

# Buber and Gandhi

Avner Falk

Martin Buber is one of the most important living philosophers and spiritual guides. His philosophical and anthropological insight into the psychical problems of interpersonal relationships, and of the human situation, has profoundly influenced some of the greatest thinkers, religious leaders, psychologists, anthropologists, and even political leaders, of our time, and left a deep mark on the development and behaviour of young and old in times of personal, social or political crisis. His profound and highly original sociological and psychological philosophy is far from being "strictly Jewish", and in fact, had been known to Jewish and non-Jewish intellectuals long before it was published in Hebrew (Bialik Institute, Jerusalem, 1959) and made known to the Israeli reader. Buber's dialogic thinking is a landmark in the history of philosophy, and of human evolution in general.

Politically and socially, on the mass scale, he is rather a lonely prophet. His small political group in Israel "The Bond (*Ihud*)", devoted to Jewish-Arab rapprochement and peace, is insignificant in terms of Israeli politics, and its monthly, *Ner* (Candle), is read by a very small group of Jews and Arabs. Yet Buber often participates in petitions and statements addressed to the Government at times of important decisions (as in the Eichmann case, the debate on military government for the Arabs, issues of nuclear disarmament, etc.) and unwaveringly maintains his standpoint against the vast majority.

The present article has as its subject Buber's letter to Gandhi on the Jewish problems in the late 'thirties, when Jews were being transported to concentration camps in Germany on a monstrous and hitherto unheard-of scale, while those Jews who had managed to immigrate to Palestine, despite British regulations and many other obstacles, were involved in a severe conflict with the Arab community and with the British colonial-mandatory government. This situation, considered in the light of the weird and

## GANDHI MARG

painful history of the Jewish people on the one hand, and of Arab national history, British rule, and Hitler's Germany, on the other was as complex as it was hideous.

Buber was one of the leaders of the Jewish community in Palestine at that time, and professor of philosophy and sociology at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem. His *I and Thou* and *On Dialogue* had been published in German (in Germany) and he had completed a German translation of the Hebrew Bible (with Franz Rosenzweig). His humanistic political outlook was definitely not "pacifist", yet he desired peace no less than any ardent pacifist, and at the same time was witnessing one of the worst catastrophes in the history of his people.

Buber and his colleague at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, J.L. Magnes, then read Gandhi's statement in *Harijan* of 26 November 1938, referring to the Jewish question. As this first long and significant statement may be inaccessible to many readers, it is worth while quoting some of its most important passages here, in full. It can be found in References 1 and 2.

"Several letters have been received by me asking me to declare my views about the Arab-Jew question in Palestine and the persecution of Jews in Germany. It is not without hesitation that I venture to offer my views on this very difficult question.

"My sympathies are all with the Jews. . . . I came to learn much of their age-long persecution. . . . The parallel between their treatment by Christians and the treatment of untouchables by Hindus is very close. . . . But my sympathy does not blind me to the requirements of justice. Their 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 a return to Palestine. Why should they not, like other peoples of the earth, make that country their home where they were born and where they earn their livelihood ?

"Palestine belongs to the Arabs in the same sense that England belongs to the English, or France to the French. It is wrong and inhuman to impose the Jews on the Arabs. What is going on in Palestine today cannot be justified by any moral code of conduct. . . . Surely it would be a crime against humanity to reduce the proud Arabs, so that Palestine can be restored to the Jews partly or wholly as their National Home.

"The nobler course 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. If the

Jews have no home but Palestine, 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 a National Home affords a colourable justification for the German expulsion of the Jews.

“But the German persecution of Jews 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. . . . The crime of an obviously mad but intrepid youth is being visited upon his whole race with unbelievable ferocity. If there ever could be a justifiable war in the name of, and for, humanity, a war against Germany, to prevent the wanton persecution of a whole race, would be completely justified. But I do not believe in any war. A discussion of the pros and cons of such a war is therefore outside my horizon or province.

“ . . . Can the Jews resist this organised and shameless persecution? Is there a way to preserve their self-respect, and not to feel helpless, neglected and forlorn? I submit there is. . . . If I were a Jew and were born in Germany and earned my livelihood there, I would claim Germany as my home even as the tallest gentile German might, and challenge him to shoot me or cast me in the dungeon; I would refuse to be expelled or submit to discriminating treatment. . . . Suffering voluntarily undergone would bring them (the Jews) an inner strength and joy which no number of resolutions of sympathy passed in the world outside Germany can.

“ . . . It is hardly necessary for me to point out that it is easier for the Jews than for the Czechs to follow my prescription. And they have in the Indian Satyagraha campaign in South Africa an exact parallel. . . . The Jews of Germany can offer Satyagraha under infinitely better auspices than the Indians of South Africa.

“ . . . And now a word to the Jews in Palestine. I have no doubt that they are going about it in the wrong way. The Palestine of the Biblical conception is not a geographical tract. It is in their hearts. But if they must look to the Palestine of geography as their National Home, it is wrong to enter it under the shadow of the British gun. A religious act cannot be performed with the aid of the bayonet or the bomb. They can settle in Palestine only by the goodwill of the Arabs. . . . They can offer Satyagraha in front of the Arabs and offer themselves to be shot or thrown into the Dead Sea without raising a little finger against them. . . . As it is, they are co-sharers with the British in despoiling a people who have done them no wrong.

## GANDHI MARG

“ . . . Let the Jews who claim to be the chosen race prove their title by choosing the way of non-violence. . . . Every country is their home, including Palestine, not by aggression but by loving service.”

Before passing on to consider Buber's and Magnes's replies to this statement of Gandhi's, let us point out a few obvious errors and misconceptions in Gandhi's mental picture of the situation, both in Germany and in Palestine, as well as of the Jewish position among the nations in general. Some of the assertions in this article cannot but seem strange and unfounded to any Jew, whether a Satyagrahi or not. It is clear that Gandhi's psychological mistake lies not only in his relative unfamiliarity with European politics, but also in his instinctive comparison of the Jews with his own people, the Indians. No amount of violence and horror perpetrated on Indians in South Africa or in India can possibly be compared to what was being done at that time by the Nazis in concentration camps. "I would refuse to be expelled or submit to discriminating treatment" must sound literally ridiculous to any ex-inmate of a Nazi camp, or to anyone who has ever had any dealings with Nazi institutions as a Jew. But it is not our purpose here to *refute* Gandhi's views and conceptions on this question. Our intention is to present the views of the various people intimately connected with the issue at that time.

In *Harijan*, of 17 December 1938, Gandhi answered some of the questions raised by the earlier article. Some of them were naturally also raised by Buber and Magnes and we shall deal with them in detail. For the rest of Gandhi's statements on the Jewish question, the reader is referred to Reference 1.

Obviously, however, Gandhi had no immediate knowledge of the real issues. The atrocities of British colonialism and racial hatred and discrimination in India or South Africa could by no means give him an adequate idea of what was actually happening, in Nazi Germany and in Palestine, his only resources on this subject being letters, articles, documents, and the views and sentiments of some Jewish acquaintances in India and abroad. It was quite natural *for him*, therefore, to apply his universal non-violent philosophy to this particular case—as he did with all political questions in Europe and elsewhere—and to issue his statements accordingly.

No one would pretend to take Gandhi's philosophy lightly, or to underestimate the mental discipline and effort which its practice requires in present-day society. Nor would anyone endeavour to reject Gandhi's standpoint as "too simple" or "unrealistic". Undoubtedly Gandhi's words were a source of inspiration and spiritual guidance to the best religious

## BUBER AND GANDHI

and spiritual leaders of the time. As Orwell says, he "enriched the world simply by being alive". Yet Buber could not help seeing this matter differently. The questions of peace and non-violence must have troubled him a good deal, but at the same time what was happening to his people in Germany, and the horrors he was foreseeing, made it impossible for him to accept Gandhi's statements wholeheartedly.

Gandhi's statement was read in Jerusalem by Martin Buber, and from November 1938 to February 1939 he was thinking of this most painful question of his own people and of humanity, and composing his letter to Gandhi.

"I have been very slow in writing this letter to you, Mahatma", Buber concludes his letter on 24 February 1939. "I made repeated pauses—sometimes days elapsing between short paragraphs—in order to test my knowledge and my way of thinking. Day and night I took myself to task, searching whether I had not in any one point overstepped the measure of self-preservation allotted, and even prescribed, by God to a human community, and whether I had not fallen into the grievous error of collective egoism. Friends and my own conscience have helped to keep me straight whenever danger threatened. Weeks have now passed since then and the time has come when negotiations are proceeding in the capital of the British Empire on the Jewish-Arab problem and when, it is said, a decision is to be made. But the true decision in this matter can only come from within and not from without.

"I take the liberty therefore of closing this letter to you without waiting for the result in London."

Buber's standpoint in this letter is that of a sufferer speaking to "a voice that he has long known and honoured, a great voice and an earnest one". Buber feels that he is representing the dire suffering of his afflicted nation; that his letter to Gandhi is not personal, but a dialogue between two nations; and, prophet-like, he identifies himself with his people. "What he (the sufferer) hears, containing though it does elements of a noble and most praiseworthy conception such as he expects from this speaker, is yet barren of all application to his peculiar circumstances", says Buber. It seems that this is the cardinal point of this historical dialogue between two great men: Buber does not reject Gandhi's philosophy, conceptions or principles; yet he refuses to accept them blindly in any given circumstances. He demands that the particular circumstances of the case be discussed and considered, and the question be investigated as to whether Gandhi's prescription and philosophy are at all applicable here. "The listener is aware that he, the speaker", writes Buber, "has cast not a single glance at the

## GANDHI MARG

situation of him whom he is addressing, that he sees him not, nor does he know him and the straits under which he labours". This is a rather heavy counter-reproach : the humanist, the believer in dialogue, accuses Gandhi of having issued his statement and judgement without in the least acquainting himself with the actual situation and plight of the Jews. Buber tells Gandhi that he has rashly applied his principles to a case he literally knew nothing about !

Let us now consider the various specific aspects of this case. It would be best to let Buber speak for himself.

"Jews are being persecuted, robbed, maltreated, tortured, murdered. And you, Mahatma Gandhi, say that their position in the country where they suffer all this is an exact parallel to the position of Indians in South Africa at the time when 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 to the black race including the Asiatics : there also the Indians were assigned to ghettos and the other disqualifications were, at all events, of the same type as those of the Jews in Germany. I read and reread these sentences in your article, without being able to understand. Although I know them well, I reread all your South African speeches and writings . . . and I did likewise with the accounts of your friends and pupils at that time ; but all this did not help me to understand what you say about us. In . . . 1896 . . . a band of Europeans had set fire to an Indian village shop causing some damage ; and . . . another band had thrown burning rockets into an urban shop. If I oppose to this the thousands on thousands of Jewish shops destroyed and burnt out, you will perhaps answer that the difference is only one of quantity. . . . But, Mahatma, are you not aware of the burning of Synagogues and scrolls of the Law ? Do you know nothing of all the sacred property of the community—in part of great antiquity—that has been destroyed in the flames ? I am not aware that Boers and Englishmen in South Africa ever injured anything sacred to the Indians. . . . Three Indian school-teachers, who were found walking in the streets after 9 p.m. contrary to orders, were arrested and only acquitted later on. That is the only incident of the kind that you bring forward. Now do you know, or do you not know, Mahatma, what a concentration camp is like and what goes on there ? Do you know of the torments in the concentration camp, of its methods of slow and quick slaughter ? I cannot assume that you know of this ; for then this tragi-comic utterance, 'almost of the same type', could scarcely have crossed your lips ! . . . And do you think perhaps

## BUBER AND GANDHI

that a Jew in Germany could pronounce in public one single sentence of a speech such as yours, without being knocked down? . . . An effective stand may be taken in the form of non-violence against unfeeling human beings in the hope of gradually bringing them thereby to their senses. But a diabolic universal steam-roller cannot thus be withstood. A martyrdom cast to the wind—that is the fate of innumerable Jews in Germany.”

Buber now points to another fundamental difference between the Jews and the Indians which Gandhi had failed to understand.

“When you were in South Africa, Mahatma, . . . did you ask then, as you ask the Jews now, whether they (the Indians) want a double home where they can remain at will? You say to the Jews: if Palestine is your home, you must accustom yourselves to the idea of being forced to leave the other parts of the world in which you are settled. Did you also say to the Indians in South Africa that if India was their home, they must accustom themselves to the idea of being compelled to return to India? Or did you tell them that India was not their home? And if . . . hundreds of millions of Indians were to be scattered tomorrow over the face of the earth; and if the day after tomorrow another nation were to establish itself in India and the Jews were to declare that there was yet room for the establishment of a national home for the Indians, thus giving to their diaspora a strong organic concentration and a living centre; should then a Jewish Gandhi—assuming there could be such—answer them, as you answered the Jews: *this cry for the national home affords a colourable justification for your expulsion?* Or should he teach them, as you teach the Jews: the India of your Vedic conception is not a geographical tract, it is in your hearts?”

Buber's method is clear. He tries to make Gandhi see his misunderstanding through drawing the obvious (though obviously absurd) parallel between the two nations. The reader will ponder for himself what Gandhi may have replied to these words—either inwardly or openly. To the best of my knowledge, no official publication has been issued of Gandhi's reply, if any.

Buber then goes on to describe the peculiar and unique situation of the Jews among the nations during the last three thousand years or so. Quoting from the Hebrew Bible and dwelling on various aspects of Jewish religion and culture, he tries to make Gandhi get a glimpse into some of the specific problems involved, which he has failed to notice.

Here we come to an interesting paragraph in Buber's letter.

“Now you may well ask whether I speak for the Jewish people when I say ‘we’. I speak only for those who feel themselves entrusted with the commission of fulfilling the commandment of justice delivered to Israel of the Bible. . . . In this connexion I must tell you that you are mistaken when you assume that in general the Jews of today believe in God and derive from their faith guidance for their conduct. Jewry of today is in the throes of a serious *crisis* in the matter of faith. It seems to me that the lack of faith of present-day humanity, its inability truly to believe in God, finds its concentrated expression in this Crisis of Jewry ; here all is darker, more fraught with danger, more fateful than anywhere else in the world. Neither is this Crisis resolved here in Palestine ; indeed we recognise its severity here even more than elsewhere among Jews. But at the same time we realise that *here alone* it can be resolved. There is no solution to be found in the life of isolated and abandoned individuals.”

It seems to me that little should be added. Here Buber is speaking of what is troubling his mind more than anything else, namely the Crisis of Faith. That crisis which is the underlying reason and cause for so many evils and horrors which we have witnessed in our own time. The crisis which led to Auschwitz and Hiroshima. The crisis which we are still part of, and which we have still not found the ways to resolve. The crisis which may ultimately bring about destruction if we do not teach our fellows to recognise and understand it, and act accordingly.

Buber then goes on to speak of “the most significant of all the things you tell us”—Palestine and Arab-Jewish relations.

“I belong to a group of people (‘The Bond’) who, from the time when Britain conquered Palestine, have not ceased to strive for the concluding of genuine peace between Jew and Arab. . . . But now you come and settle the whole existential dilemma with one simple formula : ‘Palestine belongs to the Arabs’.

“What do you mean by saying that a land belongs to a population ? Evidently you do not intend only to describe a state of affairs by your formula, but to declare a certain right. You obviously mean to say that a people, being settled on the land, has such an absolute claim to the possession of this land that whoever settles in it without the permission of this people, has committed a robbery. But by what means did the Arabs attain to the right of ownership in Palestine ? Surely by conquest, and, in fact, by conquest by settlement. You therefore admit that, this being so, it constitutes for them an exclusive right of possession ; whereas the subsequent conquests of the Mamelukes and the Turks . . . do not constitute such in your opinion, but leave the former conquering nation in rightful ownership. . . .



“Possibly the time is not far removed when—perhaps after a catastrophe the extent of which we cannot yet estimate [written in 1939!]—the representatives of humanity will have to come to some agreement on the re-establishment of relations between peoples, nations and countries on the colonisation of thinly populated territories as well as on a communal distribution of the necessary raw materials and on a logical intensification of the cultivation of the globe in order to prevent a new, enormously extended migration of nations which would threaten to destroy mankind. Is then the dogma of possession, of the inalienable right of ownership, of the sacred status quo, to be held up against the men who dare to save the situation?”

“We do not want force”, Buber goes on to say in a most significant passage. “But after the resolution of Delhi, at the beginning of March 1922, you yourself, Mahatma Gandhi, wrote: ‘Have I not repeatedly said that I would have India become free even by violence rather than that she should remain in bondage?’ This was a very important pronouncement on your part: you asserted thereby that non-violence is for you a faith and not a political principle—and that the desire for the freedom of India is even stronger in you than your faith. And for this, I love you. We do not want force. We have not proclaimed, as did Jesus, the son of our people, and as you do, the teaching of non-violence, because we believe that a man must sometimes use force to save himself or, even more, his children. But from time immemorial we have proclaimed the teaching of justice and peace: we have taught and we have learnt that peace is the aim of all the world and that justice is the way to attain it. Thus we cannot desire to use force. No one who counts himself in the ranks of Israel can desire to use force. . . .

“You say it is a stigma against us that our ancestors crucified Jesus. I do not know whether that actually happened; but I consider it possible. I consider it just as possible as that the Indian people under different circumstances should condemn you to death—if your teachings were more strictly opposed to their own tendencies (India, you say, is by nature non-violent). Not infrequently do nations swallow up the greatness to which they have given birth. How can one assert, without contradiction, that such action constitutes a stigma! I should not deny, however, that although I should not have been among the crucifiers of Jesus, I should also not have been among his supporters. For I cannot help withstanding evil when I see that it is about to destroy the good. I am forced to withstand the evil in the world, just as the evil within myself.”

Buber now raises the age-long question of non-violence and the *Bhagavad-Gita*, and questions the truth of Gandhi’s statement about India

## GANDHI MARG

being "by nature non-violent". No less than any other country in the world, India was the scene of many a fierce and cruel battle, of murder and bloodshed. Its sacred scriptures, especially the Mahabharata, abound in odes to warlike courage and force.

As we have seen, Buber's fundamental standpoint is not that of a pacifist. To the present day he is fighting for peace between Jews and Arabs, yet to the present day he would maintain that evil must be withstood. "Resist ye not evil", so ardently proclaimed by Jesus, Tolstoy, Gandhi, is not acceptable to the Jewish philosopher who is the most sincere peace-lover among Jews in Israel or abroad.

Let us now dwell upon some points raised by J. L. Magnes in his letter to Gandhi in the same pamphlet. He was at that time Rector of the Hebrew University of Jerusalem.

"I would not wait for fellow Jews to join me in civil resistance, but would have confidence that in the end the rest are bound to follow my example.' But the question is how can Jews in Germany offer civil resistance? The slightest sign of resistance means killing or concentration camps or being done away with otherwise. It is usually in the dead of night that they are spirited away. No one, except their terrified families, is the wiser. It makes not even a ripple on the surface of German life. The streets are the same, business goes on as usual, the casual visitor sees nothing. Contrast this with a single hunger strike in an American or English prison and the public commotion that it arouses. Contrast this with one of your fasts, or with your salt march to the sea, or a visit to the viceroy, when the whole world is permitted to hang upon your words and be witness to your acts. Has not this been possible largely because, despite all the excesses of its imperialism, England is after all a democracy with a parliament and a considerable measure of free speech? I wonder if even you would find the way to public opinion in totalitarian Germany, where life is snuffed out like a candle, and no one sees or knows that the light is out. . . .

"If ever a people was a people of non-violence through century after century, it was the Jews. I think they need learn but little from anyone in faithfulness to their God and in their readiness to suffer while they sanctify His Name."

Magnes now refers to the agreement planned at that time between the Evian Refugee Committee and the German Nazi Government, by which the Nazis would let a limited number of Jews leave Germany annually, in exchange for which they will confiscate all German Jewish property!

## BUBER AND GANDHI

"Here is the dilemma", says Magnes. "If one does not subscribe, no Jews will be able to escape from this prison of torture called Germany. If one does subscribe, one will be cooperating with that Government, and be dealing in Jewish flesh and blood in a most modern and up-to-date slave market.

"I see before me here in Jerusalem a child who is happy now that he is away from the torment there, and his brother, or parent, or grand-parent. One of the oldest Jewish sayings is: 'Who saves a single soul in Israel is as if he had saved a whole world'. Not to save a living soul? And yet to cooperate with the powers of evil and darkness? Have you an answer?"

The rest of Magnes's objections and criticisms are similar to those of Buber's, and we shall refer the reader to Reference 2 for further reading.

For a long time Buber has understood this age as a time of crisis, and patiently yet unrelentingly indicated the chief symptoms and the major problems of this crisis, as well as some ways and hopes for recovery. Humanity is mentally diseased, and the true philosophers must be its doctors.

The fate of the Jewish people during the Second World War, no less than the War itself, is one of the worst horrors and severest symptoms of this century. Yet it may be beyond us to grasp this horror and its meaning in their entirety. It is by no means easy for any serious thinkers to face the peculiar aspect which the human condition has assumed in general, as well as in his particular case, owing to the various features of this fantastic and rapidly-changing age, of such contradictory and bewildering aspects.

Both Gandhi and Buber had to confront "the spirit of the age" as well as their own specific environment and circumstances, and the context of their own respective personal evolutions and problems.

Buber—a European, a Jew and a German, nourished on Jewish-German culture, on the Jewish religion and scriptures as well as the best of German philosophy. Gandhi—an Indian who had undergone many mental and emotional conflicts, of a basically moral and profoundly religious nature, and had evolved the non-violent philosophy and religious principles and faith which served as its basis. Both men, however, despite all their differences in mental structure, were deeply religious, each in his own way. Both must never be taken too lightly, and both were spiritual leaders of certain sections of their respective peoples—the Jewish and the Indian—although Buber's leadership was, statistically speaking, certainly

less powerful and influential than Gandhi's. The concrete circumstances in which each of them found himself, and the different emotional implications for either of them of the horrors in Germany and elsewhere, are not to be overlooked when thinking about this dispute. Buber had a great reverence for Gandhi, shared at that time by quite an international circle of thinkers, writers etc. Yet this reverence could not blind him to the discrepancy between what was actually happening and Gandhi's ideas about what was happening.

The problem has to be understood as twofold: First, *understanding* what is happening; secondly, drawing conclusions for action or inaction, based upon principles, comprehension and reflection. It is clear that Buber and Gandhi not only differed on the second issue, but also on the first. And it must be conceded that on the first Buber was better informed.

Gandhi's insufficient acquaintance with Jewish history and problems as well as the European (especially German) social, cultural and racial complexity was amply demonstrated in Buber's letter. Gandhi made statements on problems of violence and non-violence in all parts of the world at various times, always applying the same principles of non-violence as being the best way, practically and morally, of solving personal as well as political disputes and conflicts. Whether he always *understood* the situation properly is a different question. Facing a situation in reality is different from having to state one's mind about it, having only heard about it by writing or hearsay.

But what concerns us primarily is the approach to this specific Jewish problem in 1938 and later, having the bitter knowledge of what happened to Jews and non-Jews during the following years through violence, hatred, persecution, dictatorship and the horrors perpetrated by the Nazi regime. Let us not forget that Buber and Gandhi were not dealing with philosophers, but with Hitler's and Himmler's insane institutions, such as S.A., S.S., Gestapo, and blind racial doctrines and hatred. A veritable psychosis seizing millions of people, and then engulfing the whole world in an attempt to save the situation, through the death of many more millions on both sides.

This was a most serious and painful problem to face in 1938-39: a group of mentally diseased people attempting the extermination of millions of "racially inferior", "dirty and loathsome" Jews, engaged in its actual performance in Nazi concentration camps—one of the most devilish and Godless institutions of its kind in all history—and the principles of non-violence in Gandhi's India purporting to be applicable to all human situations. The dilemma of a peace-loving Jewish philosopher in Jerusalem could not be more agonising.

## BUBER AND GANDHI

While considering Buber's situation, let us also remember that his immigration to Palestine had been founded on a long quest for the solution of the Jewish problem in Europe, and in the whole world, and the evolution of his personal Zionism as an inner (as well as national) need. The arguments of his letter to Gandhi are merely the political, social and moral. Naturally enough, he did not speak of his own *personal* conflict in much detail.

We shall therefore not "draw conclusions" or "take sides" in this dispute. This article has been written for the sole purpose of stimulating Jews, Indians, and whoever is concerned with the fate of the human race, to think and reflect on these problems, read Buber's and Gandhi's writings on these issues, and thus try to understand what has happened to us, and what is still happening. Understanding is the primary necessary condition for partial or complete solution of human problems.

### *References*

1. M.K. Gandhi, *Non-Violence in Peace and War*, Navajivan Publishing House, Ahmedabad, Third Edition, 1948, Vol. I, Nos. 64, 66, 67, 70, 75, 77, Appendix V. (pp. 159-62, 165-8, 179-81, 200-201, 205-8, 440-5 respectively); Vol. II, No. 73, pp. 116-117, in the June 1960 Reprint.
2. Two Letters to Gandhi, from Martin Buber and J. L. Magnes, published by The Bond, Jerusalem, April 1939. (Rubin Mass).
3. A German edition of No. 2., "Vom Gestern Zum Morgen", Band 4, entitled "Mahatma Gandhi und Martin Buber—Juden, Palastina und Araber", Ed. Hans Lamm, Ner-Tamid-Verlag, Munchen, 1961.