of provincial legislatures under the Government of India Act, 1935, the Ethiopian crisis began to loom large in Africa. Under pressure of events, mainly the Italian invasion of Abyssinia, an Anglo-Egyptian Treaty was entered into in August 1936. In the backdrop of the invasion England wished particularly to avoid having an unfriendly Egypt; likewise Egyptian leaders now saw advantage in the possibility of friendship with England and agreed, inter alia, to “the status quo in the Sudan and England’s right to defend the Suez Canal” with England withdrawing troops from Cairo and Alexandria. In India too, in the late 1930s there was a brief interlude when regimes led mainly by the Congress but also by certain other parties came to power in the Provinces.
During the first quarter of 1937, when Gandhi received several African-American visitors, he was sought out also by delegations from North Africa. An Egyptian Christian wanted to know whether Gandhi really thought that “the English will leave India to you and go back peacefully as a result of your non-violent agitation?” [Interview to an Egyptian, (January 22, 1937), Harijan, February 13, 1937, CW, Vol 64, pp 312-313] “I do think so”, Gandhi had replied simply, saying that he based his faith “on God and his justice”. (Idem) The visitor was moved to respond, “You are more Christian than we so-called Christians. I will write these words down in block letters”. (Idem) A deputation from Al Azhar University followed in March. Led by Sheikh Ibrahim El Gibali, it included Prof Habib Ahmed and Prof Salah Eldin. They expressed the feeling that many visitors to India had at the time: “It was impossible to come to India and go away without seeing you”. [Interview to an Egyptian deputation, (March 3, 1937), Harijan, March 13, 1937, CW, Vol 64, pp 415-416] To them Gandhi suggested more exchanges among academics in the two countries; he also made an offer similar to one he had earlier, in 1929, made to a South African visitor: “If you kindly send an Egyptian lad of intelligence and resourcefulness, we will welcome him and adopt him here...and he will be like a seed which will grow into a mighty tree. Make our boys Egyptian and we will make yours Indian. Our different religions should not matter. If you will respect our religion and we respect yours, there should be no bar to a healthy development of these relations. Identity of hearts is what is wanted, and if that is there everything will follow.” (Idem) Recommending greater academic exchanges, especially with the Delhi-based Jamia Millia Islamia, an institution born of the Indian freedom struggle, Gandhi suggested to the Egyptians from Al Azhar that “you can exchange boys and professors with the Jamia” where “there are fine men like Dr Zakir Husain, Prof Mujeeb...”. (Idem) Similar discussions about mutual exchange had been current since at least the late 1920s. (For an earlier offer before March 1929 to the “highly educated” African who visited Gandhi from South Africa, see CW, Vol 40, p. 64).

Although, India and Egypt took different paths in some of the years that followed, the warmth and common concerns that characterised relations between Egyptian and Indian leaders continued to be shared. The visits to Gandhi had taken place at a time when the second world war was round the corner; by the first quarter of 1939 the political atmosphere within India too had become increasingly tense in terms of worsening relations between diverse strands of opinion both within the Indian National Congress and outside it. At this juncture, an Egyptian Wafdist delegation came to India in March 1939 to attend the Tripuri session of the Congress. In spite of the Anglo-Egyptian Treaty of 1936, relations between the Wafd and the British had remained uneasy; there were continual intrigues between the British and Egypt’s King directed mainly against Wafdist leaders. Welcoming the Wafdist delegation, Gandhi wired: “Their visit will forge an indissoluble link between Egypt and India.” (The Hindu, March 9, 1939, CW, Vol 69, p. 42.) Nahas Pasha, the Wafdist leader, wrote to Gandhi: “Egyptians, united to their Indian brethren by sacred bonds of common ideal and efforts to realize them through channels of suffering and abnegation, have ever been inspired by your great
example," and wishing him strength to pursue his service of "downtrodden humanity" (CW, Vol 69, p. 46n). As on earlier occasions, the Egyptians struck a chord with Gandhi which went beyond mere courtesy; he was much touched by their affection just as he had been eight years earlier during and after his two voyages through Egypt’s waters and in the year thereafter during his fast in prison. “Thousand thanks for your warm kindly message. I reciprocate every sentence.”, he wired to Nahas Pasha after March 9; two days later he sent another wire to the delegation: “Delighted your affectionate wire.” (CW, Vol 69, p. 46) The delegation called on Gandhi at Delhi on March 18. On being requested for “a message to Egypt”, Gandhi complied. He made two points: Firstly, as he had said in his telegram welcoming them, “there must be a real bond of friendship between India and Egypt”. (March 18, 1939, CW, Vol 69, p. 67). “It is not a mere courteous wish. It is a wish from the heart. There is such a lot which is common between the cultures of the two countries.” (Idem). Secondly, he expected that with India’s large Muslim population, friendship between the two countries should help alleviate some internal tensions. (Idem) The delegation departed praying for Gandhi’s long life “as you are the hope not of India only but of the whole world”. (CW, Vol 69, p. 67, n. 3)

The forties in India were years of strife and Gandhi was jailed again in August 1942; he was released after nearly two years, in May 1944. The atom bomb was dropped by the United States on Hiroshima on August 6, 1945. Two days later, on August 8, 1945, the anniversary of the Quit India movement that Gandhi had launched three years earlier against British rule in India, he paid tribute to the memory of Zaghloul Pasha, the Wafd leader: “I never had the pleasure of meeting Zaghlul Pasha, but I have always entertained high regard for his patriotism and bravery.” (The Hindu, August 9, 1945, CW, Vol 81, p. 91) It was nearly two decades since the death of Zaghloul in August 1927 and in remembering him Gandhi was paying tribute to one who, like himself, had led one of the most outstanding challenges to imperialism and colonialism in the twentieth century. This would also be the last anniversary of Zaghloul’s death to be observed in the lifetime of his widow, Safia Zaghloul Pasha, who had so warmly greeted and welcomed Gandhi when he had passed through Egypt’s ports 14 years earlier.

In the first week of April 1947, Gandhi addressed the Inter-Asian Relations Conference then being held in Delhi. Speaking of his time in South Africa, Gandhi said: “I was a coolie lawyer”. (CW, Vol 87, p. 191) If you really want to see India “at its best”, he advised the delegates, they had to go to “the humble Bhangi homes” of its seven lakh villages. Africa was represented at the Conference. Attending it were leaders from South Africa, Dr Yusuf Dadoo and Dr G M Naicker both of whom stayed till May. They had called on Gandhi at Massaurhi in Bihar in eastern India on March 20, 1947, and then in Delhi on April 3, 1947.44 They met him again on April 11 in Delhi and on May 19 in Patna, Bihar when he gave them a message for South Africa. (CW, Vol 87, p. 257, p. 492, p. 495 and p. 504) Among others attending the Inter-Asian Relations Conference were representatives from Egypt who also met Gandhi on April 4. British troops were still stationed in Egypt and the Egyptians’ questions to Gandhi reflected their concerns: “If the British quit, would you still provide them with military facilities in India?” In his very quali-
fied and careful reply, including references to “certain circumstances” and “as a friendly concession vital to her (Britain’s) existence”, Gandhi hoped India would “consider the request on merits uninfluenced by the memory of past wrongs”. (CW, Vol 87, pp. 201-202) He told the Egyptians that “I would advocate the policy of non-violence as far as we can stretch it”. (Idem)

As Gandhi faced up to the looming prospect of Indian partition, which he had long sought to resist, he was asked about the possibility of the unity of Egypt and Sudan. The unity of the Nile valley had been one of the aspirations of early Egyptian nationalism. Gerald J. Rock of the United Press of America, asked Gandhi : “Do you believe that Egypt and Sudan should unite under one government when the British leave?”. Gandhi replied : “I have no doubt that they ought to”. (Answers to Questions, June 1, 1947, CW, Vol 88, p. 48) The poignancy of this answer, published in The Bombay Chronicle on June 2, 1947, must have been enhanced a few hours later with the official announcement on Indian partition.

Gandhi had developed an early interest in North Africa, derived inspiration from Mustafa Kamil Pasha, much younger though the latter was, and the Nationalist Party led by him ; the Indian leader frequently followed and commented on events in Egypt with which he saw some Indian interconnections. He noticed also the post-1919 political developments under the leadership of the Wafd, admired Zaghloul Pasha, nine years his senior, and responded warmly to expressions of fraternity and solidarity from Egyptian movements. These contacts and impulses had left lasting impressions. There would be discussion within Egypt about the respective legacies of the Nationalist Party represented by Mustafa Kamil Pasha in the early years of the century on the one hand and the post-1918 Wafd, represented by Zaghloul Pasha and later by Nahas Pasha. Interestingly, even as Gandhi defined his own methods, he straddled and absorbed these legacies, having derived early inspiration from the one and sympathetically observed and admired the struggles of both. There were several points of common interest in the Indian and Egyptian struggles and much overlapping of methods used -- not only by the dominating power but also by the nationalists in both countries. The Indian and Egyptian leaderships in the twentieth century compared notes frequently. While bearing in mind the differences in the two situations, each drew upon the experiences of the other.

References

1. The year 2011 marks the 75th death anniversary of Munshi Premchand (1880-1936), legendary literary figure of 20th Century India. This article is a slightly expanded and revised version of the written text of the Fourth Munshi Premchand Memorial lecture delivered by me under the auspices of Jamia’s Premchand Archives & Literary Centre, Jamia Millia Islamia University, New Delhi on March 22, 2011. References to Gandhi’s writings and to his Collected Works have ordinarily been given within the main text while other references are given in notes to the text. Mr E S Reddy was kind enough to read earlier drafts and made valuable suggestions from which I have benefited.
2. For an account of the events surrounding the occupation, see Jawaharlal Nehru, "Britain Seizes and Holds on to Egypt", a piece written as a letter from prison to his daughter on March 11, 1933, and included in J. Nehru, Glimpses of World History, Asia Publishing House, Bombay, 1962, pp. 603-610, first published in 1934. Yet another early Indian account of these events and their far-reaching consequences is in Syed Mahmud, The Khilaafat and England, published by Mohemad Imtyaz, Sidaqat Ashram, Patna, (1921), pp. 66-70. Gandhi would refer to the latter work in an article in Young India on September 1, 1921.

3. Evelyn Baring, First Earl of Cromer (1841-1917); British Comptroller-General in Egypt, 1883-1907. He had earlier served as Private Secretary to Northbrook, Viceroy of India (1872-76).

4. Historically, the names of Mustafa Kamal Pasha and Muhammad Farid (1868-1919) are associated with the founding of the Nationalist Party of Egypt. Maulana Abul Kalam Azad (1888-1958), who became a leading figure in the Indian National Congress and of the Indian freedom movement in its Gandhian phase, records visiting Cairo in 1908, apparently sometime after Kamal Pasha's death, and coming into contact with “the followers of Mustafa Kamal Pasha”. (Maulana Azad, India Wins Freedom, Orient Longman, New Delhi, 1959, pp. 5-6). The spelling of Mustafa Kamal’s name varies in the literature. Some variations are: Kamal, Kemal and Kamel. Kamal is now encountered most frequently; but this spelling does not seem to have been as prevalent in his own lifetime. For purposes of this lecture we have used Kamil but have retained other spellings wherever they occur in a quoted reference.

5. In our time this party has been characterised thus: “Created by men of the intelligentsia’s first generation, the first Nationalist Party was by no means the party of the Egyptian bourgeoisie... At critical moments the party became the nation – whose potential it symbolised”. [Samir Amin, The Arab Nation, (Tr. by Michael Pals), Zed Press, London, 1978, pp. 35-36]

6. Uttam Sinha of the National Gandhi Museum, Rajghat, New Delhi kindly provided me with an English translation of Mustafa Kamil Pasha’s October 22, 1907 speech from the Gujarati version published in Indian Opinion, June 27, July 4, and July 11, 1908.

7. This is also referred to as the Dinhawal or Dinhaway incident. The event had long-term implications that may be compared with the subsequent Jallianwala Bagh massacre (1919) in Amritsar, India and the shootings at Sharpeville (1960) and Soweto (1976) in South Africa. Of the Egyptian incident, one scholar writes: “Within a few days it became clear that the incident provided the impetus which had up to then been lacking in the nationalist and pan-Islamic Press. Ali Yusuf wrote twenty-three articles ... and hardly a poet kept silent.” (Jamal Mohammed Ahmed, The Intellectual Origins of Egyptian Nationalism, Oxford University Press, London, 1960, pp. 62-63) “I saw the heart of Egypt throb”, wrote Qasim Amin, a contemporary of Mustafa Kamil, on the executions that followed Denshawai (Ibid., p. 79). In England, the Denshawai repression was contemporaneously criticised by George Bernard Shaw. An English army officer in India noted that “accounts of it also reached India and Burma. In Ireland, Denshawai was used with effect, and of course the demand for Home Rule was stimulated”. (Must England Lose India? : The Nemesis of Empire, Arthur Osburn, Alfred A. Knopf, publisher, London, 1930 pp.66-67). One scholar writes that “There can be no doubt that Cromer intended the Dinhawal trial to serve as an object lesson to the Egyptian population of the way Great Britain dealt with serious offences against its rule”. [Robert L. Tignor, Practitioner and Philosopher of Imperialism, The Journal of British Studies, Vol 2, No 2 (May 1963), pp. 142-159 at p. 155]


9. Ibid., p. 861


11. The article, published in Comrade, Delhi, on September 26, 1914, was in response to an eponymous editorial in the London Times of August 29, 1914. The editors of the Collected Works of Mahatma Gandhi refer to action taken against Mohamed Ali and Shaukat Ali in October 1914 for publishing an article entitled “Evacuate Egypt”.

12. There appears to have been some confusion about the copy of the work related to Kamil Pasha, Life of Mustafa Kamal Pasha, that was reprinted in India for purposes of civil disobedience in 1919. It was apparently not the one that had been published from Gandhi’s press in South Africa and banned in India. Gandhi noted: “I find that it is not a reprint of one of the prohibited books, but it was reprinted in mistake for a copy of Mustafa Kamal Pasha’s speech which is a book included in the list of prohibited literature”. [Letter to F C Griffith, May 14, 1919, CW, Vol 15, p. 308]


15. Wavell, op. cit., p. 269. Writing from prison on May 20, 1933, Jawaharlal Nehru would recall that the arrest of Zaghloul and other leaders “resulted in the outbreak of a bloody revolution”. (See ‘Egypt’s Fight for Freedom’ in Glimpses, op. cit., p. 764). The inter-connection between events in India, Egypt and Ireland, the “classical centres of disaffection”, was recognised by activists and scholars alike. Michael Davitt (1846-1906) of the Irish Land League believed that “the Irish, the Indians and the Egyptians should regard themselves as allies in the struggle against imperialism”, (Brian Inglis. Roger Casement, Hodder and Stoughton, London, 1973, p. 296) In the context of the period 1919-22, John Gallagher, a Cambridge historian, wrote of the situation in India, Egypt and Ireland: “[n]o analysis of any of these crises will be complete without establishing its interplay with the others”. Nationalisms, and the Crisis of Empire. 1919-1922, Modern Asian Studies, Vol 15, No 3. Power, Profit and Politics: Essays on Imperialism, Nationalism and Change in Twentieth Century India (1981), pp. 355-368 at p. 355; Gandhi, Zaghloul Pasha and Eamon De Valera (1882-1975) were identified at this time as the chief threats or irritants to the Empire. Egyptian opinion, as reflected, for example, in its media and poems, saw the inter-connection between India and Egypt even more starkly. The Egyptian poet, Mahmud Bayram Al-Tunisi (1893-1961) suggested in a poem written between 1921 and 1923 that “Egypt’s occupied status is linked to British activities in India, for Egypt stands ‘directly on the road to India’”. [Marilyn Booth, Force and Translivity: Bayram Al-Tunisi and a Poetics of Anti-Colonialism, Alif: Journal of Comparative Poetics, No 7, The Third World: Literature and Consciousness, (Spring, 1987), pp. 75-111], Al-Tunisi wrote a poem entitled ‘Gandhi’; it was republished in Al-A’mal al-kamila il Bayram al-Tunisi, Vol VII, Al- Hay’a al-misyrya al-’amma li-al-kitab, Cairo, 1982, 21-24, (cited in Marilyn Booth, supra, p. 76 and p. 100, who appears to mention no date for the poem). The popular poet, who is identified with the 1919 rebellion, was already quite famous when he left Alexandria, Egypt “in late 1919 bound for twenty years as a political exile in France, Tunisia and Syria...”. (Booth, supra, p. 75).


18. Goldberg, op. cit., p. 275


20. Goldberg, op. cit., p. 273


22. For these events, and for the admitted toll at Jallianwala Bagh, Amritsar on April 13, 1919 see Raja Ram, The Jallianwala Bagh Massacre, Panjab University, Chandigarh, 1969; a list of names of 381 persons killed, based on Punjab Government archives, is given at pp. 152-174. This appears to be a list of such dead persons whose names could be ascertained. Unofficial estimates are obviously higher. According to Raja Ram: “At least 2000 persons lay in the Bagh, either dead or wounded”. (Ibid., p. 119) The Commissioners appointed by the Indian National Congress had this to say: “In the matter of the death roll, it is interesting to note that according to the Government’s own showing, they did not commence investigating the figure before the 20th August, i.e., four months after the tragedy. Mr Thompson then announced that not more than 290 had died. Now they have practically accepted the Sewa Samiti’s figures viz., 500, which are based on actual tracing and represent the minimum. The exact figure will never be known, but after careful investigation, we consider that Lala Girdhari Lal’s computation of 1000 is by no means an exaggerated calculation.” (Report of the Commissioners appointed by the Punjab Sub-committee of the Indian National Congress, published by K Santanam, Secretary to the Commission of Inquiry, Lahore, 1920, Vol 1, p. 57.) This report has since been reprinted in 1994 by the National Book Trust, New Delhi with a different pagination.

23. See, for example, Goldberg, Peasants in Revolt – Egypt 1919, op. cit., p.273

24. Jawaharlal Nehru, “Egypt’s Fight for Freedom”, in Glimpses, op. cit., p. 764. In this piece, penned in prison on May 20, 1933, Nehru noted of the Egyptian events of 1919: “But though the active insurrection was suppressed, the movement was far from being crushed, it changed its tactics and entered upon a second phase – that of passive resistance. So successful was this that the British Government were forced to take some steps to meet the Egyptian demand.”


26. Wavell, op. cit., p. 288

27. See Jawaharlal Nehru, ‘Egypt’s Fight For Freedom’, (May 20, 1933), in Glimpses, op. cit., p. 764

28. Of the Milner Commission’s response to the Egyptian boycott, Jawaharlal Nehru would recall: “The Commission were so impressed by the national resistance that they made some far-reaching recommendations. The British Government ignored these, and the struggle in Egypt continued for three years, from early in 1919 to early in 1922.” (See previous reference)
29. See Wavell, op. cit., p.323; see also pp. 290-293 generally for a British version of these events. Wavell admitted, however, that in May 1921 the “Alexandria riots had been a direct sequel to an incident at Tanta at the end of April, when the police fired on an unruly and dangerous mob, killing a few and wounding others”. (Ibid., p. 291) Yet the British establishment claimed in December 1921 that the presence of Zaghloul and his colleagues was the cause of the trouble in Cairo and elsewhere and deported him first to Aden and then in March 1922 to Seychelles in the Indian Ocean.

30. The ‘reserved points’ included “the security of British Empire communications, the defence of Egypt against all foreign aggression, the protection of foreign interests and minorities and the Sudan”. [Clare Hollingworth, op. cit., p.10] These points, wrote Jawaharlal Nehru in 1933, “bear a family likeness to their cousins in India…”. [*Egypt’s Fight For Freedom*, May 20, 1933, in Glimpses, op. cit., p. 765] About the Declaration and the events immediately preceding it, the Egyptian poet Al-Tunisi has paraphrased thus: “The first, with rifles they silenced those who revolted / The second, Lord Milner came to bind the free / The third, a declaration in February, and in truth it’s jesting”. (See Marilyn Booth, *Force and Transitivity : Bayram Al-Tunisi and a Poetics of Anti-Colonialism*, op. cit., p. 84)


32. The words in quotes are from C. Alvin Hughes who in *The Negro Sanhedrin Movement*, *The Journal of Negro History*, Vol 69, No 1, Winter, 1984, at p. 6 cites the Afro-Caribbean radical Richard B Moore referring to these impulses, at a meeting organised in New York in March 1923 for the purpose of creating an unified platform of Afro-American organisations.

33. Wavell, op. cit., p. 323n. Martial law, which had been proclaimed in Egypt on November 2, 1914, was revoked, nearly nine years later, on July 5, 1923 (Ibid., p. 322)

34. Jawaharlal Nehru, writing from prison on May 22, 1933, would sum up the purport of these demands: “Because some people had murdered Sir Lee Stack, the British Government immediately, and without even the possibility of an inquiry, treated the Egyptian Government as a whole, that is the Egyptian people, as if they had been guilty of the murder. Further they made a handsome financial profit out of the whole affair, and, most significant of all, made it the occasion to settle forcibly all the matters in dispute between themselves and the Egyptian Government, over which negotiations had broken down in London only a few months before. As if this were not enough, they added that all political demonstrations should be prohibited, thus preventing even the normal public life of the country from continuing.” [*What Independence Under the British Means*], in Glimpses, op. cit., at p. 769). Nehru compares the de facto status of the British Resident in nominally independent Egypt at the time with that of similar British Residents in Indian Princely states; these Residents were “the real authority, pulling the strings”. (Ibid., p. 770)


37. The Wafd party got its name from “delegation” after a delegation, Al Wafd al Misri (“The Egyptian Delegation”) to the British Resident sought in November 1918 permission to go to London to press for Independence, a request that was refused; (Clare Hollingworth, op. cit., pp. 10) Indian leaders highly regarded the Wafd party. In March and May 1933 Jawaharlal Nehru wrote comprehensively on political developments in Egypt. (We have referred above to his gripping pieces, written initially as letters from prison to his daughter, ‘Britain Seizes and Holds on to Egypt’, *Egypt’s Fight for Freedom* and *What Independence Under the British Means*, and included in the 1934 publication : *Glimpses of World History*, op. cit., pp. 603-610, and pp. 761-775). A brief and incisive analysis of the Wafd party was made by Acharya Narendra Deva, the doyen of the Indian socialist movement. In *Mitr Ki Rajnitik Partiyani*, *Jansan*, February 1947 (reproduced in Narendra Deva, *Raathriyata Aur Samajwad*, Gyan Mandal, Banaras, 1949, pp. 643-647). A more recent scholar whose characterisation of Mustafa Kamil Pasha’s Al Hizb al Watani we had referred to in note 4 above, considers the Wafd to have had a relatively broad base : “The Wafd, whose history dominates that of Egypt from 1919 to 1952, was also not the party of the Egyptian bourgeoisie”. (Samir Amin, op. cit., p. 36)


40. See Rizk, *Gandhi in Egypt*, supra. For three photographs related to this Egyptian welcome, see Waman P. Kabadi [*editor and compiler], *India’s Case for Swaraj* : *Select Speeches, Writings, Interviews Etcetera of Mahatma Gandhi in England and India* (September 1931 to January 1932), Yeshanan & Co, Bombay, 2nd edn, 1932.


43. Mahadev Desai, in C. Rajagopalachari and J C Kumarappa (eds.), op. cit., p. 107
44. Idem


46. Idem. Desai notes: “The women under Madame Zagloul, who is called the Mother of the Egyptians, are also astir, and what is known as the Moderate or the Liberal Party, which used to attack and criticize the Wafd, is now supporting the Wafd. Mahomed Mahmud Pasha, the President of the party, was belaboured during one of the disturbances and he has since been a staunch supporter of the Wafd”. The previous year had been a troubled one in Egypt, involving an election boycott, a general strike, police firings and attacks by soldiers on workers at a railway workshop, killing 70 and wounding about a thousand. The railway workers, according to the version recorded by Desai, had thrown pieces of iron at the soldiers but were otherwise unarmed.

47. Mahadev Desai in Rajagopalachari and Kumarappa (eds.), op. cit., pp 108-109

48. See Rik, Gandhi in Egypt, supra.

49. Idem

50. In his record of a trip to Africa in the 1950s, Reginald Reynolds writes of a visit to the office of an Arabic daily in Cairo: “It was a pleasant surprise in this Moslem stronghold to find among the few pictures on the walls of the editor’s room both a photograph and an original portrait of Mahatma Gandhi the latter a present from Gandhi to the editor, Ahmed Abdul Fath,” (Reynolds, Beware of Africans : A Pilgrimage from Cairo to the Cape,Jarrolds, London, 1955, pp. 16-17) This is probably a reference to Mamoud Abu-Fath, whose interview with Gandhi at Port Said has been referred to by Rik in ‘Gandhi in Egypt’, supra.

51. See D Guerin, in La Revolution Proletarienne. N 122. December 1931, pp 306-309. La Revolution Proletarienne was the syndicalist revolutionary journal of Pierre Monatte, Robert Louzon and others.


53. See Heather J. Sharkey, A Century in Print : Arabic Journalism and Nationalism in Sudan 1899-1999, International Journal of Middle East Studies, November 1999, pp. 531-549 at p. 540 and p. 547, n.58. A number of artisanal self-help groups were established under nationalist auspices in Sudan in the 1930s: according to Sharkey, one possible inspiration for some of these among the North Sudanese intellectuals was the Indian movement led by Gandhi “whose writings were popular in literary circles”. She cites, for example, Mu’awiya Nur, Mu’allahafat, 2 vols, Qism al-Ta’if wa-al-Nashr, Jamiat al-Khartum, Khartoum, 1970, 142-49. According to Sharkey, “[(t)he nationalist Ahmad Khayr was an active supporter of the idea of producing local cotton weave-that is, ‘dammur’ cloth”. She cites, in this connection, Mustafa Muhammad al-Hasan, Rijal wa-mawdafi al-haraka al-wataniyya (Khartoum, n.d.), 6-18.


55. Rik, Gandhi in Egypt, supra, mentions Gandhi’s arrival at Port Said as 10 am on December 18. This is, of course, an error. According to Rik, “[(t)he captain of the liner who put the crowning impediment to the Mahatma’s visit to Cairo].”

56. See Rik, Gandhi in Egypt, supra.


58. Edmond Privat, Aux Indes Avec Gandhi, Editions Dencel, Paris, 1960, p. 16; passage translated and quoted in P. C. Roy Chaudhury, Edmond Privat: A Forgotten Friend of India, Navajivan Publishing House, Ahmedabad, 1976, p. 27. Mira Behn had also accompanied Gandhi, who she referred to as Bapu (father), and would record in her autobiography: “When we reached Port Said there was mysterious tension and excitement. The Egyptian friends had come with a whole fleet of cars to take Bapu and his party to Cairo and on down to Suez by road to pick up the steamer again there. Bapu was all ready to go, but he was given to understand by officials that the ship was not going to call at Suez and if he landed he would be left behind – a thing he could not possibly afford to do at that juncture. So the whole plan fell through…. When we reached Suez, the ship did stop, and there would have been quite enough time for Bapu to be brought alongside in a launch.” Mira Behn (Madeleine Slade), The Spirit’s Pilgrimage, Longmans, London, 1960, p. 152.

59. See Rik, Gandhi in Egypt, supra. Ceza Nabrawi, b. 1893, also spells variously as Nabarawi and even Naborawi, was one of the two leading feminist figures in Egypt at the time, the other being Huda Sha’rawi. Ceza Nabrawi’s approach to feminist questions was that of a nationalist: “How could women hope to gain their freedom when Egypt herself was not free?” (See Miriam Cooke, Telling Their Lives : A Hundred Years of Arab Women’s Writings, World Literature Today, Vol 60, No 2, Spring 1986, pp. 212-216, at p. 213.)

61. Privat, op. cit., p. 17; passage translated and quoted in P.C. Roy Chaudhury, op. cit., pp. 28-29; this and the previous passage from Privat (cf. note 57 supra) have been translated by Leelavathy Rao.

62. Theodore Rothstein (1871-1953) was a Russian based in England who later went back to Moscow; after his return to the then Soviet Union he was entrusted in the 1920s with diplomatic and other assignments by the Soviet regime. His early work, Egypt’s Ruin : A Financial and Administrative Record, Fifield (publishers), London, 1910, was a critique of British policies in Egypt. A little before this he had written an article “The British in Egypt”, for Die Neue Zeit; a translation of that piece was published in The Social Democrat, Vol XII, No 1, January 15, 1908, pp. 22-31 and is available online. Gandhi’s letter to Narandas is in Gujarati. There are minor errors in the spelling of Rothstein’s name and in the title of the 1910 book as transcribed in the English translation of the letter included in The Collected Works of Mahatma Gandhi.

63. See Jawaharlal Nehru, Note [October 1938], appended to the May 22, 1933 piece ‘What Independence Under the British Means’, in Glimpses, op. cit., pp. 774-775


65. The Palestinians too met Gandhi on April 4, 1947, probably along with the Egyptians. (See C B Dalal, op. cit., p. 157.)

66. Sudan has since had another severance, leading to the birth of South Sudan as an independent country in July 2011. The forces and process that have led to this require understanding and analysis, but it may be safe to say that external economic interests in southern Sudan are not conspicuous by their absence.