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ABSTRACT

An outcry erupted shortly after the publication of Joseph J. Lelyveld’s biography *Great Soul: Mahatma Gandhi and His Struggle With India*. The book was banned in India prior to publication because Indian politicians felt the book described Mohandas Gandhi having a homosexual affair with a male friend, Hermann Kallenbach. This thesis explores the origin of this outcry. It then considers the historical and cultural contexts of Gandhi and Kallenbach’s friendship in order to assess the validity of a homosexual affair between the two men.
I. INTRODUCTION

Pulitzer Prize-winning journalist and former executive editor of the *New York Times*, Joseph J. Lelyveld, wrote a biography of Gandhi, *Great Soul: Mahatma Gandhi and His Struggle With India*. On the day of its official release, March 29, 2011, it was banned by a legislative vote in Gujarat, Gandhi’s home state in India. Narendra Modi, who was the leader of the legislative body and is the current Prime Minister of India, explained the decision:

The writing is perverse in nature. It has hurt the sentiments of those with capacity for sane and logical thinking. This attempt to defame Mahatma Gandhi by the publisher has come under severe criticism not only in Gujarat but from all corners of India. Mahatma Gandhi is an idol not only in India but in the entire world. While his life -- dedicated to the welfare of the mankind -- has been an inspiration, the author has hurt the sentiments of crores of people.¹

The ban was initiated by a belief that Lelyveld’s book postulated a sexual affair with a male associate, architect Hermann Kallenbach. Part of this perception claims that after leaving his wife Gandhi lived with Kallenbach for two years in South Africa.² Lelyveld responded to the outcry by Indian politicians by claiming the ban was based on reviews of the book, rather than the book itself. In defending his work, Lelyveld said that his book was “responsible,” “sensitive”, and “admiring of Gandhi and his struggle for social justice in India.”³ Lelyveld claimed he felt that his book was seen “as if it [was] some kind of sensationalist

---

pot boiler.” Lelyveld said in a later interview,

Now if you think love has to be sexual, love between two men can only exist if it's sexual, then I guess this was sexual, but if you look at what the two men actually said, and at their efforts in their time together to repress any hint of sexual urges, I think you'll find that at least I don't suggest that it was bisexual. The passages that I quote that so offend people can be found in Volume 96 of the collected works of Mahatma Gandhi printed by the government of India and they've been in the public domain since at least 1994.5

Lelyveld identified a review by British historian Andrew Roberts as the catalyst of the outcry in India. Roberts’s review was published in the Wall Street Journal three days prior to Great Soul’s release. Lelyveld said that Roberts “used some of the material in the book to trash Gandhi.”6 Roberts began his review with the claim that Lelyveld had provided enough information that the reader could discern that Gandhi was gay:

Joseph Lelyveld has written a generally admiring book about Mohandas Gandhi, the man credited with leading India to independence from Britain in 1947. Yet "Great Soul" also obligingly gives readers more than enough information to discern that he was a sexual weirdo, a political incompetent and a fanatical faddist—one who was often downright cruel to those around him.7

The objective of this study is to inquire into the validity of the accusation that Gandhi had a homosexual affair with Kallenbach. This accusation was reported in subsequent reviews and articles based on Lelyveld’s characterization of Gandhi’s friendship with Kallenbach and Roberts’s review of Great Soul. This study considers excerpts from Gandhi’s letters to Kallenbach mentioned in Lelyveld’s book that led Roberts and others to believe that Lelyveld was insinuating that the relationship between Gandhi and Kallenbach was of a

6 Ibid.
sexual nature. It also provides analysis of Gandhi’s letters and his close relationships. The thesis will show evidence that the media reports that Gandhi had a homosexual relationship with Kallenbach are based on both a misquotation of one of Gandhi’s letters and an interpretation of the relationship that ignores the personal, cultural, and historical context of their relationship.

Mohandas Karamchand Gandhi, often referred to as the Mahatma, or great soul, has become a symbol of peace and equality in western media. He is known for his leadership of non-violent satyagraha (soul force) campaigns to give Indians political equality in South Africa and later to release India from the British Empire in the first half of the twentieth century. Many people around the world associate concepts of unity and love with Gandhi, but fewer are aware of his life and work. Gandhi’s biographers often treat him in a hagiographical manner, focusing on his choices to not react to physical violence or his urging of Indian society to include every caste into the political process. More specific topics, such as Gandhi’s business relationships with industrialists like G.D. Birla, are often obscured in academia, thus reaching a very limited popular audience.

Popular views of Gandhi focus on his reputation as a peacemaker. In the western world as well as in India, Gandhi has become a pop culture symbol who reflects peaceful notions, which may or may not be connected to his life’s work or ideals he espoused. Historical memory of the facts of Gandhi’s leadership has faded, creating a romanticized popular culture image of Gandhi. Nearly seventy years after his assassination, Gandhi has become an enigmatic, mythologized, cultish figure. Quotes falsely attributed to Gandhi, such as “be the change you want to see in the world” adorn subculture-inspired Internet
memes that demonstrate the blurring of Gandhi’s image.\(^8\) These images contrast sharply to academic views.

Academic views of Gandhi are much more varied and nuanced. His historiography is massive and examines Gandhi from many different angles. Gandhian sexuality, Gandhi and his associates, and Gandhi in South Africa all have their own distinct literatures, among many other topics. Many of Gandhi’s biographies are hagiographical, such as Romain Rolland’s 1924 book, *Mahatma Gandhi*. Conversely, B.R. Nanda discusses such contemporary pundits in *Gandhi and His Critics*. Nanda describes British officials’ opinion that Gandhi’s fasting was “a thinly-disguised method of coercion.” This opinion was exemplified in political cartoons.\(^9\) Other critics included M.N. Roy, a founder of the Communist Party of India, who saw Gandhi’s political approach to independence to be too religious.\(^10\) Modern writers continue to offer both positive and negative reviews. Some analyses can be seen as passively critical, such as that portrayed in Lelyveld’s work regarding Gandhi’s relationship with Kallenbach.

Hermann Kallenbach was born into a wealthy German-Jewish family in eastern Germany, formerly Prussia. He was trained as an architect and moved to South Africa in 1896 to begin his career. He met Gandhi in 1903 and became involved in the Indian rights movement. It is during this political campaign that Lelyveld’s description of Gandhi and Kallenbach’s friendship takes place.

Lelyveld’s statements on Gandhi and Kallenbach’s friendship also echo several other critiques of Gandhi’s sexuality. Gandhi’s experiments involving sharing beds with

---


\(^10\) Ibid., 75.
young women in order to test his own will power and his views on rape are controversial. Regarding rape, some writers interpret Gandhi as believing that women who had been raped were worthless. These writers also think that Gandhi claimed that families who harmed their daughters who had been raped were justified in avenging the family’s honor. These views clash with some western ideas and are thus easy methods of attacking Gandhi. One historian, Roberts, is among those who have attacked Gandhi’s character.

Andrew Roberts’s views on Gandhi are made clear in his pre-release review of Great Soul. Roberts’s review was released three days prior to Great Soul and scathingly characterized Gandhi as a firebrand misanthrope. Negative words about Gandhi are sprinkled throughout Roberts’s other writings, not only in his review of Great Soul. In discussing his book, Masters and Commanders, Roberts includes a section on Winston Churchill blaming South African premier Jan Smuts for the satyagraha campaign in India. If Smuts had taken stronger action against Gandhi during his South Africa period, then perhaps Gandhi would not have gone on to be involved in more political resistance in India. In a separate incident, Churchill, lamenting the trouble with Gandhi in a statement to his cabinet, said “Gandhi should not be released on a mere threat of fasting. We should be rid of a bad man and an enemy of the Empire if he died.” Roberts allows his admiration of Churchill to dictate his views on other people, such as Gandhi. It is this kind of distorted academic perspective, published in popular presses, that makes such

---


negative images of Gandhi a problem.

Most recently, Ramachandra Guha has written that Lelyveld’s intimations are “a series of spectacular misreadings”, his interpretation “wrong-headed”, and “his research incomplete.” Guha builds on an academic legacy that acknowledges Kallenbach as a close friend of Gandhi and his family, but does not take seriously a sexual relationship between the two men. In fact, Guha derives much of his information on Gandhi and Kallenbach’s friendship from Shimon Lev’s 2010 Master’s dissertation at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem. One such piece of information claims that Lelyveld was a virgin throughout his friendship with Gandhi in South Africa.

Psychoanalyst Erik Erikson suggested in 1969 that Gandhi was bisexual; however, his construct of bisexuality was not that of being attracted to or engaging in sexual encounters with people of both sexes. Instead, Erikson asserted that India’s national identity possessed a nature of both genders. Gandhi, therefore, had to adopt the bisexual nature, or certain qualities of both genders, of India in order to become its leader. He did not adopt a sexually bisexual quality of engaging in sex with people of both sexes.

Martin Green posits a game Gandhi entertained between Kallenbach and another male friend, Henry Polak, both of whom wanted to be “closest” to Gandhi. Green analyzes the Gandhi-Kallenbach correspondence and makes the assertion that in Kallenbach, Polak, and other close friends, Gandhi was “indulging the desire, (in both

---

men) for what he elsewhere disapproved, as an “exclusive relationship.”

Green later describes an “exclusive relationship” as the bond between Gandhi and the person to whom he was the most close. Green acknowledges such a competition between Polak and Kallenbach, putting both men in object positions under Gandhi’s subject, but he never considers a sexual dynamic to the associations.

Thomas Weber does not give a definitive answer on how intimate Gandhi and Kallenbach were, but he insinuates that he agrees with James D. Hunt’s then-unpublished 1995 assessment that the two had a “homoerotic” rather than homosexual relationship. Hunt later claimed that the men had a complex relationship and that statements like “you have completely taken possession of my body” reflect a merging of the spiritual and physical.

James D. Hunt’s 1995 work was finally published in 2007, with collaboration from Surendra Bhana. Hunt and Bhana make references to sexuality, but only to say that Gandhi and Kallenbach’s discussions were “frank” and “something reserved for a close friend and confidante.” Hunt and Bhana conclude on sexuality by stating that Gandhi’s views on sex were extremely important to his character, and although his later life may muddle that view, during his time in South Africa, Gandhi maintained these views vehemently. Hunt and Bhana go on to make that point that Gandhi did not think that a person could successfully engage in public service, marriage, and sex. This view reflects the political power of brahmacharya on a practitioner’s life, which will be

17 Ibid., 180.
20 Ibid., 176.
21 Ibid., 176.
22 Ibid., 183.
discussed in Chapter Four. Throughout their article, Hunt and Bhana reiterate Gandhi’s resolve regarding celibacy.\(^2^3\)

Biographers closest to Kallenbach generally avoid discussing his sexuality. Dr. Isa Sarid, Kallenbach’s grandniece and former curator of the now-defunct Kallenbach Archive in Israel, and co-author Christian Bartlof consider the friendship but do not question sexuality in *Hermann Kallenbach: Mahatma Gandhi’s Friend in South Africa, A Concise Biography*. As a family member, it is difficult to assess Sarid’s objectivity. After her death in 2012, much of the Kallenbach Archive’s collection was sold to the Government of India.

Shimon Lev, writing after the controversy of *Great Soul*, acknowledges the suspicion but simply brushes over Lelvyeld’s work with the claim that the pair were soul mates and stating that he agrees with Hunt’s 1995 analysis.\(^2^4\) Lev’s book only slightly differs from Sarid and Bartlof’s. Both books examine Gandhi and Kallenbach through a Zionist lens. The majority of the two books examines their South Africa period and then explores the later disagreement on Zionism. In his acknowledgements, Lev mentions Sarid gave him free access to the Kallenbach Archives and offered him a place to stay while doing his research. It is clear that Sarid was deeply involved in Lev’s book, which may explain why *Soulmates* is so similar to *Hermann Kallenbach*. However, Lev’s book is academically insufficient.

As of September 2015, Lev is pursuing a doctoral degree analyzing the way India is perceived by the Jewish world. Some see him to be the world’s foremost scholar on the Gandhi-Kallenbach friendship. This perception is evident in the events surrounding the


opening of a monument of friendship in Lithuania. On October 2, 2015, a statue was unveiled in Rusne, the present-day name of the town in which Kallenbach was born. The Lithuanian ambassador to India, Laimonas Talat Kelpsa, invited Lev via e-mail to give a talk on Gandhi and Kallenbach’s friendship as a part of the event. It is reasonable to conclude that as such a highly esteemed scholar, his work should offer a deeper analysis of a controversy like the one generated by Lelyveld. *Soulmates* was published in 2012. It was long enough after the outcry in India regarding *Great Soul* that Lev had time to mention it and take a position within the debate. However, Lev does not offer any clarity beyond the explanation each man’s vow of celibacy would have impeded any sexual contact between Gandhi and Kallenbach.

To conclude on the existing literature of Gandhi and Kallenbach’s association, scholars have fed into popular images with confusing academic language. Erikson’s “bisexual” Gandhi, Green’s “exclusive relationship”, and Hunt and Bhana’s “merging of the physical and spiritual” all mean different things in lay terminology than they do in academic writing. This linguistic disconnect means that predatory writers like Lelyveld can misrepresent a situation to a popular audience with ease.

In addition to a communication breakdown, literature on Kallenbach as an individual treats him much like the literature on he and Gandhi. In fact, it is fair to say that given this treatment, there is no literature on Kallenbach as an individual; rather, Kallenbach only exists within Gandhi’s context. Authors of Kallenbach write about his contributions to nation-building processes in South Africa and Israel, although his

---


biographers typically make his interactions with Gandhi a significant, if not the primary, focus. Even his chief biographer, his grandniece Isa Sarid, focuses on his interactions with Gandhi in *Hermann Kallenbach*. Of the ten chapters in the book, four focus on his Gandhian experiences in South Africa and many of the following six consider their disagreements on Zionism.

Kallenbach and his architectural colleagues designed many important buildings in Johannesburg, making significant marks on the city and contributing to the growing national identity of South Africa. He also became an important figure in South African society. Mike Alfred discusses Kallenbach’s life in *Johannesburg Portraits: From Lionel Phillips to Sibongile Khumalo*. Alfred describes Kallenbach’s architectural pursuits, but not without splitting the chapter on Kallenbach with Gandhi. According to Alfred, as of 1904, Kallenbach’s prestige as an architect had grown so much that his office was in a building he designed, the Starcke Building on the intersection of Joubert and Commissioner streets. Kallenbach also designed two “strikingly handsome” Dutch Reformed churches, one of which became a national monument. A road in the Linksfield Ridge area of Johannesburg bears Kallenbach’s name.27

Another Johannesburg writer, Clive Chipkin, describes Kallenbach’s firm, Kallenbach & Kennedy, as an incubator for young South African architects.28 Kallenbach & Kennedy, which was renamed Kallenbach, Kennedy, & Furner, was a major player in

---

Johannesburg’s growth and image as an international city. They became a powerhouse in the 1930s when they were able to satisfy a demand for buildings that were reminiscent of those in New York City. The firm even took their work to Durban and Cape Town, giving them national influence through the 1940s. Kallenbach provided many of the visual, physical symbols that contributed to South Africa’s identity.

Despite his significance in South Africa, Kallenbach is continually objectified under Gandhi’s subjective status. He is never given credit as “architect extraordinaire” or titled with accolades of his own. He is portrayed as Gandhi’s “right hand man”, his “soulmate”, or his financier. Authors characterize Kallenbach as a “seeker,” based on his collection of many faith’s documents. It is ironic that Kallenbach, a person who left behind so many pieces of physical evidence of his influence, became placed under the shadow of Gandhi, a person whose influence lay in more abstract, intangible realms. This makes for a distorted narrative that many have used to describe their friendship.

The typical narrative of Gandhi and Kallenbach’s friendship gives the impression of a wayward, powerless, passive Kallenbach, juxtaposed against Gandhi’s powerful, confident knowledge. This lack of a strong individual narrative makes Kallenbach an easy target for Gandhian rumors and other misinformation. Scholarly misunderstanding has led to Kallenbach becoming a tool for Gandhi’s detractors to use as a method of attack on Gandhi’s character, as can be interpreted in the way Lelyveld portrays him in Great Soul. Despite his high European social status, Kallenbach becomes the subaltern to Gandhi’s hegemonic presence in their discourse. One of the goals of this thesis is to give

29 Chipkin, Johannesburg Style, 146-150.
31 Ibid., 46.
Kallenbach a voice.\textsuperscript{32}

This work engages in several significant conversations that define Gandhi and Kallenbach’s friendship. It is important because it is the first to posit its central questions around Gandhi and Kallenbach’s sexuality. This thesis considers not only Gandhi’s personal convictions, but also the status of homosexuality in the British Empire at the time, as well as cultural aspects impacting both Gandhi and Kallenbach. It also considers Kallenbach as his own force, rather than Gandhi as the dominator.

Chapter One includes short survey of the history of interaction between Gandhi and Kallenbach using largely secondary sources. It describes and critiques the standard narrative promulgated by scholars. It is here that the necessity for a rewriting of the Kallenbach narrative becomes evident. Chapter Two is a description Lelyveld’s thesis and the reactions it produced. This chapter is important in that it outlines the negative reactions that embody why Lelyveld’s description is a problem.

Chapter Three considers homosexuality in the British Empire during the late Victorian era. It uses biographical, autobiographical, and legal documents to demonstrate that despite sex between men being illegal, men under the jurisdiction of the United Kingdom could engage in sex with other men without legal repercussion unless they did something else to offend Britons who held political power. Gandhi was a significant agitator to the British Empire; therefore, if the rumors describing an affair between Gandhi and Kallenbach were real, it is likely that imperial forces would have interfered and official evidence would have been produced.

Chapter Four examines the intangible social forces that shape attitudes about

sexuality. It examines British, Indian, and German cultural and religious influences on male relationships. It also considers ethics stemming from Gandhi and Kallenbach’s philosophical motivations. Another Gandhian disciple, Madeleine Slade, is introduced as a comparative case. Slade is among those Europeans of whom a sexual dynamic with Gandhi has been questioned. Her interaction with Gandhi, twenty years after Kallenbach’s, offers valuable insight regarding Gandhi’s friendships with his followers and shows that Gandhi’s sentiments toward Kallenbach were not unique to their friendship, nor time period.

Chapter Five is about writing. It examines Lelyveld’s account of Gandhi and Kallenbach’s friendship in *Great Soul*. Lelyveld’s evidence consisted of letters Gandhi wrote to Kallenbach. This chapter examines the original letters and compares them to Lelyveld’s presentation of them. It also considers the institution of Victorian letter writing and biography in order to glean information about the social trends visible in Gandhi’s writing. Chapter Six utilizes sociological models of male relationships. It examines several models of relationships, including several varieties of platonic friendship as well as male sexual models. This chapter also contains the conclusion to this study.

This study is necessary and important because it highlights the detachment between academic and popular opinion. Furthermore, while Gandhi was a great soul in many respects, some writers have ascribed too much glory and not enough critique. This admiration has allowed him to overshadow other people involved in his movements, such as Kallenbach and Madeleine Slade. This work will offer more credence to Kallenbach and Slade’s influences on the world.
This study argues that cultures converged in Victorian-era South Africa. Thus, spaces were created from which new cultures and identities emerged. The sites in which Gandhi and Kallenbach interacted were among those cosmopolitan areas. There, a new identity and culture developed around the *satyagraha* campaign, which took on Indian, South African, British, and German qualities. This culture espoused minimal sexualities between traditional heterosexual couples and was so opposed to male homosexual relations that it did not acknowledge them. Thus, evidence indicates that Gandhi and Kallenbach did not have a sexual component to their relationship. They had a close friendship that existed within the acceptable trends created by this new culture.
Mohandas Gandhi and Hermann Kallenbach first encountered each other in South Africa, then a part of the British Empire, in 1903. To understand their friendship it is necessary to understand the historical context from which their friendship arose. Lelyveld’s account of Gandhi and Kallenbach’s friendship in *Great Soul* reflects a lack of historical context. This chapter will provide an analysis of the relationship of the two men within the wider contexts of the British Empire and Victorian society and more specifically will consider the development of the relationship within colonial South Africa. This chapter also explores the interaction of British officials, European and Asian settlers, and indigenous peoples in the United Kingdom, British India, and South Africa, which established the political structure that brought Gandhi and Kallenbach together. It goes on to provide the facts of Gandhi and Kallenbach’s friendship in South Africa from 1903-1914, followed by the standard narrative of the friendship scholars often use to frame their accounts. Gandhi and Kallenbach’s friendship was set during the Victorian era and was thus subject to its social forces.

The Victorian era began in England when Queen Victoria ascended to the British throne in 1837 and lasted until after her death in 1901. The era is noted for its relative peace, economic prosperity, and cultural refinement that stretched from the British Empire to other western societies, including those in continental Europe and the United States. As the British Empire reached its pinnacle during the late-nineteenth century, its most valued colonial holdings were India and the locales, including Natal, Transvaal, and Cape Colony, which became the Union of South Africa in 1910. India, whose splendor
lied in its cotton, silks, tea, dyes, opium, and other raw materials, was rivaled only by the South African gold industry, and after 1866, diamond mining. British mining companies initially used native African labor in the mines. However, British mining companies could not meet their labor demands only using Africans. Thus, the British mining industry began importing indentured laborers from India in the late 1870s. An increasing Indian laborer population in Natal, an eastern colony in South Africa, led to the necessity for other industries in order to support the Indian community. Gandhi went to South Africa as a lawyer to support the Indian community, but stayed much longer than intended in order to help the community in myriad other ways.

Mohandas Gandhi was born in Gujarat, a province of British India, in 1869. He attended barrister training in England between 1888-1891. During his time in England, Gandhi was introduced to a variety of Victorian English cultural trends and was influenced by European writings that would provide the basis for his future ethics. The rise of the Social Purity campaign in the late nineteenth century was been visible to the young, impressionable Gandhi. Social Purity campaigners sought to banish sexual activity that did not fit in with what was seen as morally Christian. This perspective led to certain views and trends that can be seen in Gandhi’s life regarding sex and the relations between the sexes. Letter writing was a cultural institution in which Gandhi became involved and adopted many styles. Also, he learned about vegetarianism and other ethics that guided his life, as discussed in Chapter Four. Gandhi was a product of the Victorian era in that he thought he could refine his life and community in order to reach his ideals of perfection. His time in England was extremely influential on his life. After becoming certified to practice British law, he returned to India.
Many Indians were taken to British South Africa as indentured laborers. After they completed their indentures, many chose to stay in cities, such as Durban, and formed Indian communities. These communities began to interact with neighboring European communities. These exchanges led to the necessity for legal services for Indian population. In 1894, a young Gandhi went to South Africa to represent a Gujarati-speaking client who needed help making a legal dispute against an English speaker. Gandhi intended to stay for one year to complete the case. Gandhi became very sympathetic and protective toward the Indian community early in his time in South Africa and stayed there much longer than his intended one-year period. He was involved in the community’s struggle for civil rights and embarked on many endeavors to support it. He became a significant figure in Indian political rights.

Gandhi’s first political move was the co-founding of the Natal Indian Congress (NIC) in 1894, for which he served as the organization’s first secretary. The NIC’s aim was to end discrimination against Indians in South Africa. Their main method of communication was through a newspaper, *Indian Opinion*, founded in 1903, to which Gandhi frequently contributed. *Indian Opinion* eventually came to be housed and published from the Phoenix Settlement, Gandhi’s first ashram. Among the *satyagrahis* involved in the Phoenix Settlement was Hermann Kallenbach. As their friendship grew closer, Kallenbach became one of Gandhi’s primary allies in his South African struggle and was involved in both the NIC and *Indian Opinion*.

Kallenbach arrived in South Africa in 1896 to pursue a career as an architect with his uncles who had formed a company in Johannesburg several years prior.33 He grew up
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in a middle-class, German-Jewish family in eastern Germany, formerly Prussia. Germany was united in the year of his birth and he experienced both German and Prussian influences. Throughout his schooling he enjoyed sports and was trained in masonry, carpentry, and architecture. Isa Sarid, Kallenbach’s granddaughter, conveys a sense of obedience demanded by her granduncle. Kallenbach fulfilled one year of compulsory military service in the German military, which demanded a particular work ethic and obedience that he later demonstrated in the fight for Indian rights in South Africa.

The beginning of Gandhi and Kallenbach’s association was the introduction by a mutual friend and businessman, Mr. R.K. Khan, in 1903. Their friendship immediately became close and productive. They shared many interests, including philosophy, religion, and ethics. Kallenbach was interested in Buddhism and Gandhi had studied it extensively along with Christianity and Hinduism. Both men were interested in the philosophies of John Ruskin and Leo Tolstoy. Tolstoy’s The Kingdom of God is Within You was particularly influential for Gandhi, as it describes the practice of non-violence, per the example of Jesus Christ. John Ruskin’s critique of the effects of modernization on the environment also influenced Gandhi’s methods. Gandhi began forming his principle of satyagraha, or soul force, during this time. Satyagraha highlighted the active force in choosing not to react, rather than the passivity of accepting any treatment. Gandhi and Kallenbach’s friendship was developing during this time and Kallenbach was involved in the refinement of the principle of satyagraha. He was an important figure in the early satyagraha struggle.

The Phoenix Settlement was founded in 1904 in Durban and was based on Ruskin’s ideas. It was intended to be a site of agricultural production to provide revenue
for the newspaper *Indian Opinion*, as well as a headquarters for the publication.\textsuperscript{34} The methods used in agriculture were to have a minimal impact on the land and surrounding physical world. Phoenix allowed Gandhi and his followers to separate themselves from discriminatory governmental and financial institutions as well as exploitation they thought was introduced by capitalism. The *satyagrahis* built the settlement on their own, grew their own food and produced their own goods. Their interaction with exploitative South African institutions was as limited as it could be for their survival.

Gandhi and Kallenbach’s political activity reached a new level in 1906. This was the year that *satyagraha* became an action and not just an idea. Gandhi tested the Transvaal Asiatic Registration Act, or Black Act, by refusing to register with the colony of Transvaal. The colony required each person above eight years old of “Asian” descent, including Chinese and Indians, to register with colonial officials. Gandhi did not carry the proper documentation and refused to be fingerprinted. He encouraged his followers to publicly burn their registration documents. After the Black Act was repealed and then re-implemented in 1908, Gandhi was persecuted and sent to jail for two months at Volksrust Prison.\textsuperscript{35}

Gandhi moved to the Kraal, Kallenbach’s home, in March of 1908. Their home was located in the Orchards, a suburb of Johannesburg. Gandhi had abandoned his law practice and his family was living at the Phoenix Settlement in Durban, more than 350 miles away from Johannesburg. Without professional or family distractions, they were able to dedicate their time to fulfilling their goals, one of which was a vow of *brahmacharya*. The vow was complementary to the implementation of *satyagraha*.

Brahmacharya is a vow taken that is intended to perfect one’s self-control via celibacy, thrift, and voluntary poverty; it will be explored in-depth in Chapter Four. Gandhi’s vision of the vow involved “control in thought, speech, and action in all senses.” Gandhi saw such self-control as instrumental in satyagraha, as he recommended it to his fellow satyagrahis, such as Kallenbach.

Gandhi dictated Hind Swaraj to Kallenbach in 1909. In Hind Swaraj, Gandhi critiqued various aspects of modernity, such as medicine and trains. Gandhi described the interference of man with nature, as demonstrated by the medicine trying to keep a sick patient alive. Man’s intervention could hide the acute symptoms of the disease and could even make it look like “all is well,” but it could not hide the underlying condition: that the consumptive was dying. This critique of man’s encroachment on and interference with nature and the ability to cover up negative effects demonstrates his scorn for modern conventions. Ruskin’s influence on Gandhi’s thinking is clearly displayed in Hind Swaraj. This book provides the philosophical basis upon which Gandhi’s next ashram, Tolstoy Farm, was established.

Gandhi and Kallenbach continued to live together privately until 1910 when they moved to Tolstoy Farm. Kallenbach purchased the land, which was to provide a place for the families of Gandhi’s followers to receive support while their family members were in jail serving time for their political acts. Meanwhile, being at Tolstoy helped remove them from discriminatory South African society and cultivated the principle of noncooperation. Indian relations seemed to improve when the Union of South Africa won its

independence from Great Britain in 1910. Jan Smuts, Minister of the Interior, reached an agreement with Gandhi that repealed the Black Act and would grant immigrating Indians legal equality. Unfortunately, their agreement did not become a reality. Instead, the Union government proposed three new pieces of discriminatory legislation that would be implemented in 1913. One of these would make any non-Christian marriage invalid, rendering non-Christian wives and children illegitimate. *Satyagraha* was re-enacted and, when pressure on the government was intensified by a strike of Indian mine workers and by criticism from the Viceroy of India, the proposed legislation was repealed.38

Gandhi and Kallenbach lived and struggled together until 1914. Gandhi felt that his work in South Africa came to a close in 1914 and decided to return to India. Gandhi sailed to England with his wife, Kasturba, and Kallenbach before going to India; however, Kallenbach did not leave England with them. World War I had commenced and anti-German sentiment was prevalent. Despite living peacefully in a British area for more than fifteen years, Kallenbach, a German citizen, was held in an internment camp on the Isle of Man until 1917. Gandhi, meanwhile, began his campaign for Indian independence. The pair continued communication, but Kallenbach returned to South Africa after being released and continued his architecture practice. After that, their friendship was limited. An affectionate, but still distant, tone is evident in their letters written after 1914.

Later in his life, Kallenbach’s contributions to the Zionist movement became his pride. He took the Hebrew name “Chaim”, or “life”, in the 1930s. The leaders of the Zionist movement asked Kallenbach to travel to India in 1937 in order to gain Gandhi’s support for the establishment of Israel. Kallenbach also intended to persuade Gandhi to

reconsider his urging of the Jews in Europe to resist Hitler passively. Kallenbach went to India for three weeks and expressed that upon being reunited with Gandhi, the twenty-three year absence seemed to not exist. While Gandhi’s impressions of the meeting are unknown, a photograph from 1937 shows the two men smiling together. Although the available records indicate they enjoyed their time together, Gandhi did not alter his policy.

In November 1938, Gandhi published an article called “The Jews.” The article came in the wake of the growing Arab-Jewish conflict in Palestine, the rise of Hitler and the Nazi Party in Germany, and the pressure upon him from Kallenbach to support Jewish efforts. Gandhi expressed that, although Jews had his sympathies, in these conflicts, he was opposed to their efforts. He believed the land upon which Palestine existed belonged to the Arab population. Furthermore, he suggested the Jews of Germany merely resist Hitler’s violence and stand their ground. At best, Gandhi offered to be a mediator between the Arabs and Jews. Upon publication of “The Jews”, Kallenbach swiftly embarked on a second trip to India in order to persuade him to the Jewish side. Unfortunately, he contracted malaria during the 1939 visit to India and died of residual health complications in 1945. Gandhi continued his struggle in India and in 1947, he finally achieve his life’s work.

India achieved its independence from Great Britain August of 1947. British India was carved into the Dominion of India, with a primarily Hindu population, and the
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Dominion of Pakistan, a majority-Muslim area. This division is known as the partition of India. Violence between members of the two religious groups broke out, leading to suggestions of relocating refugees and other ways to divide the resources among the new nations. Gandhi opposed the partition, as it conflicted with his views on Indian unity. Because of this position, Hindu nationalist Nathuram Godse saw Gandhi as favoring Muslims over Hindus. Godse shot Gandhi in the chest three times on January 30, 1948, ending Gandhi’s life.

The assassination of Gandhi marked the beginning of scholarly inquiry into his life and work. Writers began creating biographies as early as the 1920s, but comprehensive accounts could now be conceived. The body of literature on Gandhi is massive and, as previously discussed, ranges from very specific academic topics to popular mythology. Among the specific academic work is Gandhi’s friendship with Hermann Kallenbach. This body is literature is relatively small and each work follows a similar pattern.

The Gandhi-Kallenbach narrative begins when Gandhi was in the early stages of the Indian rights movement by serving in the Boer War in Natal at the start of the twentieth century. Despite his aversion to violence, Gandhi felt that by aiding the British in the Boer War, he could demonstrate that Indians were worthy of political rights. After being introduced by Mr. Khan, Kallenbach was fascinated by Gandhi and by 1906 joined Gandhi’s movement, extending it from Natal to Johannesburg. Kallenbach absorbed Gandhi’s other notable qualities, such as his vow of *brahmacharya*, “simple” lifestyle, and vegetarianism, while distancing himself from his earlier life. The two men
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then co-habited in Kallenbach’s mansions while Gandhi’s wife and children remained in poverty-like conditions at his ashrams, funded by Kallenbach.

The standard narrative then explains that Kallenbach’s enthusiasm for Gandhi’s movement was exemplified by his purchase of the land that became Tolstoy Farm. His dedication was further demonstrated in his political resistance, leading to time in jail. The pair’s separation was brought by the outbreak of World War I and Kallenbach’s internment. After the war, Kallenbach returned to South Africa, returned to his upper-middle class lifestyle, architecture practice, and realized his Zionist views. Gandhi would become known as the Father of India.

In conclusion, this narrative portrays Kallenbach as a passive, blind follower of Gandhi. It crushes Kallenbach as a subaltern character under Gandhi’s hegemonic, hagiographical weight. This dynamic is traditionally seen with the European as the dominant party and the non-European as the passive person. Edward Said described this dynamic in *Orientalism*. He asserts that during the colonial era, Europeans saw the eastern part of the world, or the Orient, through a European-biased lens. Rather than seeing the world east of Europe in an open-minded, perhaps more realistic basis, Europeans saw what they wanted to see and interacted with “orientals” as such.\(^{44}\) Said’s framework became the foundation of the school of Postcolonial Studies, also known as Subaltern Studies. This school of thought seeks to reverse the hegemonic dynamic and tell the stories of postcolonial peoples from their own perspectives. Making Gandhi the dominant party in the Gandhi-Kallenbach dynamic serves to give Gandhi his own voice, but the standard narrative involving Kallenbach goes too far. The narrative makes Gandhi

so dominant and Kallenbach so passive that it mirrors orientalism and creates a hagiographical picture of Gandhi that is devoid of appropriate historical and cultural context, opening the door to misinterpretation of the relationship, as seen in Great Soul. It is one of the goals of this work to rewrite the Gandhi-Kallenbach narrative in order to make Kallenbach a more equal character in this tale.
III. LEYVELD’S THESIS AND REACTIONS TO IT

Joseph J. Lelyveld’s construction of Mohandas Gandhi and Hermann Kallenbach’s association in *Great Soul* emphasizes certain aspects of the relationship between the two men, while omitting other significant details. This construction created a space in which inventive conclusions were drawn. These conclusions inspired an outrage among various interests related to Gandhi. The text of *Great Soul* on its own was not enough to warrant an extensive academic study, but the reactions to *Great Soul* and later fictional accounts demonstrate that certain misinterpretations injure Gandhi’s image and legacy. This chapter provides prime examples of Lelyveld’s construction in *Great Soul*, the reactions to it, and considers critiques of Lelyveld’s other work. The goal of this chapter is to introduce the provocative text in *Great Soul*, the reactions to the text, and to consider trends in Lelyveld’s writing.

Lelyveld’s construction of Gandhi and Kallenbach’s friendship hinges on a letter written by Gandhi to Kallenbach on September 24, 1909. The original text of the letter, provided by the *Collected Works of Mahatma Gandhi*, is as follows:

Your portrait (the only one) stands on my mantelpiece in the bedroom. The mantelpiece is opposite to the bed. The eternal toothpick is there. The corns, cottonwool, and Vaseline are a constant reminder. The pen I use (you see the pencil has disappeared) in each letter it traces makes me think of you. If, therefore, I wanted to dismiss you from my thoughts, I could not do it. My nose—well it won’t stop its action. Each time I blow it I take out my ‘kerchief (is the’ kerchief mine except by appropriation!) and say’ no, I must not use a torn envelope if I am in the office and I must not settle the dust on the road as Polak would say because you would not like it.’ Yes, I have never departed from the contract. The result is I use a’ kerchief per day. That however is in passing. The point to illustrate is to show to you and me how completely you have taken possession of my body. This is slavery with a vengeance. But then the reward, what is it to be?

The unwritten contract is you take the body and give the mind by way of
study. You cannot take ‘no’ for an answer from yourself.\textsuperscript{45}

Gandhi wrote the letter to Kallenbach during a several-month stay in the United Kingdom to lobby for Indian political equality in South Africa. By that point, Gandhi and Kallenbach had spent several years together in their political struggle. They lived and fought together, meaning they shared a large amount of time. Gandhi’s journey was the first time the two had spent that long a time apart. Gandhi tells his friend that his portrait stands alone of the mantelpiece and then describes aspects of hygiene. Gandhi and Kallenbach’s interactions emphasized certain hygienic practices. Gandhi makes references to toothpicks, which promoted dental health. He goes on to mention corns, cotton, and Vaseline, for the comfort of the skin on their feet, which was important as they walked very far distances. He then mentions his running nose, which he considers wiping with a handkerchief, but opts for the more frugal option of using a piece of scrap paper. Gandhi then describes that Kallenbach had “taken possession” of his body, which indicated Gandhi’s debate between using certain luxuries, such as a handkerchief, or a less wasteful piece of paper. This letter demonstrates Gandhi missing his close friend, whom had become family. It describes Gandhi’s open, clear love for his friend Kallenbach, but it does not include or in any way imply physically intimate activities between the two men. Lelyveld’s presentation of the letter is as follows:

\begin{quote}
If not infatuated, Gandhi was clearly drawn to the architect. In a letter from London in 1909, he writes: “Your portrait (the only one) stands on my mantelpiece in the bedroom. The mantelpiece is opposite to the bed.” Cotton wool and Vaseline, he then says, “are a constant reminder.” The point, he goes on, “is to show to you and how completely you have taken possession of my body. This is slavery with a vengeance.” What are we to make of the word “possession” or the reference to petroleum jelly, then as
\end{quote}

now a salve with many commonplace uses? The most plausible guesses are that the Vaseline in the London hotel room may have to do with enemas, to which he regularly resorted, or may in some other way foreshadow geriatric Gandhi’s enthusiasm for massage, which would become a widely known part of the daily routine in his Indian ashrams, arousing gossip that has never quite died down, once it became clear that he mostly relied on the women in his entourage for its administration.  

Lelyveld omits very important pieces of the original letter and adds comments, which open the door for speculation. He begins by describing Gandhi as “infatuated” with Kallenbach. Infatuation is a word that explicitly includes a sexual tone to the desire it describes. He then goes on to splice an important word, “corns” from the sentence involving cotton and Vaseline. Cotton and Vaseline on their own can be interpreted as referring to many different activities, some involving homosexual sex. However, including the word “corns” makes it clear that Gandhi’s use of the two products were intended to improve the health of the skin on his feet. Lelyveld’s splicing of several other important sentences, such as the reference to Gandhi’s running nose and his choices between luxury and frugality, removes important pieces of the letter that clarify its context and meaning. Instead of exploring those pieces of context, such as the references to corns, Lelyveld makes references to enemas and Gandhi’s controversial relationships with the women at his ashrams. Lelyveld’s omissions are dishonest. These omissions, combined with the alternative explanations, demonstrate the sensationalist perspective Lelyveld applies to Gandhi and Kallenbach’s friendship.

Lelyveld’s sensationalized construction of Gandhi and Kallenbach’s friendship was published in *Great Soul* on March 29, 2011. Prior to and following its publication, writers around the world responded to Lelyveld’s version of Gandhi in a multitude of

---
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ways. While a lack of attention may have allowed Lelyveld’s representation to be swept under the rug, the variety of responses necessitates a larger discussion.

Lelyveld’s construction solicits a variety of responses, some critical, some flippant. On March 26, 2011, the Wall Street Journal published a review of Great Soul by revisionist historian Andrew Roberts. Roberts’s review portrays a Gandhi that was the opposite of the mythological, romanticized Gandhi of popular culture. The review highlights the unsavory aspects of Gandhi that Roberts interpreted Great Soul as displaying and claims that the book “obligingly gives the readers more than enough information to discern that [Gandhi] was a sexual weirdo, a political incompetent, and a fanatical faddist – one who was downright cruel to those around him.” Roberts goes on to say that Gandhi claimed to love humanity but hated people as individuals. He criticizes what he sees as the hypocritical, hagiographical discourse of Gandhi as a “mortal demi-god” while pointing out Gandhi’s godless qualities, such as shameless self-promotion, causing more problems for India’s independence campaign than he solved, and racism.47 This scathing view of Gandhi may stem from Roberts’s appreciation for Winston Churchill. Churchill and Gandhi struggled to work together in a civil manner and Churchill made no secret of his distaste for Gandhi. Thus, biographers sympathetic to Churchill may be tempted to portray Gandhi negatively.

On March 27, 2011, the British publication Daily Mail published a review written by Daniel Bates. Bates’s article begins with “Mahatma Gandhi was bisexual and left his wife to live with a German-Jewish bodybuilder, a controversial biography has claimed.” Bates goes on to describe the dynamic portrayed by Lelyveld and refers to

47 Roberts, “Among the hagiographers”.

Gandhi’s wife, Kasturba, as his ex-wife. He claims that Lelyveld’s book “goes beyond the myth” to describe the Mahatma’s private life. Bates’s article is perhaps one of the most sensationalized responses to *Great Soul*. Rather than offering an explanation of why he sees Lelyveld as making these claims, Bates jumps to conclusions and says that Lelyveld labeled Gandhi as bisexual.

On March 29, the *Mumbai Mirror* reported that western reviewers “gleefully pounced upon these details which add juice to what is an otherwise unremarkable book. (One publisher in India turned it down because it was “”boring””).” The *Mirror* reported that in defense of his book, Lelyveld claimed that the word “bisexual” was nowhere in the text and that his goal for the book was to discuss Gandhi’s life in a “careful, responsible, and balanced way.” The article ends with a question of whether or not someone with such a high status in Indian imagination can be discussed in a balanced fashion at all, especially by revisionist biographers.

In the wake of pre-release reviews, newspapers across the world posed questions of Gandhi’s sexuality and interest in Hermann Kallenbach spiked. *Great Soul* introduced such controversial material that one state in India banned the book and other states were considering a ban, believing that it smeared the image of the father of their nation. *The Guardian* reported on March 30, that Gandhi’s home state of Gujarat had banned the book in response to the reviews written by Roberts, Bates, and the *Mumbai Mirror*, and
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that Maharashtra was considering doing so.\textsuperscript{50} Gujarat’s state assembly consisted of 182 members and was lead by future Prime Minister of India Narendra Modi of the Bharatiya Janata Party (BJP). Modi and the BJP are noteworthy for their social conservatism, which leans toward conservative Hindu nationalism, \textit{Hindutva}. Modi introduced the resolution to ban the book and the state assembly voted unanimously in favor. Homosexuality was illegal in India until 2009 and maintains a significant social bias. This means that even after homosexuality was decriminalized in India, 182 state leaders still voted to eradicate the book from their jurisdiction. Thus, the association of homosexuality with the Father of India was met with great disdain.

Satirical, tongue-in-cheek stories also appeared after the release of \textit{Great Soul}. On April 11, the \textit{New Yorker} published “I Was Gandhi’s Boyfriend.” Author Paul Rudnick began with “I know that some people still don’t buy that Gandhi was gay, but let me tell you, from experience, Gandhi liked guys.” This story is a prequel to Gandhi’s association with Kallenbach. It concludes when Gandhi ends his romantic relationship with the narrator and begins spending time with Kallenbach.\textsuperscript{51}

In “Gandhi’s Boyfriend,” Gandhi and the male narrator, Kelly, interact in a manner in which Gandhi is the dominator. While obviously a satire, the story mimics the negative personality traits attributed to Gandhi in reviews that critique Gandhi’s personal interactions, such as Roberts’s. This fictional Gandhi objectifies and belittles Kelly, as seen when he tells Kelly “you are so handsome when you are not speaking.” Gandhi goes on to make fun of Kelly’s feminine name. Kelly then questions Gandhi’s philosophy of


non-violence. Kelly says that if someone punched him that he would throw his drink at the person and suggests Gandhi try that with the British. Gandhi sarcastically responds, “You are so very wise, perhaps you should spell your name Kellhi.” These attacks on Kelly’s personality suggest a disdain for Kelly as an individual, as proposed by Roberts when he claims Gandhi hated individual people. The perpetuation of such qualities in publications like the New Yorker creates a problem because of its personal attack of Gandhi. This account vilifies Gandhi, turning him into a flat, monolithic character. Great Soul’s controversy persisted into the following years.

The Government of India suddenly purchased a collection of Gandhi and Kallenbach’s personal correspondence on July 10, 2012. With the purchase, Sotheby’s auction house canceled the auction of the correspondence, which was to take place the following week. The purchase added fuel to the ominous Gandhi-Kallenbach fire, leading to suspicion about why the Indian government was eager to acquire these documents in the wake of Great Soul. Was the Indian government trying to hide something about its beloved Mahatma? Historian Ramachandra Guha allegedly viewed the letters before their auction and said that they were not useful for determining the level of intimacy between Gandhi and Kallenbach. Despite Guha’s clarification, questions regarding intimacy between Gandhi and Kallenbach persisted.

In “Was Gandhi gay? Intimate letters go on display in India,” the Telegraph and

---
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other news outlets furthered speculation of Gandhi and Kallenbach through 2013. The *Telegraph* reported that although the correspondence was put on display at the National Archives of India in January 2013, those looking for answers in the letters were “disappointed,” as only a sample of the collection was on display. Mushirul Hasan, former Director-General of the National Archives of India, denied picking and choosing which letters to display in order to maintain Gandhi’s hagiographical image in India.56

These reactions respond to the sensational aspects of Lelyveld’s representation of Gandhi. Sensationalist media focuses on those aspects of a situation that will arouse the most public attention, typically at the expense of accuracy. This type of media often focuses on sexual qualities of its objects. The 1970s sexual revolution opened the topic of sexuality to public discussion and ushered in an era of sexual permissiveness that facilitates sensationalist media. But this open sexuality produced hyper-sexed cultures that see sex where it is not, thus, sensational accusations of sexual impropriety are common. Therefore, the hyper-sexed culture in the West and the conservative treatment of sexuality in India are the cultural contexts that explain reactions to *Great Soul*. “I Was Gandhi’s Boyfriend” demonstrates the reactions of the West and the ban of *Great Soul* embodies the reaction in India. Lelyveld omitted important context and added provocative comments in his description Gandhi and Kallenbach’s friendship, and opened the door to a sensationalized, sexualized version of the two men’s shared history. Furthermore, Lelyveld’s denial of his role in these conclusions and his insistence that he never uses the word “bisexual” attracts more attention to *Great Soul.*

56 “Was Gandhi gay? Intimate letters go on display in India” The Telegraph, January 30, 2013, accessed April 25, 2013, http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/asia/india/9836759/Was-Gandhi-gay-Intimate-letters-go-on-display-in-India.html; two more collections of Gandhi and Kallenbach’s correspondence have since been acquired by the National Archives.
Gandhi’s vow of *brahmacharya*, characterized by qualities of simplicity and voluntary celibacy, would have impeded any sexual experiences, even with himself. Cherry-picking sentences and omitting key words and contexts of Gandhi and Kallenbach’s letters reinforces Lelyveld’s construction. Lelyveld does not connect this to the larger context of the *brahmacharya* oath Gandhi took and the vow of celibacy Kallenbach accepted, despite mentioning their celibacy in *Great Soul*. Lelyveld’s description is nuanced enough that reactions are polarized. While the nuance is slight and dismissed as tabloid fodder by some parties, such as Ramachandra Guha, it is connected to sexuality strongly enough to evoke the strong reactions, such as those of the Gujarati and Maharashtrian Indian state governments. Lelyveld’s manner of reporting is not limited to *Great Soul*.

Lelyveld’s other work seems to have similar misinterpretations rooted in omissions of context as those displayed in *Great Soul*. Lelyveld’s 1985 book, *Move Your Shadow: South Africa, Black and White* won the 1986 Pulitzer prize in general non-fiction for its descriptions of South Africa during apartheid. Cherri Waters, who self-identified as a black American woman, claimed that Lelyveld’s description of apartheid was so powerful that it gave her nightmares that she was among black South Africans living under its tyranny. Despite his vivid descriptions, Waters is critical of Lelyveld’s ability to concoct a feasible solution to the apartheid problem. Waters also critiques Lelyveld’s ignorance of the context of such issues. She claims that he seemed to accept white rule and a passive black population, while ignoring major black resistance movements such as the United Democratic Front and minimizing the impact of groups
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57 *Brahmacharya* is discussed at length later in Chapter Four of this thesis.
such as the African National Congress. Waters makes the point that “Lelyveld seems to have been blind to the handwriting on the wall.”\textsuperscript{58} This diametrical comparison of strong versus weak is similar to his portrayal of a dominant Gandhi and passive Kallenbach. Omission of context is noted in other reviews, as well.\textsuperscript{59}

This media discussion of Gandhi, Kallenbach, and homosexuality has not been stifled by examination of their political struggle. In his response to \textit{Great Soul}, Gandhi historian Jad Adams angrily retorted that if Gandhi did have a gay affair, he would have left many pieces of evidence containing his shame.\textsuperscript{60} Thus, a broader discussion of Gandhi, Kallenbach and homosexuality is necessary. This thesis seeks to support and expand Adams’s assertion.

In conclusion, Lelyveld portrays a construct of Gandhi and Kallenbach’s friendship in \textit{Great Soul} that omits the appropriate historical and cultural context. If left alone, this account could have faded away without impact, but because of strong reactions by historians, governments, and journalists, a study of Gandhi, Kallenbach, and homosexuality is necessary.

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{58} Cherri Waters, “By any means necessary”, \textit{Christianity and Crisis} (June 16, 1986), 217-220.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
IV. HOW THE BRITISH EMPIRE ADDRESSED MALE SAME-SEX SEXUALITY AND WHAT THAT MEANT FOR GANDHI

The idea of a gay, bisexual, or sexually deviant Gandhi, while entertaining, must be given scholarly consideration. This chapter seeks to expel the cloud of mystery surrounding Gandhi and Kallenbach’s association by looking outside of the men’s friendship and examining the manner in which powerful Britons treated male same-sex sexuality. The peak of Gandhi and Kallenbach’s friendship occurred in South Africa. This thesis must consider conditions in Great Britain and how those conditions affected people throughout the British Empire. Given that Gandhi and Kallenbach were two public figures in South Africa, it can be expected that their sex lives were somewhat public and thus would encounter imperial scrutiny. This chapter examines cases of male same-sex sexuality from the passage of the Criminal Law Amendment Act of 1885, through the beginning of World War I in 1914.\[^{61}\]

The objective of this chapter is to paint a picture of what a male public figure that engaged in sex with other men might experience during Gandhi and Kallenbach’s time. This chapter will summarize British law regarding male-male sexuality and then examines how it was or was not applied, based on the social standings and actions of individuals. From this, it can be deduced that if Gandhi or Kallenbach were known to have engaged in homosexual activity, they may have had those kinds of experiences interacting with imperial forces.

This chapter argues that given the information available about the manner in which male same-sex sexuality was addressed by the authorities of the Empire, male

\[^{61}\] The CLA promoted the expansion of previous anti-homosexuality laws, which promoted the restriction of male sexuality under the blanket term “gross indecency.”
same-sex sexuality itself was not a problem. In other words, for men, same-sex sexuality was persecuted only if they did something else to offend the imperial rulers. This argument will be explored by examining the cases of John Maynard Keyes, Sir Roger Casement, Oscar Wilde, the men involved in the Cleveland Street Scandal, and the men involved in the 1907 investigation into unnatural vice among South African miners. Given his blatant provocation of imperial law and the subsequent consequences he faced, if there was any evidence of a homosexual affair between Gandhi and anyone else, the law enforcers of the Empire would have seized upon it and used it to bring about his demise. As seen in the case of Sir Roger Casement, the imperial enforcers sought and exploited any available evidence in order to bring down political opponents of the Empire. Gandhi was, most certainly, a political opponent; therefore, if any evidence had surfaced, he would not have reached the peaks of notoriety that fuel his present-day mythological status. A glimpse of Victorian social trends is useful in this consideration.

Philosopher and historian Michel Foucault notes in his “repressive hypothesis” that publicly, human sexuality was repressed in western cultures, especially in Victorian-era Europe. This repression was realized in the norm of social convention, which directed that sex was a realm exclusively reserved for men and their wives. Within this realm, sex with intended to serve only reproductive purposes, fueling capitalism by providing workers and breaking down social ties outside of the family. However, in practice, this framework was not rigidly followed, as seen in the “visible explosion of unorthodox sexualities…”62 This demonstrates that, while one version of sex was prescribed by the common public discourse, Victorians most certainly engaged in sexual activities outside
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Imperial historian Ronald Hyam asserts that the British Empire would not have risen to such greatness without the sexual opportunity presented by the distance put between colonizers and sexual trends at home. He bases this claim on the expansion and success of the Empire before 1880. After 1880, the rise of the Social Purity campaign led to the attitude that the success of the Empire was dependent upon sexual restraint. It is after the success of the campaign that the Empire declined and eventually disintegrated.\textsuperscript{63}

European colonizers left their homes and forged empire in search of adventure and fortune. Sexual adventure was indeed a part of that pursuit, although not the primary motivation.\textsuperscript{64} Hyam makes the point that when leaving home to go on these grand adventures, colonizers left the comfort and sexual restrictions of home; they left the “nasty, dirty, and coarse” British sex workers who offered limited sexual adventure.\textsuperscript{65} When arriving at the vast reaches of the Empire, they were welcomed with loneliness, heat, dirt, and lack of amusement and stimulus. But in that foreignness, they found relaxed inhibitions, professional, socially respected sex workers, more privacy, and greater opportunities. The rates of syphilis make it clear that these sexual adventures were, indeed, happening.\textsuperscript{66} Furthermore, Hyam indicates, “sex between men flourished in convict settlements,” such as Australia and “everywhere there was bisexual indulgence in same-sex solutions if opportunity presented itself.”\textsuperscript{67} The opportunity for same-sex sexuality was available for white men where it was permissible in the indigenous

\textsuperscript{63} Ronald Hyam, \textit{Empire & Sexuality: The British Experience} (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1990), 1.
\textsuperscript{64} Ibid., 2.
\textsuperscript{65} Ibid., 88-89.
\textsuperscript{66} Hyam, \textit{Empire & Sexuality}, 88-89.
\textsuperscript{67} Ibid., 101-110.
cultures.

This paper will not dive into the precarious conversation of the meaning of “homosexual” or “gay”. Such a discussion would detract from the larger goal of this work.68 Instead, the term “same-sex sexuality” signals the sexuality of humans of the same morphology and the term “gay” is avoided. As to what “sex” is, this study leaves it to the individuals to self-report having sexual experiences.

The sexuality of which this paper is concerned is that between individuals who were and are perceived by others as men. “Gay” and “homosexual” are modern terms and it is presentist and anachronistic to attribute such terms to these people acting between 1885-1914. Those terms represent identities. This incorporation of homosexuality into one’s identity is also a modern development and thus, inappropriate to apply to Gandhi, Kallenbach, and the rest of the men discussed in this chapter. One also must resist the use of the term “sodomite” because it is pejorative and the idea of a sodomite per the era was not always an accurate attribute to these men. These men sought to fulfill their natural, human desires fueled by their biology. They were not seeking to engage in behaviors in order to offend. Some were lonely men seeking companionship. Others sought thrill in the wide-open world of the Empire.

David Cannadine supports the premise that cultural and legal patterns were similar in the British home as well as the Empire in Ornamantalism. Despite the shortcomings of Ornamantalism regarding the underplaying of race conflicts, Cannadine
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demonstrates that British subjects saw their Empire abroad as they did at home, thus facilitating the transfer of culture and law from the Metropole to the Empire. Victorian-era cultural trends found in England, therefore, were exported out of the island and imported throughout the British Empire.

Britain has a long history of anti-homosexual policy. Regarding English and eventually British imperial law, certain activities between men were traditionally prohibited. Major examples include the punishment of hanging due to “buggery” established in 1533. The Offenses Against the Person Act in 1838 maintained the punishment of hanging if convicted of certain same-sex sexual offenses. Other European imperialists had policies regarding same-sex sexuality. Napoleon decriminalized male-male sexuality in the French Empire in 1811. Because they were an enemy of the British, male-male sex may have been intentionally contrasted from the French mode.

The Criminal Law Amendment Act of 1885 added “gross indecency” to the list of illegal activities in order to convict those for whom buggery was not provable. “Gross indecency” and “unnatural vice” thus became blanket terms for any activity involving two or more men engaging in physical activities of which the rule makers did not approve. Despite its illegality and social stigma, male-male sex still happened. Some people could get away with it while others could not. Individuals of elite standing in British society were more likely to be able to engage in such behaviors unscathed. Among the men who expressed their same-sex sexuality successfully was John Maynard Keynes.

Keynes was a prolific, highly influential economist in the first half of the
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twentieth century. Keynes was born to an upper-middle class family in Cambridge, England, in June 1883. His father was a professor at Cambridge University and his mother was a local social reformer. He was a bright student and excelled in mathematics and philosophy. He won a scholarship to the highly prestigious Eton College and began there in 1897. During Keynes’s years as a student at Eton, whose students were exclusively male, his sexual experiences were with his fellow male students. There is a long history of male same-sex experimentation in the United Kingdom’s all-male schools, which is not surprising as many male students were convened with limited female contact.\textsuperscript{70}

Young Keynes was not secretive about his liaisons in spite of the fact that such doings were not legal. In 1901 he began recording his sexual encounters in a diary. Among the first entries are encounters with Dillwyn Knox, future code breaker of the Zimmermann Telegram, in 1901, and Dan Macmillan, brother of future Prime Minister Harold “Supermac” Macmillan, in 1902.\textsuperscript{71} Keynes graduated from Eton and began his university studies at King’s College at Cambridge University in 1902. He became a member of the Bloomsbury Group, a group of friends whose ideas flaunted the Victorian attitudes of the time in terms of writing, art, sexuality, and philosophy. Other members included Virginia Woolf, E.M. Forster, Lytton Strachey, Duncan Grant, and Vanessa Bell.

Keynes recorded no more sexual experiences until 1906 when he reported encounters with writer Lytton Strachey, psychoanalyst James Strachey, and future Liberal politician Arthur Hobhouse. This same year he began his civil service career in the India
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Office and also began lecturing at Cambridge. He maintained affairs with the two
Stracheys in 1907 and continued them into 1908. He began an affair with painter Duncan
Grant that year. In 1909, Keynes did not record Lytton Strachey as a lover, but did list
actor St. George Nelson and had an encounter with a person he called “Stable boy of Park
Lane.”72 Keynes continued to have sexual experiences with other men, which he recorded
through 1915, amassing nearly thirty male lovers.73 Keynes began working at the British
Treasury in 1915, the same year his sex diaries cease. One may speculate that he stopped
recording his experiences because as an employee of the British Treasury, his morality
may have been under a higher level of scrutiny.

The details of his sexual encounters are uncertain until 1918, when he began to
associate with Russian ballerina Lydia Lopokova while she performed in England.74 In
1919 his lovers consisted of actor Gabriel Atkin and psychologist Sebastian Sprott. His
affair with Sprott lasted several years. They were very close and spent holidays in North
Africa together in 1921. Biographer D.E. Moggridge supposes that Sprott was Keynes’s
last male lover.75 Keynes and Lopokova married in 1925. She became pregnant in 1927
but suffered a miscarriage. While Keynes transitioned from one version of his sexuality
to the next, his career blossomed.

Keynes initially gained professional notoriety after his review of economics in
India. He later represented the British Treasury during the 1919 Versailles Peace
Conference. Keynes urged the allied powers to be lenient on the defeated Germany, but
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his suggestions were ignored. After the Allied powers, primarily the United Kingdom, France, Italy and the United States, dealt Germany its punishment, Keynes published *The Economic Consequences of the Peace*. In *The Economic Consequences*, Keynes foretold of Germany’s devastation by the Allies’ demands and the impending Second World War. After World War II, he was a significant force in the shaping of the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund. His ideas directed many of the world’s capitalist economies after the 1940s. The influence of his theories waned in the 1980s-2000s, but they made a major comeback after the Great Recession of 2007. *Bloomberg Businessweek* economics editor Peter Coy argues that in spite of the recommended fixes to mend the casualties of the 2007 global financial crisis, such as Greece and Portugal, policies that adhere even closers to Keynes’s principles are needed to solve the problems that still existed in 2014.

Keynes’s resurgence has brought attention not only to his theories, but also to his sexuality. At the Altegris Strategic Investment Conference in 2013, controversial historian Niall Ferguson commented that Keynes’s homosexuality had a significant impact on his economic theories; because Keynes was gay and had no children, his policies are beneficial in the short-term, rather than the long term, and thus were poor policies. Facing harsh criticism, Ferguson apologized on several instances.

Keynes is useful in the study of Gandhi’s sexuality because of their comparative qualities. The time period in question is the same, the first decade of the 1900s. Keynes
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existed in sexual worlds with both men and women. His many affairs were with men, but he ultimately married a woman. He often proclaimed love for his wife and she suffered a miscarriage in 1927, implying his sexual relationship with her. One may argue that being married legitimized Keynes’s sexuality; his marriage could demonstrate a change of heart for the better, according to British rule makers. Thus, one may use marriage to erase or otherwise right the wrongs of his sordid past. Marriage could also be seen as a rebirth or baptism, if given a religious perspective; however, as seen in the case of Oscar Wilde, marriage to a woman did not alleviate the pressure created by sex with men. Lelyveld’s version of bisexual Gandhi would have lived in sexual worlds with both men and women. Being married to a woman would not have made hypothetical bisexual Gandhi immune to persecution. The unsavory aspects of his life would have been exposed and used against him. Luckily, for the satyagraha struggle and India’s future, this Gandhi did not exist.

No record of Keynes suffering legal persecution for his sexuality during his lifetime has been discovered, despite his own accounts of having over thirty recorded male lovers. His example provides evidence for two arguments. The first argument supposes that same-sex sexuality was not a problem until it became a problem. Keynes was cherished and celebrated by the British Empire during his life, despite his homosexual experiences. Few of his male lovers suffered any legal persecution for their activities, as well. Furthermore, he was born into the upper-middle class of British society and eventually rose to elite ranks. His social status protected him from persecution and thus facilitated the development and expansion of his ideas. Many of his male lovers were also from the higher ranks of society. Their lack of persecution further supports the
idea that the elite could include same-sex sexuality in their lifestyles without legal repercussions. It should be made clear that the interests of the rule makers of the Empire trumped social standing of others. Sir Roger Casement’s demise demonstrates this premise.

Roger Casement was born in Ireland, then a colony of the British Empire, in 1864, and moved to England at age sixteen for better employment. He went to the Congo, Africa, in 1884 to work on a survey to improve communication. He eventually joined the British Foreign Office and was commissioned to investigate human rights abuses in the Belgian Congo, which was then a private land owned by Belgian King Leopold II. Leopold II was known for his atrocious treatment of Africans. Casement published the *Casement Report* in 1904, exposing Leopold II’s terrorism and exploitation of laborers on Congo rubber plantations. Casement’s work eventually led to international pressure on Leopold II to give up his property in Africa and to cease inhumane treatment of laborers. This report gave Casement a reputation of being an early humanitarian.

Casement was sent to South America in 1906 to serve as a consul. He was eventually promoted to consul-general and began investigating the Anglo-Peruvian Amazon Company (PAC). In 1910 he reported his findings on the poor conditions to which the PAC had subjected indigenous tribes and Barbadians. Because the Barbadians were British subjects, the British government was able to intervene and appeal to South American governments to persecute the members of the PAC who had implemented cruel policies toward Indian laborers. Casement was knighted for his work in South America in 1911.
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Between various assignments as a British consul, Casement returned to Ireland and realized his Irish patriotism. After his retirement from the consul in 1913, he began getting involved in the Irish independence movement. He joined the Gaelic League, a group dedicated to ensuring the future of the Irish language, and assisted in the foundation of the Irish Volunteers, an Irish nationalist military organization, in 1913. He was an avid recruiter for the Irish Volunteers and was instrumental in running guns for the organization. In late 1914, after Britain’s declaration of war upon Germany, Casement went to Germany and met with German officials on behalf of the Irish cause. Irish nationalists thought they gained an ally in Germany upon the war declaration, as England had become their common enemy. Casement’s goals were to gain German support for Irish independence, spread pro-Irish propaganda in Germany, and recruit prisoners of war in order to form an Irish Brigade to assist in the independence campaign.\textsuperscript{80} After sixteen months of little success, a defeated Casement returned to Ireland in a German submarine. Upon arriving home in April 1916, he was captured by British law enforcement; he had been under British surveillance for the duration of his time in Germany. Although he was knighted and widely respected throughout the Empire, his offense of the Empire in promoting Irish separation overrode his heightened social standing.

Casement was quickly tried for high treason. He was tried, made a failed appeal, was sentenced to death, and his knighthood was withdrawn. Casement’s prosecutors cited what they saw as “adhering to the King’s enemies” under the Treason Act of 1351.\textsuperscript{81}
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However, due to changes in the English language over the nearly 600 years between the Treason Act and Casement’s trial, it was not clear if such adherence to the enemies outside of British soil constituted high treason.\textsuperscript{82} After debate, the prosecutors decided that adhering to the enemy on German soil was, indeed, treasonous.

Casement’s sexuality was suddenly thrust to the forefront of public opinion. During his trial for treason and subsequent appeal, the British government published Casement’s personal papers, which took on the name \textit{The Black Diaries}. The \textit{Black Diaries} detailed many of his international homosexual encounters in 1903, 1910, and 1911. Many, but not all, of his encounters were in exchange for money, and they were consensual. Some commentators have made accusations of pedophilia as some of his encounters were with men below the age of eighteen, but all were above sixteen; although, Casement does describe admiring younger boys.\textsuperscript{83} Male homosexuality had been illegal since the Criminal Law Amendment Act passed in Parliament in 1885. Public opinion was not supportive of homosexuality. This public exposure of his sexual life was an attempt to turn public opinion against Casement. But the \textit{Diaries’} authenticity was questioned. The British government claims to have found the diaries in Casement’s home in London. Many Irish nationalists and scholars believe that they were forged by the government and used to turn public opinion against him.\textsuperscript{84} Despite international appeals, the British government maintained Casement’s charge of treason and he was hung on August 3, 1916.

The British government’s use of the \textit{Black Diaries} to build a claim against him

\textsuperscript{82} Casement, \textit{The Trial of Sir Roger Casement}, 126.
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demonstrates that Casement’s same-sex sexual encounters were used as a tool. If Casement wrote the Black Diaries, as forensic scholars concluded in 2002, then the government was using his personal property, which it had acquired under suspicious circumstances, against him.\textsuperscript{85} If they are false, then the government chose homosexuality as their tool to condemn him, and they chose homosexuality for a reason. In this case, it does not matter if they are authentic or not. The use of the Black Diaries shows that homosexuality was a damnable offense, used when the British Empire needed it to build a case against someone who was well favored for his humanitarian work. Homosexual activity seemed to be the worst thing the government could pin on Casement in order to ensure that they could successfully execute him for treason without overwhelming interference from clemency supporters.

Despite the British government’s attempts to turn domestic and international public opinion against Casement, British and American supporters understood Casement’s potential homosexuality and treason charges as symptoms of insanity. A western belief gave the idea that prolonged exposure to hot colonial climates caused European minds to degenerate, making one more susceptible to their sexual desires and other deviant behavior observed in the natives of such sweltering climates. Because of Casement’s years in Africa and South America, his supporters believed that his alleged homosexual experiences and his treasonous activities could be attributed to his work on behalf of the British Empire, and therefore he deserved clemency and a life in an asylum, rather than the punishment of treason, which was hanging.\textsuperscript{86}

The British government’s condemnation of Casement received international
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attention. Irish-Americans and other Americans of Irish decent were extremely supportive of Casement. Newspapers across the United States published articles describing their hope for Casement to be granted clemency. Even the U.S. Senate favored Casement. In July 1916, the month before Casement’s execution, New Jersey Senator James Martine lobbied for Casement’s cause. The Senate voted on a resolution proposed by Nevada Senator Key Pittman, which expressed “the hope of the Senate that Great Britain would observe clemency in the treatment of Irish political prisoners…”\textsuperscript{87} The reference to “political prisoners” was understood to apply to Casement.\textsuperscript{88} Furthermore, Senator Henry Cabot Lodge met with British Foreign Secretary Viscount Grey to discuss commutation for Casement, but the British government was not to be swayed.\textsuperscript{89} Evidently, charges of treason and homosexuality were two ironclad offenses about which the government would not negotiate.

Roger Casement’s homosexuality was not an issue until he became a problem for the British Empire. Although it had been illegal since 1885, homosexuality did not ruffle any feathers, especially amongst the British elite. He was knighted for his humanitarian work in South America and Africa, all while engaging in sexual activity with other men. Finally, when he returned to Ireland and became involved in its violent fight for separation from the British Empire, his homosexuality was exposed and he was persecuted for it.

Roger Casement was a Knight of the British Empire-turned Irish patriot and separatist. The Casement case demonstrates that respected white men did not need to worry about their same-sex sexual encounters impacting their social, economic, or legal
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status until they first did something else to offend those in power in the Empire. After that offense, their sexuality was vulnerable to persecution. Gandhi, as a member of the non-elite, was a problem for the Empire, as seen in his numerous incarcerations for his political resistance and encouragement of others to follow against the Empire. If there was any evidence or were any rumors of Gandhi’s involvement in “buggery” or “unnatural vice”, the Empire would have used that against him to add to his charges. As a non-white, non-elite member of society, he was subject to far more persecution than Casement.

Casement is particularly useful in this study because of his parallels with Gandhi and Keynes. His liaisons occur in the same time period. Gandhi and Casement were also members of colonized societies and members of political and independence movements, Gandhi from India and Casement from Ireland. Casement and Keynes demonstrate the basis for treatment of white male same-sex sexuality by the rule-makers of the British Empire. Another man of Irish descent, Oscar Wilde, was subject to persecution for his sexuality.

Oscar Wilde is the most famous of the men considered in this study. He became a problem for powerful Britons in the 1890s, when he launched a libel campaign against Scottish politician John Douglas, the Marquess of Queensbury. This libel campaign led to Douglas’s retaliation, in which he gathered male prostitutes who had done business with Wilde, and provided evidence to convict him under the Criminal Law Amendment Act.

Oscar Wilde is useful in analyzing Gandhi and Keynes because all three men were married to women. Wilde demonstrates that even though a man who engaged in same-sex sexuality was married to a woman, such marriages did not provide the social
legitimacy to protect men from persecution. Wilde and Casement had strong ties to the British colony of Ireland. Their Irish colonial backgrounds also destabilized their social positions, causing them to be “the Other” to Britain’s hegemonic status, most certainly condemning Casement, and potentially hurting Wilde.

The sexual habits of men like Keynes, Casement, Wilde, and other late Victorian-era elites, such as Field Marshall Henry Horatio Kitchener, diamond magnate Cecil Rhodes, and founder of the Boy Scouts Robert Baden-Powell, have been a topic of discussion amongst historians of sexuality and the Empire. Some inquiries have been launched as a result of their lack of marriages, children, or other recorded affairs involving women. It may be possible that some highly active and accomplished men, like Kitchener and Rhodes, were asexual or sublimated their sexual energies into their prominent work. Hyam discounts the idea of sublimation, arguing that the concept is misunderstood, misused, and too ambiguous to be useful in academia.\(^90\) Furthermore, he argues that sublimation may indeed be a form of asexuality.\(^91\) Regardless of the true nature of many enigmatic, elite Victorian figures, their perceived sexuality greatly diverged from the experiences of the non-elite.

Hyam points out that records of sexuality during the British Imperial era exist because something went wrong.\(^92\) In Casement’s situation, he was tried for treason, his home was searched, and his diaries describing his sexual activities were exposed. In Gandhi’s case, he went to jail many times, his possessions and associates were subject to examination, but no evidence was discovered. One may argue that no evidence was found in his possessions because the notoriously frugal, minimalist Gandhi did not have very
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many possessions. Ramachandra Guha, in his discussion of why Lelyveld’s insinuations about Gandhi’s sexuality lacks integrity, points out that Lelyveld picked up this idea about sexual intimacy between Gandhi and Kallenbach through “casual gossip [Lelyveld] picked up decades after Gandhi left South Africa”. Guha also makes clear that this gossip is not extant in any historical archive or record. If such gossip did exist during Gandhi’s time in South Africa, the Empire would have seized upon it and used it to discredit Gandhi’s political activities and reputation.

Hyam’s work describes scenarios in which white men of the Empire could realize their uninhibited sexual fantasies without fear of backlash when they traveled beyond their home boundaries. Gandhi’s non-elite, non-white status made him vulnerable to investigation and persecution, as were native mine workers in South Africa who had found a way to release their sexual urges with one another when denied access to women and the non-elites persecuted in the Cleveland Street Case, which dealt with young boys working as prostitutes. Casement’s saga demonstrates that for elite, privileged members of the Empire, same-sex sexual activity was not a problem until it became a problem.

The non-elite were not as fortunate in their legal dealings as the elite. As demonstrated by the elite examples of this study, same-sex sexuality among men, despite being criminalized by the CLA of 1885, was not a problem until it became a problem through the beginning of World War I. The non-elite were persecuted for their sexuality and punished far more often than the elite, who had the luxury of their elevated social status and potentially the financial ability to run away from persecution altogether.

Evidently, being from a lower social class was an offense to the Empire. One incident,
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the Cleveland Street Scandal, demonstrates the divergence in the results of same-sex sexual experiences of the elite and non-elite.

The Cleveland Street Scandal is important because it is where the elite and non-elite met in the arena of male-male sexuality. The different ways individuals involved in the same situation were persecuted demonstrate the deviation of the elite and non-elite. The Cleveland Street Scandal began in July 1889 when a fifteen-year-old boy, who worked delivering telegraphs, was stopped by police and discovered to be carrying a large amount of money. Suspecting him of theft, the police took him into custody and interrogated him. The boy eventually admitted to having earned the money as a prostitute in a male brothel at 19 Cleveland Street, operated by a man named Charles Hammond. The boy claimed to have been introduced to Hammond by a post office clerk, Henry Newlove. The boy named two other telegraph boys who worked at the brothel, both of whom confessed their involvement to the police. The police also questioned Newlove, who corroborated the previous evidence. A warrant was given for investigation of the brothel and the arrest of Charles Hammond. The CLA banned men seeking sex with other men, thus Hammond was in violation as a facilitator. Newlove also provided the police with a list of high-profile patrons of the all-male brothel. These patrons included Lord Arthur Somerset, son of the Duke of Beaufort, and Henry James FitzRoy, Earl of Euston. When the police went to inspect the brothel, it was closed and Hammond had fled.

The case received little press and public attention until journalist Ernest Parke wrote about the story in *The North London Press* newspaper. In an article dated November 16, Parke specifically named FitzRoy as a patron of the brothel who may have been covering up for an even more elite patron of 19 Cleveland Street, Prince Albert
Victor, who had also been accused of being Jack the Ripper. FitzRoy sued Parke for libel. FitzRoy admitted to going to 19 Cleveland Street, but under the belief that it was a place to admire nude women. Parke was judged to be guilty and was sentenced to one year in prison. Historian H. Montgomery Hyde asserts that FitzRoy was being truthful in his explanation.  

Two members of the elite, Lord Somerset and FitzRoy, made it through the scandal without legal repercussions. Lord Somerset, whose importance outside of the of his aristocratic background lie in his position as the head of stables for Edward VII, then Prince of Wales and future King of the United Kingdom, was interviewed by the police because several eyewitness accounts, including one brothel worker who reported having sex with Somerset, reported his involvement in the Cleveland Street brothel. Despite such accounts and the interview, no action was taken against him. He went on about his life and despite urging by the Assistant Treasury Solicitor and the Commissioner of Police, but the Lord Chancellor Halsbury blocked his persecution. By the time a warrant for his arrest was finally issued in November, Lord Somerset had already relocated to France and lived out a comfortable existence. 

The non-elite men in the case did not fare as well as the elites. Newlove and several of the boys involved plead guilty and were sentenced to hard labor. Hammond fled to France but was later expelled by French authorities under British pressure. After a brief stint in Belgium, he moved to the United States. The non-elite men suffered much more than the elites.
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For the men involved in the Cleveland Street Case, their same-sex sexuality was only a problem for those who did not have the social stature to overpower their offenses against the state. Several accounts claim that the police knew there was a brothel operating at 19 Cleveland Street. It was not a problem until accusations of child abuse involving a government entity, the General Post, made the brothel a problem. Allegations of child abuse and corruption also made the sexuality of native African mineworkers a problem in South Africa in 1907.

In search of cheap labor, South African mining companies began importing indentured servants when diamonds were discovered in 1867. Initially, Indians were imported, but after a few decades, the Indian community grew, flourished, and began to demand more for their labor.99 South African mineral mines turned to cheaper native African and imported Chinese labor. Labor demands were too numerous to rely on one subordinate group. This led to outcry against the Chinese from both Europeans and Africans. The low wages and poor living conditions led to European criticism of “Chinese slavery,” while Africans were unhappy because they only received 80% of the wages they earned before the Boer War.100 Among the anti-Chinese hysteria were accusations of rampant sodomy. The Bucknill report investigated these claims and concluded that they were wildly exaggerated.101

On the coattails of the Chinese homosexuality investigation, Reverend Albert Baker, Director of the South African Compounds and Interior Mission, wrote a letter to

Governor-General Lord Selbourne, claiming that homosexuality was far more rampant among native African mine workers than it had ever been among the Chinese. In his letter to Lord Selbourne, Reverend Baker claimed that this case involved not only sodomy, but also corruption among mining officials, coercion, child abuse, and potentially, murder. An investigation was led by magistrate J. Glenn Leary and Native Affairs Department official Henry Taberer. Leary and Taberer toured mines in the Witwatersrand region, interviewing mine workers of various ranks. What they discovered was a practice called *inkotshane*.

Many of those interviewed claimed that *inkotshane* originated with one individual called Sikisi, who learned it from Portuguese miners on the western coast of Africa. Some of those laborers claimed that Sikisi had learned the practice from Portuguese colonists in Portuguese West Africa and that such male-male sexuality had not existed among their tribes prior to European contact. *Inkotshane* usually involved a man taking on a younger or smaller male as a wife. Details as to which wifely duties the *inkotshane* performed varied by account, but most accounts agree it involved cooking and cleaning in return for money or gifts from the elder. Many accounts also include performing wifely sexual duties. The most common sexual act admitted to and described was rubbing the elder’s penis between the thighs of the younger *inkotshane*, to simulate vaginal intercourse. Very rarely did those involved in the practice admit to sodomy, although some did.

The tale of the origins of *inkotshane* and how those accused describe it reveal several interesting characteristics. The Sikisi figure and the alleged Portuguese origins of
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inkotshane offer another form of Othering. Sikisi is practically an anonymous individual. Without concrete information about him, it is easy to create an image of Sikisi as an undesirable deviant, exactly the kind of person expected to be involved in such a practice. Furthermore, the Portuguese were among Britain’s European imperial rivals in Africa and thus it would benefit the native laborers to blame such an offensive practice on them. The gender roles and racial strands of thought also support Anne McClintock’s assertions that race, gender, and class were inextricably tied to empire building and how such empires dealt with, and in some cases, created, situations among the natives whose rules followed those social structures.104

Scholars Taru and Basure make the point that Europeans did not bring homosexual practices to Africa; instead, Europeans introduced homophobia to colonized societies. Although imperialists attempted to criminalize same-sex practices, they could not be eradicated because many male-only spaces were created. Same-sex sexuality would have impeded the growth of the labor force in an industry that could not meet the demand for labor as it was; therefore, the capitalists who ran the mines discouraged homosexuality. Many of the men involved in inkotshane did so because of the lack of female presence. Male laborers were often separated from their wives when leaving home for long periods to work in mines.105

The investigations into Chinese sodomy and unnatural vice amongst mine workers in South Africa during the first decade of the 1900s is important to this study of Gandhi because they take place during the same decade, region, and political climate as

Lelyveld implies Gandhi’s affair with Kallenbach happened. The investigations demonstrate an atmosphere of fear and suspicion of male homosexuality in South Africa during Gandhi’s alleged affair, especially among non-whites in the country. Those who were investigated or accused of homosexuality were clearly seen as the Other, non-British, and therefore backward and in need of Christian Britain’s civilizing forces. Such public suspicion would have discouraged entry into same-sex sexual experiences, especially a non-white, public figure like Gandhi. Britain’s racist elements also held negative views on Jews.

Hermann Kallenbach actively flaunted the common image of an effeminate Jew. He was a bodybuilder and had many other masculine characteristics that would have distracted from anyone trying to pin homosexual or not-masculine accusations to him. He was, apparently, also a ladies’ man, having had a long affair with a business partner’s wife.106 He embodied many qualities of the Victorian male ideal and thus flaunted anyone that would have made him the Other.

Kallenbach was a valued member of South African society during his life. His architecture firm was the top firm in the country and created buildings throughout the state that became national monuments. As a white European, the dominant British population would have treated him as more of an equal than Gandhi. His exalted position in society and his own physical image insulated him from homosexual persecution even more so than Gandhi. This is an area in which a biography of Kallenbach, which made him the subject rather than Gandhi’s object, would be very helpful. More information about Kallenbach’s place in early-twentieth century South African society is necessary to

write such a piece. The existing evidence does not directly indicate if his fellow Europeans, or the British who held power, saw him as their wealthy, white equal, or as Gandhi’s puppet or sidekick.

Mohandas Gandhi was clearly a problem for the British Empire during his time in both South Africa and India. He went to jail on numerous occasions during his many satyagraha struggles. If there were any shreds of evidence that he had any same-sex sexual affairs, the Empire would have exploited it and added to his charges. The Empire may have also conducted a smear campaign against Gandhi using this evidence in order to sway followers from his movement, as they did in Casement’s saga. A smear campaign during his satyagraha struggle in South Africa between 1904-1914 would have halted Gandhi’s larger satyagraha struggle in India in the following decades. But, contrary to what could have been, British imperial officials never made any charges of homosexuality against Gandhi.
V. THE CULTURAL, RELIGIOUS, AND PHILOSOPHICAL INFLUENCES ON GANDHI AND KALLENBACH

Debates in various jurisdictions worldwide regarding the legal status of homosexuality have often hinged on the cultural, religious, or philosophical histories in those places. In India, cultural and religious influences prevented the decriminalization of homosexuality until 2009. It is important to consider these influences not only in determining government policy, but also individual views on sexuality. This chapter considers the cultural, religious, and philosophical influences on Gandhi and Kallenbach in order to their possible views on male same-sex sexuality. This chapter also introduces a third person, Madeleine Slade, also known as Mirabehn. Slade was one of Gandhi’s female friends of whom journalists have suggested a sexual relationship long after their friendship ended.

Upon Gandhi’s return to India after his successes in South Africa, Gandhi received a letter from a young English woman named Madeleine Slade. Slade was interested in relocating to India in order to adopt Gandhi’s lifestyle and work on behalf of Indian independence. Gandhi was hesitant to accept her, but after one year of Slade making significant lifestyle changes, she arrived in India and joined Gandhi’s ashrams in 1925. Over the next twenty-three years, Slade was deeply involved in Gandhi’s interactions with powerful Britons and became a missionary for Gandhi’s causes.

Similar to Gandhi’s relationship with Kallenbach, recent writers have explored the idea of a sexual dynamic between Gandhi and Slade. These considerations produced sensationalized accounts of their friendship ten years prior to the situations involving Kallenbach, demonstrating a trend among modern writers of Gandhi. This chapter seeks
to examine Gandhi’s relationship with Slade in order to identify similar misrepresentations with Kallenbach.

Misrepresentations of Gandhi’s relationships with his friends and disciples expose the need to discuss them in detail. Books have been dedicated to very specific areas of Gandhi’s life, such as his political associations with individuals such as the first Indian Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru; this work seeks to examine specific sexual rumors. This chapter will consider the forces that shaped Gandhi’s, Kallenbach’s and Slade’s attitudes regarding sexuality in order to provide insight into the possibility of sexual dynamics. Such forces include philosophy, religion, and culture. Scholars must use these concepts in order to identify their attitudes regarding same-sex sexuality, as direct evidence is unknown.

Gandhi, Kallenbach, and Slade began their lives on different continents. They grew up in very different ways, in very different cultures. But Slade and Kallenbach encountered Gandhi and they came together to embark on new traditions. They adopted philosophies that fueled their personal, spiritual, and satyagraha struggles. From these cultural, religious, and philosophical backgrounds and adoptions of new traditions, one may distill how these individuals viewed same-sex sexuality in the absence of candid addresses.

Slade was born in 1892 to Sir Edmund Slade and his wife, Florence. Admiral Slade was a significant British figure, having served as Commander in Chief of the East Indies Fleet of the Royal Navy and chairman of the board of Anglo-Iranian Oil. Madeleine Slade showed an early interest in the natural world and to things that represented a stark contrast to her nascent influences. She was interested in new, exotic
people, places, and ideas. Gandhi described her as a gypsy.\textsuperscript{107} Her interest in the natural world clashed with western ideas about human separation from and conquering of nature that flourished during the late British imperial period. Her first love, Beethoven, represented German culture to which the British were hostile after World War I.

Slade was introduced to Gandhi by French dramatist Romain Rolland in 1924. She read Rolland’s biography of Beethoven and went to France to meet him. He also published an early biography of Gandhi that year. During their meeting, Rolland told her “[Gandhi] is another Christ.”\textsuperscript{108} She wrote to Gandhi immediately, hoping to join Sabarmati ashram. He responded that the strain of the move and emotional turmoil of culture shock would be too much for her. She stayed in Europe for one year to practice new hardships she would face if she joined an ashram, such as sleeping on the floor. She moved to Sabarmati in November 1925. Upon arriving, Gandhi proclaimed to her “you shall be my daughter.”\textsuperscript{109} She soon cut her hair and took the vow of \textit{brahmacharya} to symbolize her commitment to \textit{satyagraha}.\textsuperscript{110} Such commitments marked her transformation into her new Indian identity, Mirabehn.

Slade immediately took to weaving \textit{khadi} upon the commencement of her training as Gandhi’s political apprentice.\textsuperscript{111} Gandhi championed this movement as a political message. Making wool goods out of hand-spun \textit{khadi} symbolized self-reliance and rejection of the hegemonic dependence the British wanted from India. Indians were made dependent on the British for their own native-grown cotton because of a mercantilist
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economic system in which it was exported to Britain to be refined and then shipped back to India at a high price. Skipping the middle step was beneficial economically and unified Indians.\textsuperscript{112} Slade was very supportive of the \textit{khadi} movement, having taught herself to weave. Her support was displayed in a 1929 tour of India, during which she was responsible for ensuring Gandhi’s personal routine, including spinning.\textsuperscript{113} She was active in creating publicity and garnering attention from the British government in the 1930 Salt March and the Round Table Conference in 1931.

As World War II raged in Asia, Gandhi initiated the Quit India campaign in 1942. He sent Slade to England to lobby for it. At Gandhi’s urging, the Indian National Congress supported a mass protest in favor of British withdrawal from India. The British were prepared for this protest and Indian politicians were arrested before action could be taken. Quit India was immediately a failure because of heavy government suppression, but ultimately it showed the British that Indians would not tolerate imperial rule any longer. Gandhi’s time in jail is one of the most famous qualities of his legacy. As per her apprenticeship training, Slade went to jail with Gandhi several times, including an incident at the Aga Khan Palace after the Quit India campaign.

In the mid-1940s, Slade established her own set of ashrams in the Himalayan Mountains. She spent many years in the Himalayas in order to promote \textit{satyagraha}. She lobbied Indian Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru to help in stopping agriculture companies from using a certain type of tree to construct buildings, as the lack of that species promoted harmful flooding in rural areas.\textsuperscript{114} Her activism led to her becoming an ideological leader in the Chipko Movement and ultimately the twenty-first century
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environmental movement. After Gandhi’s death in 1948, she continued to maintain the ashrams until 1952, when she returned to her European lifestyle.

Gandhi and Slade’s association emphasized a shared concern for the natural world. In the vein of John Ruskin, they were critical of the negative effects of modernization, industrialization, and globalization on the Earth. They shared an emotional intimacy that supported their father-daughter bond. But the most notable aspect of their association was Slade’s apprenticeship. Slade’s carrying of Gandhi’s environmental legacy through the twentieth century demonstrates an apprenticeship relationship, rather than a romantic one.\(^{115}\) This view contrasts with scholars who argue Gandhi and Slade had a "spiritual marriage."\(^{116}\)

Slade is a controversial figure. Among male Indian scholars, she is seen as an over-eager annoyance for Gandhi. Ved Mehta wrote that she was “the daughter of an English admiral and liked to lord it over everybody.”\(^{117}\) Mehta also references her constant attempts at micromanaging Gandhi’s affairs, for which Gandhi would chide her.\(^{118}\) Slade occasionally appears in Indian tabloids. In one article, published in 2005 in The Telegraph, Khushwant Singh describes her as “[i]n [l]ove [w]ith the Mahatma.” It should be noted that in addition to Singh’s unfounded title for her, he incorrectly lists facts about her, such as her status as a “princess.”\(^{119}\) Singh’s article is a piece of sensationalist literature, which, like Lelyveld’s Great Soul, misinterprets the historical and cultural context of Gandhi and Slade’s relationship, opening the door to inventive
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conclusions about their friendship. This writing foreshadowed the more recent wave of sensationalism surrounding Gandhi and Kallenbach.

Psychotherapist Sudhir Kakar describes Slade and Gandhi’s friendship as an anxious, insecure association. Kakar’s popular psychological perspective shows Gandhi growing weary with Slade’s enthusiasm and overbearing nature and sending her off as a missionary for their cause in order to use her energy productively.\textsuperscript{120} Kakar’s analysis is interesting from a human psychology point of view, but provides very little, historically or scholastically.\textsuperscript{121} He describes Slade as “a tall, strapping woman, handsome rather than pretty.”\textsuperscript{122} This is an example of Kakar attempting to de-sex or intentionally masculinize Slade in order to make her a more acceptable associate for Gandhi. Slade’s status as an English woman makes her an unacceptable intimate associate for Gandhi in male Indian eyes.

The publication of Kakar’s book \textit{Mira and the Mahatma} in 2004 was met with similar outrage as \textit{Great Soul}. Although it is fictitious, it drew some influence from Gandhi and Slade’s association. Like Kallenbach’s letters to Gandhi, Slade’s letters to Gandhi were also inaccessible; therefore, Kakar based his ideas on what Gandhi wrote to Slade. Kakar claimed that “by drawing on the available historical record he ha[d] arrived at the ‘emotional’, if historically unverifiable, reality of Gandhi’s relationship with Slade.”\textsuperscript{123} Another article regarding the outraged responses explains that Kakar “does not suggest that the relationship ever turned physical. But he does suggest that Slade fell
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passionately in love with Gandhi, who had taken a vow of celibacy, and that Gandhi may have been tempted by her affections before the intensity of her feelings caused him to all but banish her from his life, to her everlasting despair.”¹²⁴ Both articles mention Indian Member of Parliament and social activist Nirmala Deshpande as the primary political opposition to the book. Deshpande objected on the grounds that Kakar did not understand “the spiritual plane” upon which Gandhi lived, and thus, Kakar could not accurately understand Gandhi or his relationships.¹²⁵

Ramachandra Guha says there is no biography of Slade, to the lament of his praise of her as one of two of Gandhi’s most important female associates.¹²⁶ As an Englishwoman turned Indian, she is representative of a group of colonizers returning to the colonized.¹²⁷ Like Cyril Fielding in A Passage to India, she goes to India to be Indian, rather than be a European who sees herself as superior to Indians. Slade accepts Indian culture as her own, demonstrating her belief that Indian culture was preferable to English culture. This preference upends Victorian-era British hegemony in India. She deserves more objective, if not sympathetic, attention.

Victorian-era society focused on reform and their ideas of “improvement”, which aligned with Christian views. Thus, Christian sexual ideals ruled. Sex was to be for men and women who were married. The Social Purity campaign targeted this ideal and promoted it vigorously. The Purity movement clearly espoused Christian ideals and sough to abolish prostitution, homosexuality, and other activities considered to be against
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the Bible. The Purity movement became particularly strong during the late 1880s, thus influencing Slade during her upbringing and Gandhi during his law education in England from 1888-1891.

Anne McClintock explains that Victorian-era social hierarchies were race-based. Secondary to race, gender was the defining characteristic. At the top of the hierarchy were upper-middle class white men, followed by women of that station. Victorian femininity centered on being passive and frail. Working women, such as factory workers and prostitutes, were considered unfeminine and portrayed as such. Furthermore, physical characteristics beyond white skin, such as the size of lips and buttocks, were used to distinguish between varying levels of degeneracy, and thus used to place individuals within certain social categories.\(^\text{128}\) Slade was born as a white female into an upper-middle class family and was thus classified into the highest level of the social hierarchy, behind only men. Slade’s upper-class status within English society would have ensured her security of status, regardless of her sexual actions. She was born into a high social stratum and she lived up to the ideal of Victorian femininity until she began her transition to Indian life.

One indicator of Gandhi and Slade’s friendship is religion. Slade converted to Hinduism when she took on an Indian identity. Religion does not seem to have had a significant role in Slade’s life prior to her conversion to Hinduism; although, Slade’s autobiography reflects a Christian upbringing. While her family was not overtly religious, there was a level of Christian expectation. As such, from a religious perspective, as weak as it was for her, Slade’s sexuality would have been expected to follow the hegemonic,
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prescribed Victorian standard of female repression.

Slade is useful in the study of Gandhi and Kallenbach because of her parallels and differences from the latter. They both came from upper-middle class European backgrounds and largely abandoned those backgrounds in order to become immersed in Gandhi’s foreign, exotic ways. They also returned to their European ways of life after their bonds with Gandhi were broken. They differ in their genders and time periods. While Kallenbach’s association with Gandhi was strongest in South Africa between 1904-1914, Slade had her Gandhi experiences in India from 1925 until his death in 1948. Her friendship with Gandhi demonstrates that Gandhi’s intimacies were not exclusive to his male associations, nor were they in a temporal vacuum. Analyzing Kallenbach and Slade’s relationships with Gandhi demonstrates that his intimacies were not unusual at any point in his life. Like Kallenbach, her dedication to Gandhi and poverty defied her civilized, privileged European upbringing.

Hermann Kallenbach was born in East Prussia in 1871. He was raised in a Jewish family and was thus exposed to Judaic culture and religion. Culturally, he was indoctrinated with masculine and sexual ideals of late-nineteenth century Germany. As he was among the first generation of Germans born in a unified Germany, he was subject to nationalist indoctrination via education and military service. In the years leading up to his time with Gandhi, Kallenbach saw himself as German. His German culture and Jewish heritage are what informed him in his early years, thus is it necessary to discuss these views.

Many authors refer to Kallenbach as a “German-Jewish bodybuilder” and emphasize his physical capabilities. Lelyveld emphasizes Kallenbach’s physical
characteristics and like some scholars, attributes this to Kallenbach’s appreciation for the contemporary bodybuilder Eugene Sandow. Although Sandow may have been an important influence on Kallenbach, a more important influence was the writer and thinker Max Nordau. Nordau was also influential upon Sandow. Scholars must look past Sandow and focus more on Nordau in order to distill Kallenbach’s Jewish identity.

Max Nordau was quite influential on Kallenbach, who internalized the masculine physical characteristics Nordau described. German historian George Mosse describes Nordau’s work as responding to the Jewish worldwide diaspora leading up to the late nineteenth century. He was concerned with the image of Eastern European Jews in particular, such as Kallenbach. Nordau was troubled because these Jews seemed to epitomize the problems with modernity; they were “city-dwellers, over-refined, disputatious intellectuals who, as he saw it, lost their taste for productive work.”

Furthermore, they were seen as more prone to degeneration brought on by more problems with nerves than the rest of the population. Nordau proscribed a medical and educational regime that was supposed to help Jews deal with these effects which modernity imposed on their nerves in order to help them navigate the industrial age.

Nordau urges Jews to avoid the effects of degeneration. To do that, he suggested that Jews be men who embody duty and discipline, who “rise early and are not weary before sunset, who have clear heads, solid stomachs and hard muscles…” Nordau preferred Jews to adopt what he saw as an average, middle class, unremarkable life,
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rather than Jews turning to mysticism or other obscure, impractical trends.\footnote{Mosse, “Max Nordau, Liberalism, and the New Jew”, 570.}

For Kallenbach, his Jewish heritage meant that male same-sex sexuality was forbidden and subject to capital punishment per Jewish law. Aside from religious texts, his Jewish heritage also would have prohibited acceptance of male-male sexuality, as seen in the influence of Nordau. Kallenbach also experienced strong influences from his German upbringing, as well. The newly emerging state of Germany developed a cultural indoctrination trend, which focused on producing loyalty to the state. Friendship and particular ways of interacting with friends were particularly important to this nascent nationalism.

Mosse identifies friendship as a crucial aspect of male relationships in Germany and argues that German culture’s value of friendship as a crucial aspect of nationalism ultimately played a role in the downfall of German socialism.\footnote{George L. Mosse, “Friendship and Nationhood: About the Promise and Failure of German Nationalism”, \textit{Journal of Contemporary History} 17, no. 2 (April 1982).} Friendship was a significant social force in the unified Germany: “[p]atriotism was thought to support the existence of an autonomous network of personal relationships. Specifically, the ideal of friendship gave body and direction to such personal relationships and was widely viewed as their finest expression.”\footnote{Mosse, “Friendship and Nationhood: About the Promise and Failure of German Nationalism”, 353.} Patriotism supported friendship. Quality of friendship was tied to their personal integrity and their patriotism. Furthermore, in the nineteenth century, friendship tied to supporting the state served the function of solace from the chaos of the busy, crowded, industrializing world.\footnote{Ibid., 356.}

A cult of friendship existed in nineteenth-century Germany whose qualities included a “concern for the unity of the nation” and helped to control human passions.
Friendship was thought as based in reason, rather than senses, and was therefore superior to erotic love. This ideal was a reaction to the ever-increasing speed of change in the nineteenth century industrializing world, which gave friendship a spiritual quality. Furthermore, it sought to remove eroticism and sexuality from the male-male dynamic altogether. The emphasis on a more strict level of morality heightened the need for the lack of sexuality within male friendships.\textsuperscript{136} There was also an important aspect of the “joining of souls” or \textit{Seelenbund}, which heightened the level of spirituality. This ideal was also present in concepts of philosophy; friendship was more masculine, and therefore aligned with contemporary philosophy. Its binary, femininity, was associated with emotions.\textsuperscript{137}

In a separate work on nationalism and sexuality, Mosse explains that control of sexuality was a concern for modern nationalist movements. Mosse makes a useful point that sexuality could be controlled, re-appropriated, and used to shape what was considered respectable.\textsuperscript{138} Nationalists worried that cities, one of the products of industrialization, were teeming with vice and sin. Being a part of a city was not an option if one wanted to participate in the new economies of the nineteenth century, so nationalist movements had to have some control over people to help them avoid the degeneration of their members. Nationalists felt the need to regulate people in order to make sure they stayed on the normal side of the normal versus abnormal binary emerging in the nineteenth century.\textsuperscript{139}

The debate between normal and abnormal sexuality was thus intertwined with
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European racism. The image of the Jewish man was small and effeminate, analogous to the image of the homosexual and in complete opposition of the male ideal, which involved a particular level of chastity and integrity of the spirit. Thus, many Jews, on the urging of writers such as Max Nordau, sought to sculpt their bodies and do other things to fit the European ideal of “normal” and to be far from “abnormal.”

Under the ideal of control of sexuality, abnormal activity such as masturbation and homosexuality were seen as symptoms of internal pathology, such as nerves and bad thoughts. Many believed that engaging in either habit resulted in outwardly visible symptoms, such as weakness. Thus, homosexuality and masturbation were cause for public concern. One physician claimed “wasting one’s sperm through masturbation was like throwing money out the window.”

As ideals of respectability came to dominate unified Germany in the 1870s and 1880s, by the 1890s, a youth-based subculture emerged. This Lebensreform, or life reform, movement romanticized nature as opposition to the growing industrialization of Germany. The Lebensreformers wanted to emphasize the “genuine forces of life” via vegetarianism, teetotalism, land reform, “nature-healing,” gardening in cities, and sometimes nudism. They shared the concern with the dominant ideology that cities were dirty, had a negative impact on human development, and increased social ills. This cultural backlash demonstrates how deep the movement to reject modernization ran.

German cultural developments had several parallels with English cultural development, particularly in the areas of manliness and respectability. According to
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Manliness (both German and English) is seen in self-control (so dear to the middle class), manliness meant freedom from sexual passion, the sublimation of sensuality into leadership of society and the nation… Manliness was not just a matter of courage, it was a pattern of manners and morals. Masculine comportment and a manly figure exemplified the transcendence of the so-called lower passions.

Manliness as an outward symbol of the inner spirit had medieval roots in the ideals of knighthood, whose symbols were employed in daily speech, defining male attitudes toward women, as well as in the popular culture surrounding modern wars. Chivalry in battle was a sign of national superiority. But above all, manliness was based upon the Greek revival which accompanied and complemented the onslaught of respectability and the rise of modern nationalism.¹⁴³

Thus, Mosse’s work demonstrates that in both Germany and England, masculinity, or manliness, was epitomized by freedom from sex and passion, leadership, integrity or friendship, and reason over passion. During his time in England, Gandhi encountered these male cultural ideals. He also encountered a Victorian trend in male friendships in which the close bonds between men were displayed in much more emotional terms than is usually displayed in twenty-first century society. Some authors acknowledge sometimes these emotional expressions hid homoerotic love, but only “in some cases.”¹⁴⁴ Furthermore, this emotional expression of male friendship was important to Victorian concepts of masculinity:

They [male friendships] were not only expressed in a more demonstrative manner, but were also central to the contemporaneous constructions of manliness. The concept of “manly love” was derived from interpretations of classical Greek and medieval chivalric schools of thought. Platonic love between men was seen as purer and less threatening to a man’s spiritual

pursuit of perfection than any relationship between a man and a woman, precisely because it lacked any physical element. Sexual love was considered inferior and even diversionary. The ‘muscular Christianity’ central to the imperial mission in the late nineteenth century encouraged these friendships.  

Exclusion of women in regular interactions was an explicit element in the Victorian constructions of male friendship and masculinity.

Vinay Lal argues that Gandhi is quite Victorian in many of his views. This is exemplified in not only Gandhi’s adoption of vegetarianism and his growing admiration for Jesus during his time in England in the late 1890s, but also his bond with Kallenbach. Gandhi and Kallenbach’s friendship contained many elements of Victorian male friendship, including an exclusion of women from many of their activities and emotional displays of friendship. Although England certainly had a major influence on his thinking, Gandhi was, indeed, Indian and held many Indian cultural qualities.

Gandhi’s critique of modernity echoes other Victorian-era concerns with the rise of modernity. Some Victorians saw homosexuality as one of the evils of modernity, as it was seen to flourish in the ever-expanding industrializing cities. It is possible that Gandhi internalized this idea and may have seen homosexuality as an evil of the modern developments he distrusted. His treatise, *Hind Swaraj*, discusses many modern developments of which Gandhi was critical, such as trains and medicine. Thus, Gandhi may have been against homosexuality on the basis of its association with modernism.

Gandhi came from a mixed cultural background. He was born and raised in Gujarat, British India, but much of his intellectual formation took place in England and
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South Africa. He exemplifies a transnational development experienced by individuals who spent significant amounts of time in different parts of the British Empire. He was exposed to certain Indian cultural and Hindu religious ideas regarding gender and sexuality during his upbringing in Gujarat, but his soul-searching and refining of his personal philosophy came about in British colonial settings.

For Gandhi, his native religion of Hinduism offered many different views on sexuality. One group in particular, the *hijras*, exemplified the Hindu view of gender that does not follow a male and female binary. *Hijras* are a part of the Indian caste system, but popular understanding of them is limited. Vinay Lal expresses this sentiment and seeks to clarify; he mentions that “hijra” seems to be a blanket term for anyone who does not match the physical and social characteristics of either men or women. This group includes transvestites, hermaphrodites, transsexuals, men who are effeminate, women who are manly, the castrated, and so on. In certain roles, *hijras* represent good luck; however, in other roles, they are a bad omen. The dual nature of the *hijras* thus creates confusion and a muddled, negative image of those individuals who do not fit into monogamous, heterosexual, or morphological expectations. Thus, Gandhi may have carried negative connotations with non-heterosexual practices due to the confusing nature of their sexual representatives in India.

The sexualities represented in India were so numerous and varied that European colonizers wrote tomes on the exotic sights they witnessed in India. John Splinter Stavorinus, a Dutch admiral, described scandalous practices he witnessed in the 1770s in *Voyages to the East-Indies*. British colonizers also kept files on the sexual practices of

various Indian princes; however, the files were reportedly destroyed when British
officials retreated from India after Indian independence. Even with the variety of
sexuality in India, male homosexuality is apparently hidden to such a degree that
Indologist Wendy O’Flaherty claimed that male homosexuality is not even
acknowledged.\textsuperscript{148} One may wonder if male homosexuality was merely muted by Christian
influences, as is claimed to have happened in Africa during the colonial period.\textsuperscript{149}

Gandhi’s research of and enthusiasm for Christianity offers another twist in
distilling his attitudes. Jesus intrigued Gandhi, as seen in his appreciation for the Sermon
on the Mount. Gandhi said that sermon reminded him of the teachings of the \textit{Bhagavad Gita}.\textsuperscript{150} While he greatly admired the Christian teachings, he claimed that above all else,
he was a Hindu and led his life as such. He claimed that he admired the messages of the
sermon, but that when in need of spiritual support, he was not as fulfilled by Christianity
as he was Hinduism.\textsuperscript{151} Thus, he remained aligned with his native Indian qualities.

One of the major cultural Indian characteristics Gandhi engaged with was the
practice of \textit{brahmacharya}. Gandhi began his practice in 1906, Kallenbach took his own
oath in 1907, and Slade began hers in 1925. Indian mystics see life as divided into four
stages; \textit{brahmacharya} is the first. It is a stage associated with learning and discipline.
Discipline is instilled in the \textit{brahmachari}, or student of \textit{brahmacharya}, via voluntary
depivation of worldly pleasures. \textit{Brahmacharis} are expected to adopt minimalist
lifestyles in order to attain a connection with the supernatural, as seen in Christian mystic
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traditions. Taking the vow of brahmacharya demands that one eat simple food, embrace an impoverished lifestyle, and refrain from sexual activity. An accomplished brahmachari is to have total control over his spirit, mind, and body.

Indian cultural scholars highlight the role of semen in the vow. According to Joseph S. Alter, brahmacharya “means total control over the flow of one’s semen. Without question it signifies an immunity from sexual desire.”¹⁵² That is to say that brahmacharya is not simply a vow of celibacy; it is a vow to retain semen and a complete lack of sexual desire. That means that one is not only to avoid sexual acts with one’s wife, but that one is to also not be sexually involved with other men or masturbate.

Semen holds a significant place in Indian culture. It was thought to function like blood, but at a much more supernatural, spiritual level. Retention allowed one to be heroic, strong, and vigorous. Indian wrestlers are often seen as the archetype for brahmachari. Because they retained their semen, they become strong, sound individuals.¹⁵³

Furthermore, semen retention and masculinity were linked to Indian nationalism. As eastern concepts of knowledge differ from western ideas, Alter explains “the body is regarded as more fundamental and natural than are ideas and concepts; it is incontrovertible, and therefore moral in a biological rather than an ideological way.” Thus, the body was used as the outward representation of nationalism and the individual became responsible for taking on such aspects as glory, happiness, peace, and freedom.¹⁵⁴

There were many symptoms of semen loss and they could not be hidden.

Although there is no medical basis for it, Indian men report suffering from dhat

syndrome when they feel they are losing too much semen, which includes constipation and indigestion. There are three factors to producing good semen: eat simple food, live simply, and engage in the simple exercise of walking. Concerns about semen loss are not exclusive to India. Similar cultural ideals exist in China, Sri Lanka, and many African cultures. Anthropologist Charles Lindholm emphasizes that South Asian men attach importance to semen; therefore, they are afraid to lose it, producing a feeling of anxiety around women and by implication, anyone else to whom they were attracted. Gandhi, therefore, would have to avoid activities, particularly romantic ones, which could cause a loss of semen.

Gandhi saw brahmacharya as a search for truth. Anyone could access the truth through “contemplation and inner illumination”, but such illumination could not come without “complete control of the senses”. The perfect brahmachari would be disease-free and would live with God as a strong influence in one’s life. In 1925, Gandhi reported having gained control over his speech and his actions, but struggled to control his thoughts. He lamented falling seriously ill in the ten years prior and not being able to control his thoughts, including his dreams, and mentioned having “involuntary discharge” as well. An article published later that year revealed that Gandhi’s vision of brahmacharya had been informed by Satyarth Prakash, a book written by social reformer Maharishi Dayanand Saraswati, the founder of Arya Samaj. Arya Samaj was a Hindu
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reform movement that emphasized *brahmacharya*.\(^{159}\)

If Gandhi intended to appeal to the Indians of South Africa and India as the leader of their political struggle, he would have to fulfill such a cultural ideal of political integrity. Slade, as an English convert, would have used the vow to legitimize Indian acculturation. Lal makes the point that Gandhi took the vow fairly late in life; this suggests that Gandhi took the vow in order to support his political capabilities. Therefore, *brahmacharya* was not just a moral oath for Gandhi; it was a powerful political message to the world. After taking the vow in 1906, Gandhi reported that he and his wife, Kasturba, had finally become “true friends” and expressed a comfort and ease in their marriage that was not present prior to the vow.\(^{160}\)

Lal expresses that although some people see Gandhi’s messages as bad for women, his vow of *brahmacharya* actually expressed “a striking testimony to his emphatic willingness to reject varying standards of sexual mores for men and women and to persuade women to give up false standards of modesty, which ironically undermined the true capacities of feminine power.”\(^{161}\) Lal speaks to what he sees as Gandhi’s “vulva envy.” Gandhi seemed to find masculinity the most troubling obstacle in attaining *brahmacharya* and expressed the desire to be reborn as a woman on more than one occasion.\(^{162}\)

Gandhi’s views on *brahmacharya* echo the values of German masculinity described by Mosse. In his autobiography, Gandhi expressed “[l]ife without
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brahmacharya appears to me to be insipid and animal-like. The brute by nature knows to self-restraint. Man is man because he is capable of, and only so far as he exercises, self-restraint.”¹⁶³ This quote from 1929 reflects Mosse’s assertion that German masculinity idealized refraining from sexuality, if not a complete absence of sexual desire.

Furthermore, Gandhi stated, “a life of perfect continence in thought, speech, and action is necessary for reaching spiritual perfection.”¹⁶⁴

Gandhi’s view on the place of sex is also made very clear. He wrote, “sexual intercourse for the purpose of carnal satisfaction is reversion to animality, and it should, therefore, be man’s endeavor to rise about it.”¹⁶⁵ This reflects Mosse’s assertion that German men sought to avoid eroticism. According to Gandhi, marriage “does not mean that procreation is obligatory but means that if progeny is wanted, marriage performed in a strictly religious spirit is essential.”¹⁶⁶ Gandhi accepted sex only if children were necessary to a relationship.

Gandhi’s vow of brahmacharya may not have been such an extreme development for the German Kallenbach. Gandhi’s motivations for retaining his semen were indeed related to exalting himself among the Indian community in South Africa and to create an identity for South African Indians in their new home. Kallenbach may have been attempting to find unity with the Indians in his embarkation of celibacy, but for a German man, who also had the ideals of semen retention and masculinity previously bred into his

psyche, it was not such an extreme endeavor. This contrasts with some biographers who use his celibacy to identify his passive role in his relationship with Gandhi. Additionally, the cultural urgings to avoid eroticism and excessive semen loss inhibit the potential for the two men’s sexual interactions with each other. Another important facet to their association was their philosophical interest.

Gandhi and Kallenbach were highly supportive of Tolstoy’s philosophy, so much so that they adopted many of his prescribed practices and named Tolstoy Farm in his honor. Lev Nikolayevich Tolstoy, who went by Leo Tolstoy, was widely known as a Russian novelist, best known for writing *Anna Karenina* and *War and Peace*. After a spiritual crisis, he adopted the teachings of Jesus according to the Sermon on the Mount. He espoused pacifism, Christian anarchism, nonviolence, and voluntary poverty. In the early years of the twentieth century, Gandhi and Kallenbach adopted Tolstoy’s views and would use them throughout the South African *satyagraha* campaign. Gandhi was able to communicate with Tolstoy via letter writing before Tolstoy’s death in 1910.

Tolstoy’s sexuality is also questioned. Some authors see evidence of homosexuality in his autobiography *Childhood, Boyhood, and Youth*, published in 1856.\(^{167}\) However, he held Victorian views on sexuality and thus thought it was among the evils of modernity. Early in life, Tolstoy found himself physically attracted to men and spiritually attracted to women, but he grew to oppose all sexuality. This opposition, coupled with his voluntary poverty, appropriately fit with Gandhi’s *brahmacharya*. Tolstoy condemned homosexuality as one of the decays of modern society.\(^{168}\) He portrays
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\(^{167}\) *Encyclopedia of Homosexuality*, s.v. “Russia and USSR.”

homosexuality negatively in *Anna Karenina* and *Resurrection*. Thus, it is reasonable to draw the conclusion that Tolstoy had a position similar to Gandhi’s opposition to homosexuality, as they shared many similar beliefs, such as negative views of modernization. This is not to say that Gandhi was therefore Russian or that Tolstoy was Indian; rather, they shared common views.

John Ruskin was also an important influence on Gandhi, as well as Kallenbach, and Slade. Ruskin’s major influential work upon Gandhi was *Unto This Last*. In it, Ruskin described one of the problems of modernity as unequal compensation for equal forms of labor. Gandhi explained that his interpretation of *Unto This Last* was that it taught “the good of the individual is contained in the good of all”, the work of the barber is as socially valuable as the work of a lawyer and the barber should be compensated a such, and the life of a physical laborer is “the life worth living.” Furthermore, Ruskin wrote a piece about what he saw as the impact of industrialization on the weather, titled *The Storm-Cloud of the Nineteenth Century*. This work would have influence on Slade, in particular, who was interested in the environment.

Gandhi and Slade’s friendship hinged on a philosophy of love for the natural world. Thus, their ideas of nature are important to understanding their views on sex. One may extrapolate two possible attitudes toward sexuality from this philosophy. One, because sex is natural, homosexuality is an acceptable practice. However, this depends on Gandhi and Slade viewing homosexuality as natural. From what is already known about them, it is known that they did not see it as such. What is known is that Gandhi viewed
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sex within marriage for the purposes of reproduction as the only natural and acceptable means of sex.\textsuperscript{171} Thus, their philosophy would not have been compatible with homosexuality. Furthermore, because of Gandhi’s stance on sex in marriage, he would not have engaged in a physically intimate relationship with Slade.

Using David Cannadine’s thesis, which argues that Britons took British institutions with them throughout the British Empire, it can be understood that cultural practices in the Empire were similar to those in England.\textsuperscript{172} The Victorian era held certain views about sexuality. While the Victorian sexual norm prescribed certain things, Victorians actually practiced other things. As demonstrated in Chapter Three, male same-sex sexuality was permissible so long as an individual followed the other rules of Great Britain. If one were to offend those in power in England, then their sexuality became vulnerable. Something as simple as living in poverty qualified as an offense to the empire, as seen in the poor boys sentenced to hard labor in the Cleveland Street Case. This practice reflects Foucault’s thesis that publicly, as seen in the Criminal Law Amendment Act of 1885, the Great Britain and its empire condemned homosexuality as a deviant sexual practice, but in reality, it was permissible, to a point.

Using Hyam’s thesis that sexual attitudes were open on the edges of empire, one may assert that homosexuality was indeed practiced in South Africa, with similar overarching legal attitudes. Thus, Gandhi and Kallenbach encountered an atmosphere of relative sexual permissibility in South Africa. Because of Gandhi and Kallenbach’s cultural influences from Germany and England, it demonstrates that these views were


\textsuperscript{172} Cannadine, \textit{Ornamentalism}, 4-5.
compatible and thus developed naturally during their friendship in South Africa. Both men are far from home; they may have seen similarities in each other from home and connected in order to fulfill their homesickness.

From Mosse’s description of German masculinity, it is evident that Kallenbach was a product of the changing social trends in Germany. He possessed some aspects of the 1890s Lebensreform movement, such as his tendency toward vegetarianism, but he was a romantic and harkened for days past, as evidenced in his masculine qualities that more closely resemble those of the 1870s and 1880s.

Gandhi and Kallenbach got along so well as friends because surprisingly enough, their native and adopted cultures were highly compatible. This compatibility is reflected in mirroring ideals relating to friendship and sexuality. These ideals include restraint from sex, leadership, and reason over passion. Therefore, Kallenbach was not necessarily absorbing Gandhi’s culture, he was simply expressing his own, which happened to be a lot like Gandhi’s. Thus, the common Gandhi-Kallenbach narrative must be revisited.

As demonstrated by Mosse’s, Lal’s, and Alter’s work, German, Indian, and British masculinity had very similar qualities in the late Victorian era. Kallenbach was not passively following Gandhi as some biographies, like Great Soul suggest. Instead, he was actively exemplifying the German cultural ideal of friendship. Kallenbach appreciated and adopted Gandhi’s simple lifestyle because he still had a life in the busy city of Johannesburg. He was among the influences that made the city so busy as he designed the buildings that brought so many people to it. Thus, as was engendered in him culturally, he needed Gandhi’s friendship and the simplicity it brought to balance his life.

In conclusion, one may examine Gandhi, Kallenbach, and Slade’s philosophical,
religious, and cultural heritages to draw conclusions on the nature of their attitudes regarding same-sex sexuality and sex outside of marriage. Because it is evident that all three people were exposed to anti-homosexual notions prior to and during their associations, it is reasonable to conclude that no sexual activities occurred between Gandhi and Kallenbach or Gandhi and Slade. Furthermore, due to the complementary natures of their native cultures in India and Germany and British ideals the encountered in South Africa, one may see Kallenbach through a new perspective. Rather than viewing Kallenbach as Gandhi’s puppet, as many narratives have suggested, Kallenbach was actively pursuing the same ideals as Gandhi because such ideals were evident in his background, as well.
VI. GANDHI’S WRITING STYLE AND SEXUALITY

Gandhi’s legacy to the world is supported by a plethora of writings and recorded speeches. A large collection of his writing is easily accessible in the Collected Works of Mahatma Gandhi (CWMG), many volumes of which have been made available online by the GandhiServe Foundation.\textsuperscript{173} Outside of the CWMG, Gandhi also published an autobiography as well as writings specifically on his South African campaign.\textsuperscript{174} CWMG contains many of Gandhi’s handwritten letters. This chapter engages in an analysis of Gandhi’s writings in order to critique to Joseph Lelyveld’s construct of the friendship between Gandhi and Hermann Kallenbach. Lelyveld’s use of Gandhi’s letters to Kallenbach will be compared to the actual text of those letters. Gandhi’s letters to Madeline Slade will also be considered in order to make comparisons between Gandhi’s relationship with her and with Kallenbach. In order to do so, the institution of Victorian writing will be considered.

Catherine Golden, author of Publishing It: The Victorian Revolution in Letter Writing, describes the first day of the general post availability in Great Britain as mirroring the scene in George Elgar Hick’s painting The General Post Office, One Minute to Six. The painting is a portrayal of how Britons responded to the first day on which penny post was available. Prior to that day, January 10, 1840, receiving a letter was a very expensive purchase. One did not have to pay to send a letter, but rather the receiver was to pay postage. Many poor Britons could not afford to accept postage prior to 1840. In an age when receiving a letter usually meant learning of the death of a loved

one, poor Britons resorted to only sending envelopes with codes written on the outside so that it was not necessary for the receiver to accept the letter, but rather they only had to see the tick marks or other code on the outside of the letter. With the introduction of the penny post and paying to send a letter rather than to receive one, the British postal system opened the way for many social revolutions, such as the expansion of literacy and the movement of information.¹⁷⁵

It was this Victorian-era economic shift toward modernization and moving letters from one place to the other that facilitated the mass movement of ideas across the British Empire. The imperial postal system was firmly in place by the time Gandhi was born in 1869. Letter writing was a major aspect of Gandhi’s life. From his early years in law school in London through the very end of his life, Gandhi wrote prolifically. The CWMG provides only a portion of his countless letters addressed to his friends, family, colleagues, and political opponents. A postal system that was compatible with Gandhi’s frugal financial habits was imperative for Gandhi’s messages to reach their intended audiences and thus foster his legacy. The postal system made Gandhi’s messages reach their intended audiences, thus fostering his lessons for the world. Gandhi is one of the most influential people to communicate his ideas worldwide before the advent of the Internet. Golden goes to far as to compare the postal system to the Internet.

In addition to the expanded literacy base facilitated by Victorian postal reform, new trends in styles of letter writing emerged. Certain styles of writing developed. The content of the letter, such as beginning by apologizing for assuming that a person wanted to receive a letter from the sender, and the physical characteristics of the letter, such as

which corner of the paper was folded first, became highly symbolic, social aspects of letter writing. Such characteristics became so embedded with British respectability and proper character that letter writing guides were published. These guides, such as *Companion to the Writing-Desk; or, How to Address, Begin, and End Letters to Titled and Official Personages* and *The Universal Letter-Writer; or New Art of Polite Correspondence* offered a Victorian contradiction of being honest and sharing one’s true feelings, but not sharing too much.¹⁷⁶ Victorian letter writers were very particular in their penmanship and word choice.

*Frost’s Original Letter Writer* touts itself as having “plain directions about everything connected with writing a letter.”¹⁷⁷ Indeed, it strives to. It lists instructions for average situations such as “introducing one lady to another” to unusual situations such as “ordering dry goods from a firm just starting in business.”¹⁷⁸ *The Gentlemen’s Model Letter-Writer: A Complete Guide to Correspondence on All Subjects With Commercial Forms*, also lists model letters for a variety of situations, such as writing a letter to “a book-keeper and Accountant applying for Employment” and “A letter from a Father to a Son at School, on the necessity of Attention to his Studies.”¹⁷⁹ These model letters for such specific situations reflect a desire of the Victorians to be as precise as possible in their written communication. There was no room for question or interpretation; the
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¹⁷⁶ *Companion to the Writing-Desk; or, How to Address, Begin, and End Letters to Titled*, (London: R. Hardwicke, 1861); Rev. T. Cooke, *The Universal Letter Writer; or New Art of Polite Correspondence*, (London: Milner and Company, c. 1850).


Victorians wanted to attain their ideal of perfection.

*The Mystery of Love, Courtship, and Marriage Explained*, by Henry J. Wehman, illustrates that love letters should be “plain, fervent, respectful, and to the point. Never write a letter merely for the sake of writing; let it have some aim…” He later suggests not using too many adjectives and avoiding repeating endearing terms. He also makes the claim that writing a good love letter requires more talent than solving a complicated philosophical problem. Thus, lovers should not expect much from each other’s letters.

Wehman explains that a man writing to a person in whom he is romantically interested should always begin by apologizing for his presumption that it was welcome and or acceptable for him to write to the person of interest. He should then explain that he has certain feelings and request to spend time. In subsequent letters, the tone should remain extremely polite. The male letter writer should then attempt to predict the responses to their questions and requests and offer pre-emptive responses in return.

Wehmen even discusses postage stamp flirtation. A stamp upside in the left corner of an envelope signified that the sender loved the receiver; a stamp at a right angle, upside down meant that the sender longed to see the receiver. Wehmen also makes the pivotal point that pre-marital sex is “mean, and a sign of low breeding.” This critique of intimacy mirrors Gandhi’s and sheds light on Gandhi’s interaction with Victorian culture.

Gandhi’s aloof, somewhat impersonal, yet still personal, style of writing follows many Victorian letter-writing conventions discussed by Frost and Wehmen. This is just
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one example of the influence of British Victorian culture on Gandhi.\textsuperscript{185} Thus, it is reasonable to examine his letters in the context of such a style; for example, “love letters”, including those between romantic couples and intimate relationships such as families, typically did not end with “love, name” as seen in more recent writing. Instead, Victorian letters ended with other conventions, such as “ever your friend”.\textsuperscript{186} Writers would sometimes sign their letters “sinly” as an abbreviation for “sincerely”; however, that is interpreted by modern readings as implying sinful or sexual tones. This kind of lost-in-time miscommunication between cultural eras can create misinterpretations. In addition to letter writing, biography is also a form of communication that was significant in the Victorian era.

Trev Broughton, a scholar who analyzed Victorian biography in her doctoral studies, refers to the professionalization of biography as a trend that emerged in the late Victorian era.\textsuperscript{187} A significant biographer, author, and historian of the era, Leslie Stephen, became the editor of the first \textit{Dictionary of National Biography (DNB)}, which has transformed into the modern-day \textit{Oxford Dictionary of National Biography}. The \textit{DNB}, whose first volumes were released in 1885, was among the first English collections of biography and demonstrates the standardization of “life-writing.” Broughton sees life-writing as a development in western masculinity. Writing about one’s life was a form of subjectivity that provided a method to interpret oneself and a conscious examination of individualism. Because the subjects of life-writing were most often white, male property-owners, such a study provides information of the state of white, middle- to upper-class
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masculinity.\textsuperscript{188} As Gandhi’s political struggle was intended to appeal to such individuals, the upper-class rulers of the British Empire, he also wrote of his life in \textit{An Autobiography: The Story of My Experiments with the Truth}. In \textit{An Autobiography}, readers can witness his Victorian-influenced, personal-yet-impersonal way of communicating, as seen in his letters. \textit{An Autobiography} is one important sampling of Gandhi’s writing. His letters to important friends, such as Madeleine Slade, who took the name Mirabehn, and Hermann Kallenbach, are equally telling.

Many of Gandhi’s letters to Kallenbach and Slade are available in the \textit{CWMG}. Slade published many of the letters Gandhi wrote to her in \textit{Gandhi’s Letters To A Disciple}. One may be concerned that Slade, born twenty years after Gandhi and growing up during the pre-World War I Georgian era rather than the Victorian era, might not subscribe to the Victorian ideals one may ascribe to Gandhi. The same concern may exist regarding Kallenbach, who was of German descent. This study is not concerned with Slade’s and Kallenbach’s letters to Gandhi so much as it is concerned with Gandhi’s letters to Slade and Kallenbach.

Volume 96 of the \textit{CWMG} contains Gandhi’s letters to Kallenbach and was published by the Government of India in 1994. Some letters not found in the \textit{CWMG} are available in other books, such as \textit{Gandhi Letters: From Upper House to Lower House}. The National Archives of India also houses letters purchased from Kallenbach’s niece, Isa Sarid; these were the letters that caused such controversy because of their sudden purchase in 2012. More collections of the letters were acquired in 2013. The available letters are written only from Gandhi’s hand. The location of Kallenbach’s letters to
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Gandhi is unknown; many believe that Gandhi destroyed them, at Kallenbach’s request. This idea comes from a letter in which Gandhi refers to destroying the letters. But it is not clear whether Gandhi meant destroy the one letter or destroy them all. At that, did Gandhi destroy all of the letters during the forty years they wrote to one another? It is possible that many of Kallenbach’s letters to Gandhi are extant; however, due to Gandhi’s frugal nature and highly mobile life, it is unlikely that these letters will be recovered. Lelyveld ignores the obvious possibility that only one letter was destroyed, instead adding to the drama of Great Soul by claiming the evidence disputing his concoction is nonexistent.

Lelyveld introduces Kallenbach into Gandhi’s biography with a provocative statement:

“They were a couple,” Tridip Suhrud, a Gandhi scholar, said when I met him in the Gujarati capital of Gandhinagar. That’s a succinct way of summing up the obvious-Kallenbach later remarked that they’d lived together “almost in the same bed”-but what kind of couple were they?

Lelyveld asks the question about the nature of their status as a “couple”, but his choice of the word automatically classifies the pair as a romantic couple, per the connotation of the word. These first lines in Lelyveld’s depiction of Gandhi and Kallenbach’s friendship are followed by points being made that Gandhi destroyed Kallenbach’s letters and a description of the word-of-mouth rumors among locals in South Africa. The paragraph ends, “It was no secret then, or later, that Gandhi, leaving his wife behind, had gone to live with a man.”

Lelyveld’s description in this opening paragraph seems to build up to the idea that
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there was something unusual about Gandhi and Kallenbach sharing a residence without Gandhi’s wife or family living there, as well. What Lelyveld does not mention is that Gandhi’s relocating to Johannesburg was in support of his political agenda. Johannesburg was the seat of the government and the political realm in South Africa. Gandhi’s family remained in Durban, on the Phoenix Settlement, helping satyagrahis and furthering the goals of the Indian civil rights movement. On present-day roads in modern vehicles, Durban is a six-hour drive from Johannesburg, where Gandhi lived with Kallenbach. The family’s separation was not because of marital collapse; it was to broaden the movement in order to support Gandhi’s political goals. Furthermore, men living with other men are not nor were they unusual in the early twentieth century. Men live together in dormitories, military barracks, and myriad other environments.

Lelyveld begins the second paragraph of his section on Gandhi’s relationship with Kallenbach by making the point that as Platonic love has little credibility in modern times, it is easy to arrange details to give the impression of a sexual relationship. Lelyveld then jumps to a brief biography of Kallenbach. The arrangement of these two disjointed two ideas seems odd. Kallenbach’s masculinity is juxtaposed next to Gandhi’s softer, more feminine aura. Lelyveld’s emphasis on their physical bodies and sensual natures distracts from the pair’s political work. Lelyveld does the same with the letter from September of 1909, previously discussed in Chapter Two. Lelyveld could have used that to describe their dedication to their activism. Gandhi’s passion about the Indian rights movement was so strong that he made the overseas journey from South Africa to London to lobby for it. Rather than asking what kind of couple they were or what the significance of Vaseline was to their association, Lelyveld could have analyzed their
activism and interactions with one of the many communities Gandhi and Kallenbach encountered.

One may interpret Gandhi’s “love letters” in several ways. However, Gandhi’s love letters were simply the way he communicated with his friends around the world. Gandhi wrote many “love letters” to his close friends, such as Kallenbach, missionary Charles Freer Andrews, fellow satyagrahi Henry Polak, his proxy leader in his 1930 Salt Satyagraha, Abbas Tyabji, and Danish missionary Esther Faering.192

Esther Faering was similar to Madeline Slade in that she was a European woman who went to India in order to support Gandhi’s independence campaign. Gandhi and Faering had a long letter-writing friendship, much like Gandhi and many of his other friends. In April 1918, Gandhi was acted as a symbolic leader during the Champaran labor dispute, during which Indian agricultural workers protested British landowner’s requirements to grow certain cash crops.193 In a letter to Fearing, he lamented not having written to her sooner: “I seem to have been cruelly neglectful in my correspondence with you. I wanted to give you a long love-letter. I have not the quiet for framing such a letter. And I dare not wait any longer.”194 Gandhi goes on to describe the stress he was living under and signs the letter “With love, Yours, Bapu.”195 “Bapu” meant “father” to each of the people he used the term with. There was nothing sexual about his letter to Faering.
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Gandhi did not intend for his love letters to have the sexual undertones that present-day westerners may read into them. Instead, they were letters to people for whom he had non-erotic love. Therefore, when he wrote love letters to Kallenbach, he was not inviting any sexual or worldly feelings; he was expressing his non-sexual love.

Lelyveld’s next set of evidence involves the men’s nicknames for one another and an agreement they made regarding Kallenbach’s conduct while visiting his family in Germany in 1911. In his discussion of the two men’s nicknames, Lelyveld again describes them in a dichotomous, complementary way. Gandhi, or “Upper House”, is the dominant party, “wittier”, and the decision maker. Kallenbach, or “Lower House”, is the younger, simpler, but more physically able of the two. Kallenbach’s portrayal is much like George Milton and Lennie Small in John Steinbeck’s *Of Mice and Men*. George is small, intelligent, and scrappy, while Lennie is large, dumb, but physically strong. Lelyveld seems to establish this complementary framework in order to passively demonstrate the two men’s need for one another. However, it is curious that he again uses the opportunity to discuss personal details, rather than mentioning the personal details and how they connect to the men’s public efforts.

In an agreement, Kallenbach agreed not to engage in certain behaviors that violated his vow of *brahmacharya* while in Germany visiting his family. These prohibited behaviors included looking at women with lust and engaging in marriage proceedings. It ends with both parties agreeing to “more love, and yet more love…” in their relationship. Lelyveld blames the atmosphere of the letters to the “playful undertone that might easily be ascribed to a lover,” attributed to Gandhi as the author of the
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supposed “love” letters.\textsuperscript{197}

Lelyveld then describes the nature of the pair’s refraining from sex. Lelyveld uses a letter written by Kallenbach to his brother in Germany in 1908 in which Kallenbach discusses changes he had made in the previous two years since becoming celibate. He and Gandhi no longer had a servant in their shared house, so they managed their home alone. They grew their own food, cooked and cleaned. In January 1906 Kallenbach gave up sex, eating meat, and eating fish with the goal of simplifying his life. Kallenbach assures his brother that he was not “eccentric.” Instead, he took on “a most unusual life” which sought to help a person become more independent. He changed his “daily life in order to simplify it.” Finally, he remarked that he felt like his character had become stronger, his mental capabilities were more acute, and his body was in the best condition it had ever been.\textsuperscript{198}

Gandhi and Kallenbach also became wary of milk and chocolate because, according to Lelyveld, “Few foods are so ‘heating,’ meaning likely to stimulate forbidden appetites. [Gandhi] sends Kallenbach a verse on nonattachment to ‘bodily pleasures.’”\textsuperscript{199} Lelyveld constructs the image of the two men anxiously avoiding their feelings for one another via a seemingly constant discussion of how to avoid being aroused. Lelyveld’s portrayal is inaccurate; the two men certainly conducted dietary experiments in order to avoid sexual feelings, but it was not sexual feelings for each other that they were avoiding. The pair was avoiding arousal in order to not lose semen, per their cultural ideals of masculinity and self-control, which allowed no room for arousal.

This letter reflects Kallenbach’s acceptance of a vow of celibacy, but not
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necessarily a full commitment to brahmacharya, at approximately the same time as Gandhi. When discussing the vow in his autobiography, Gandhi notes that Kallenbach “was convinced that he must carry out in his life the changes I was making in mine.”

Because the majority of the evidence surrounding this situation comes from Gandhi’s hand, it is tempting to attribute Kallenbach’s actions to the influence of Gandhi. Gandhi’s claim that Kallenbach took the same vow does not mean Kallenbach took it at Gandhi’s urging. Gandhi clearly wanted Kallenbach to join him in brahmacharya, but Kallenbach’s growing support of Zionism demonstrates some resistance to Gandhi’s influence. Detractors of the homosexual affair use both men’s oaths to dispel it, but those explanations are insufficient without understanding the cultural, political, and moral implication of semen retention, an absence of sexuality, and control over one’s mind and body.

Lelyveld goes on to describe their co-living situation and Gandhi’s persuasion to have Kallenbach quit his architecture practice. After describing the nature of the Kraal, Kallenbach’s house in the Orchards area of Johannesburg, Lelyveld mentions, almost in passing, that the pair cohabited for eighteen months. This passive comment, in the midst of a description of history and architecture, stands out from the architecture discussion, almost highlighting the fact of their shared living scenario.

Lelyveld introduces their move to a grander home, Mountain View in Linksfield, by referring to the pair as “the couple.” Lelyveld uses gendered words, such as when he refers to Gandhi nagging Kallenbach to dispose of an automobile in order to uphold their commitment to voluntary poverty, and eventually give up his architecture practice.

---
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Gandhi asks Kallenbach to give up his professional life as Gandhi had given up his, so that they could continue a “shared life of service” to their cause.\textsuperscript{202}

Lelyveld then discusses an agreement regarding living arrangements at Tolstoy Farm, noting that the agreement states that Gandhi and Kallenbach would live together, away from the rest of the settlers. He also notes that Gandhi and his wife had been sleeping apart for over five years, despite her living at Tolstoy for a year.\textsuperscript{203}

Next, Lelyveld contrasts Kallenbach to Gandhi’s married male associates. Lelyveld notes that Kallenbach was more involved in Gandhi’s dietary, medical, and linguistic experiments than other men involved in the campaigns. Lelyveld concludes that thought by highlighting Kallenbach’s place: “His commitment to Gandhian values, as they evolve, seems wholehearted, not selective. He is more an acolyte, less than an equal. Never, as far as we can tell, does he present an intellectual challenge to the spiritual explorer who has become his companion.”\textsuperscript{204} This statement clearly displays the passive role Lelyveld constructed Kallenbach as fulfilling. Not only is Lelyveld imposing a false role onto Kallenbach, he is also incorrect in his absolute statement that Kallenbach never challenged Gandhi. As seen in his drifting closer toward his Jewish identity and further away from a Gandhi-directed lifestyle, Kallenbach clearly challenged Gandhi’s aggressive attempts to fully acculturate Kallenbach to Indian ways. Lelyveld’s statement is ironic, because only one paragraph later, he describes Kallenbach’s challenge.

Lelyveld then mentions that despite Gandhi’s efforts to push Kallenbach deeper into Hinduism and brahmacharya, Kallenbach pulls away and instead begins to fill his time with a study of Judaism. He then asserts that Kallenbach’s feelings toward Gandhi
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could be measured by which language Kallenbach was studying that week, as he studied Hebrew and Hindi concurrently. His wavering is demonstrated in his emotional response when he does not get as much of Gandhi’s time as he wants. Lelyveld writes, “He’s disconsolate, if not jealous, when Gandhi lavishes admiration and time on someone else. Persisting, Gandhi puts up with all this for more than two years, all the time seeking to preserve their bond.” Lelyveld then remarks that Kallenbach knew he was not Gandhi’s equal. Kallenbach’s records display a power imbalance when he refers to “Mr. Gandhi” rather than a more familiar term. Kallenbach’s resistance to Gandhi’s insistence on expanding his Hindu practices confirms that Kallenbach was not Gandhi’s puppet, but rather was pursuing his own ideological agenda.

Lelyveld further builds his emphasis on Kallenbach’s jealousy in his conclusion. He claims that after long talks with Gandhi, Kallenbach steps up his effort in learning Hindi and maintaining their strict lifestyle. Lelyveld goes on to claim that when Gandhi spends time with someone else, such as Gandhi’s secretary Sonja Schlesin, “a fresh shower of doubts rains down on him”, which discourages Kallenbach’s efforts to learn Hindi.

There is a noticeable absence of correspondence in 1912 during Kallenbach’s trip to Germany. It is possible that the two men were not communicating or that their letters were lost. Whatever the case may be, one can see distance grow between them after Kallenbach’s return to South Africa in 1913. It is plausible that his trip made Zionism much more important to Kallenbach, bringing him closer to his Jewish heritage but distancing him from Gandhi. Kallenbach gradually returned to his material lifestyle,
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especially after Gandhi left Tolstoy Farm in 1913 and returned to Phoenix. Gandhi expressed remorse at Kallenbach’s change. He told him that he wished that Kallenbach “could stand this life.” In the next letter, though, Gandhi gave up on compelling Kallenbach to return to their shared lifestyle when he wrote, “I will not, therefore, strive with you. I quite see that you should now proceed along your own lines.” He goes on to tell Kallenbach that he knew that he was unhappy with their shared lifestyle, but “Palestine isn’t the answer.”

Kallenbach was still clearly attached to Gandhi and may have felt guilt over the distance brought by his new Zionist nature, so he gave up his architecture profession for a time and continued to support Gandhi in the 1913 Satyagraha. In April and May 1914 their letters became quarrelsome. Gandhi berated Kallenbach for the nature of his letters and questioned Kallenbach’s love for him. Gandhi stopped addressing his letters to “Lower House” in May 1914 and their letters became shorter and more business-oriented.

In concluding his discussion of Gandhi and Kallenbach, Lelyveld describes Gandhi’s leaving South Africa as though he made the decision to leave a tumultuous romance. Lelyveld writes, “In leaving Joburg, Gandhi appears to have left him behind, to have broken free,” but in the next line he notes that Gandhi expected Kallenbach to follow him to India. Lelyveld then discusses a letter Gandhi wrote to Kallenbach comparing his relationship to that with British missionary Charles F. Andrews. Gandhi said that he would not give up Kallenbach for Andrews and that he knew Kallenbach would support him unconditionally. Then Gandhi questioned how he had the right to
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expect so much from Kallenbach. Lelyveld’s next comments, “So much of what, we’re left to wonder” is provocative and can be read as an insinuation.

Gandhi and Kallenbach engaged in a fight against political oppression and prejudice in South Africa. Their struggles had an unintended consequence of the development a unique microcosm of proto-nationalism that was a blend of Indian and European Jewish influences and resisted the dominant white British culture. The other European Jews involved in supporting Gandhi’s political work, such as Henry Polak, Millie Polak, and Sonja Schlesin, contributed to the identity. Many of these individuals also lived on either the Phoenix Settlement or Tolstoy Farm. The two locations served as incubators for this new identity. As Kallenbach associated nationalism with friendship, when Gandhi did not reciprocate what Kallenbach expected from their friendship, he became upset. Thus, the jealousy that some authors attribute to Kallenbach’s alleged romantic feelings for Gandhi was not at all rooted in romance. It was rooted in the integrity of their movement.

Gandhi’s letters to Kallenbach appear to tell the story of a friendship with a clear, unequal balance of power. However, that is because readers can only access Gandhi’s side of the story. Lelyveld’s construct revolves around this one-sided account and focuses on the personal interactions it displays, rather than the larger context in which it existed. This unequal balance of power is reflected in Gandhi’s letters exchanged with Slade; however, Slade confirmed Gandhi as the dominant party in their relationship in her autobiography. Slade is useful because of her similarities with Kallenbach. Because they are so alike, readers can see Gandhi’s messages to his close friends were not unique to one individual.
Gandhi’s letters to Slade begin and progress similarly as those to Kallenbach. Gandhi’s earliest known letter to Kallenbach in late 1906 is very formal. During a mission to England, Gandhi thanks “Mr. Kallenbach” for his letters and support and mentions under being great stress. In Gandhi’s first letter to Slade in 1924, he apologizes for not writing to her sooner and thanks “Miss Slade” for a donation she made for “popularizing the spinning wheel.” After their letters demonstrate that Gandhi had accepted Kallenbach and Slade as intimate friends, he begins to refer to their exchanges as “love letters”.

Within one year of making acquaintance of her, Miss Slade had become Mirabehn and Gandhi became “Bapu”, the Indian word for father. Although his nickname did not come as quick, Mr. Kallenbach became “Lower House” and Gandhi became “Upper House.” Slade’s role as Gandhi’s spiritual daughter and continuation of his legacy became evident. Gandhi told Slade that she should “not squander the inheritance that [she had] claimed as [hers] but [would] add to it a thousandfold.” Her inheritance was that of Gandhi’s activist legacy. Gandhi was confident that his adopted daughter would maintain the spirit of the satyagraha movement. The way he begins his next and subsequent letters, “Chi Mira,” further shows that he thought she would do this for a long time. He explained that “Chi”, short for “Chiranjivi” stands for “long lived”, and that it is a symbol of blessing from a elder to ones kin.

---

Gandhi’s letters to Slade resemble those to Kallenbach not only in the evident progression of their level of intimacy, but also in their content. In late 1926, Gandhi asked Slade to report on daily occurrences such as what she did that day, her prayers, her studies, and her diet. He was so concerned with what she was eating that he inquired about the amount of milk she consumed and her meal times. He also inquired into her personal finances as well as the finances of the ashram while he was away. Gandhi discussed those topics with Kallenbach throughout their friendship. Topics like diet, daily activities, and prayers, were those about which Gandhi liked to maintain a constant dialogue. They were very important to their vows of brahmacharya and the personal integrity Gandhi sought in his European friends and satyagrahis.

Slade and Kallenbach shared many similar traits and a similar timeline in their relationships with Gandhi, which is why she is useful in analyzing him. Examining Slade’s relationship with Gandhi reveals that Gandhi’s habits with Kallenbach were not unique, nor were they indicative of an intimate, physical affair. Gandhi’s behaviors with friends were habitual and not unique to one person or era, both during Kallenbach’s time and through Slade’s generation.

As will be discussed in Chapter Five, their roles as father and daughter are evident in their interactions and display a familial relationship more than a friendship. While distant at times, Gandhi was always concerned with Slade’s well being. He asked about the important things they had in common, like his dietary experiments and her

commitment to brahmacharya.\textsuperscript{220} He scolded her when he thought she needed it. In exasperation because of her demands on his time, he told her “you must forget me in the body. You can’t have it for ever.”\textsuperscript{221} He also supported her financially.\textsuperscript{222}

Slade’s autobiography reflects a poor relationship with her father. As a Navy Admiral turned businessman, he was in high demand by colleagues and therefore absent in his daughter’s life. Perhaps she sought a fatherly influence from Gandhi. Gandhi, like her father, traveled frequently and was in demand by people other than his family. Psychological studies indicate that people often chose relationships that resemble the relationships they had with their parents.\textsuperscript{223} Perhaps Slade wanted such a relationship with Gandhi, but because of her experience with her father, she sought out powerful but distant, inaccessible men. Gandhi was clearly a patriarchal figure to Slade. His dominance, seen in their letters and in Slade’s description in her autobiography, in the dynamic is too imbalanced for them to be simply friends.

Kallenbach and Slade had several important things in common before becoming involved with Gandhi. They were both of European origin and had spent significant portions of their lives outside of Europe. Kallenbach was born in Germany but lived in South Africa and England for several years before meeting Gandhi. Slade was born in England but relocated many times due to her father’s role in the military, including to India. They were both people of means; they did not have a financial interest in associating with Gandhi and therefore their associations were entirely voluntary.
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After encountering Gandhi, Kallenbach and Slade followed similar patterns, as seen in their “love letters”. These letters describe similar progressions of events building up to their peaks and eventual ends. Gandhi’s love letters are not letters to people in whom he had sexual interest. For Gandhi, love letters were literally that, letters containing platonic love, not lust. Love letters containing familiar, intimate thoughts were not unusual for Gandhi to send to friends.

Another piece of the pattern Kallenbach and Slade both experienced were major lifestyle changes. After developing a friendship, his new friends commit to Gandhi and his vision. Slade shifted her entire life to live in Sabarmati ashram. In Kallenbach’s case, he financed the establishment of an ashram with Gandhi.224 Flight to the ashram was accompanied by a change in diet. The Europeans took to Gandhi’s dietary experiments.225 With Gandhi’s encouragement, Kallenbach and Slade also took vows of celibacy.

Gandhi limited himself from his European friends. His political power caused him to be in high demand, frequently traveling and catering to his cause. Kallenbach and Slade both wanted more from Gandhi. They both wanted the gratification of being Gandhi’s favorite, but Gandhi did not fulfill their desires and they grew frustrated and jealous. Gandhi chided them for such feelings and seemed to insinuate that they were being selfish and therefore immoral for demanding his attention. They reached Gandhi’s intimacy ceiling after gradually growing closer over a period of time. Their bonds eventually broke and the Europeans return to their pre-Gandhi lives.

Sudden, unexpected violence caused major changed to both sets of relationships.

224 Lelyveld, Great Soul, 93.
In Kallenbach’s case, he was ready to commit to Gandhi fully and move to India with him. Before going to India, though, Kallenbach was interned as a prisoner of war in 1914 at the start of World War I. He was held until 1917 and returned to South Africa. He reclaimed his old life of materialism, women, and architecture, but maintained a letter-writing friendship with Gandhi. Slade’s relationship with Gandhi was ended by his assassination in 1948. She, too, found her own way without Gandhi, but eventually returned to her pre-Gandhi lifestyle in Europe later in life.

Comparing Kallenbach and Slade’s relationships with Gandhi reveals a pattern first seen with Kallenbach. Gandhi developed a pattern in his relationships with many of his European followers. He took on a dominant, guiding role that some may interpret as masculine or fatherly. Kallenbach and Slade were both people of means who give the impression of seeking excitement and the exotic, perhaps influenced by ideas based in orientalism.226 Both people developed intimate bonds, which were not unusual in their time, but in a modern perspective, can be interpreted as romantic. It is possible that these submissive Europeans were tools to Gandhi. They both provided services and feedback to Gandhi that was useful to his campaigns. Both read drafts of Gandhi’s English-language writing. Kallenbach helped Gandhi record *Hind Swaraj*; Slade read drafts of Gandhi’s *Autobiography*.227 Their feedback and critique from a European perspective was useful for Gandhi in that his political goals involved appealing to powerful Europeans.

The possibility of Slade or Kallenbach having sexual relationships with Gandhi is highly doubtful. A one-time sexual encounter cannot be verified, but there is evidence against it. Neither Kallenbach nor Slade would have ever gotten the chance to have a

---

physical relationship with Gandhi because all three were celibate. His sexuality became so muted that many followers ceased to see Gandhi as a sexual man at all. Slade even said that she confused Gandhi with her mother in her dreams.\textsuperscript{228} Generally, those who take the vow segregate the sexes, but segregation was something he rejected, a detail Lal says scholars need to know that in order to understand Gandhi’s relationships with women.\textsuperscript{229}

In conclusion, an examination of Gandhi and Kallenbach’s written correspondence helps to clarify Lelyveld’s representation of their friendship. It is evident that Victorian letter writing conventions reflect more intimacy than modern communication styles. Modern readers may, therefore, interpret letters written in the Victorian era, such as those from Gandhi to Kallenbach, as more romantic or intimate than they actually were. Analysis of Gandhi’s correspondence with Slade also reveals a pattern Gandhi had with his European associates over his half-century career.
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VII. SOCIOLOGICAL MODELS DEFINING GANDHI AND KALLENBACH'S RELATIONSHIP

Victorian era thinkers, a category in which some scholars may include Gandhi, believed that society could be improved by logic and organization. Some modern schools of thought, such as sociology, extend the legacy of this Victorian idea by creating academic fields around them. Among the wisdom sociology has given the world is models of modern relationships. Such models reflect various categories of intimacy, such as homosocial relationships and homosexual relationships. Several prominent models have established clear, identifiable guidelines. According to these models, Gandhi and Kallenbach did not have a sexual relationship. Instead, their relationship had elements of homosociality, fraternal friendship, and apprenticeship.

A modern, popular examination of male bonds based on photographs is the blog titled “The Art of Manliness.” In a 2012 article, Brett and Kate McKay, writing in “The Art of Manliness,” lamented that male friendship has progressively lost its sense of intimacy between the Victorian era and present day.230 The blog seeks to “uncover the lost art of being a man.”231 While it focuses on men’s trends during the post-World War II era, many of their articles explore earlier time periods. In “Bosom Buddies: A Photo History of Male Affection,” the McKays analyzed hundreds of photographs of American men between the Civil War and the 1930s. They note that the men in their photographs cannot be definitively labeled as gay or straight; however, the men in the photographs did not think of their poses as anything questionable or hinting at anything socially

unacceptable, like homosexuality. Furthermore, they highlight that poses in the photographs are common rather than unusual and that they highlight intimacy, rather than sexuality.232

The McKays note that many readers may see these late-nineteenth century photographs and assume the men, many of whom are draped across each other, were gay. The McKays then explain in a succinct manner that today, being gay is an identity, whereas in the 1800s, engaging in a homosexual encounter was merely something a person did, like a hobby. Their comments regarding presentism and identity versus practice serve as a neat microcosm with which to compare Lelyveld’s account of Gandhi and Kallenbach’s friendship. The ways Gandhi and Kallenbach interacted were ways that, in their time, were not unusual for them or other heterosexual men to behave. However, cultural discourses on male relationships in the western world have changed in the century since Gandhi and Kallenbach had a close friendship. Their interactions may be interpreted as having sexual components by modern cultures. Thus, the McKays’s brief analysis of the model of male relationships in pre-World War I United States provides a useful comparison for such relationships in South Africa during the same era.

This conclusive chapter considers sociological models of relationships to provide a scientific perspective to the larger study of Gandhi and Kallenbach’s relationship. Scholars and researchers used Victorian-era literature, biography, and other contemporary methodologies to develop theories about Victorian men. Gender theorist David M. Halperin outlined four models of male gender deviance and male sex before homosexuality was commonly acknowledged in the nineteenth century. In other words,
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there were four patterns in to which male relationships fit during Gandhi and Kallenbach’s friendship.

These four models include (i) effeminacy, or identification with “feminine” concepts, like love, rather than “male” concepts, like war; (ii) “active” sodomy, or the desire to penetrate another male; (iii) friendship, or an egalitarian pairing with a disinterested love that leads to very tight bonds; and (iv) passivity or inversion, which involved the subject giving up their masculinity and demonstrating a preference to being penetrated.233 These four models fed into the modern concept of homosexuality, which includes a perception of perversion or pathological orientation; a perception of same-sex desire; and an awareness of sexually deviant behavior.234 Halperin’s theory emphasizes individual perception and self-identification. Sexual love values the differences in partners, while friendship emphasizes the sameness of those involved.235 Best friends can lose themselves in one another and possess a willingness to die for each other.236 This pattern evolves into the thought of a “best friend” or “another self”.

Halperin’s model that best applies to Gandhi and Kallenbach is the friendship model. It promotes an equal relationship with qualities like reciprocity and mutuality. Men in this model are of the same social rank, and can claim similar statuses in areas like age, masculinity, and social power. Although their social rank was different because of how race was interpreted, Gandhi and Kallenbach were of similar age, were both masculine according to their own cultures, and possessed similar levels of social power within their respective racial communities. Effeminacy is also applicable, as Gandhi and
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Kallenbach advocated love and non-violence over violence. The other two models, “active” sodomy and passivity, are not applicable, as there is no evidence that either man penetrated, was penetrated, or had such a desire.

Halperin notes that for modern westerners, it is hard to not apply sexual ideas to intense, but platonic, shows of affection among men. This is due to explorations in psychology and sexuality in recent decades. This process of applying twenty-first century notions of homosexuality to a nineteenth-century pair of men, such as Gandhi and Kallenbach, is presentist and produces a false interpretation of their association. A more accurate model is fraternal friendship.

Danny Kaplan and Niza Yanay developed a second concept important to understanding male friendships. They refer to it as fraternal friendship. This concept derives from Halperin’s early work and is based on a case study of male members of the Israeli military. The “hegemonic script for male bonding” says that there are three steps toward male bonding in “dramatic and tense situations”: (i) a bond is reinforced or developed during a stressful situation; (ii) a moment of emotional crisis ensues; and (iii) their shared experience forms a bond of solidarity between the men. Gandhi and Kallenbach encountered many stressful situations in their political struggle, including going to jail. They faced several emotional crises throughout their struggle, and their bond is evident in their letters. Their friendship also contained elements of homosociality.

Scott Fabius Kiesling offers a third study useful in considering Gandhi and Kallenbach’s relationship with regard to homosociality, or interactions with people of

---
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one’s own gender. Kiesling’s study examines male fraternities and emphasizes that male homosocial relationships marginalize women, according to the theory of Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick.²⁴¹ A sense of belonging, without the interference of sexuality, is one of the primary facets that attract men to male solidarity.²⁴² Homosociality is explicitly devoid of sexual meaning. Homosociality is therefore an important idea and is applicable to Gandhi and Kallenbach’s relationship. As Gandhi and Kallenbach shared so many aspects of their lives, like members of a fraternity, Kiesling’s study is useful.

Kiesling describes a “male homosocial double bind” to which many western, heterosexual men are subject as a result of clashing cultural discourses. The double bind arises from the desire to form a close bond with another male, while also having to avoid intimacy, leading to the necessity to express oneself indirectly.²⁴³ Gandhi and Kallenbach did not bow to avoiding intimacy; they were very clear and open about their feelings for one another. This directness, which is seen as a signifier of homosexuality in American cultural discourse, contributes to the reading of Gandhi and Kallenbach’s narrative as having a homosexual, rather than homosocial, nature. But because Gandhi and Kallenbach were not of twentieth-century American culture, Kiesling’s model is flexible. The most useful aspect is the sense of belonging without interference from sexuality. This model accurately mirrors the German nationalist trends seen in Kallenbach’s early Germany. In addition to homosociality, an apprenticeship aspect was also present in Gandhi and Kallenbach’s dynamic.

Edward Simpson describes a model of apprenticeship, formulated in observing
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Gujarati shipyards. Apprentices enter a workspace to learn a skill through participation and disciplining one’s mind and body for the occupation upon which they will embark.\textsuperscript{244} Apprenticeship is a method to maintain social order and involves orienting one’s traditions, religion, and politics toward their study. It also “creates a dependent constituency for the master,” or supplies a base of support for the person training the next generation in one’s skills.\textsuperscript{245} Gandhi’s insistence on Kallenbach adopting his Indian lifestyle demonstrates Gandhi’s desire to make Kallenbach his political apprentice. Slade was much more receptive to Gandhi and therefore, fulfills the apprentice role more effectively than Kallenbach.

There were two levels to Slade and Gandhi’s association. First, they adopted each other as father and daughter. Second, she was his apprentice in passive resistance. It is also significant that theirs was an interracial friendship. Gandhi was already accustomed to racial mixing because he had lived in a mixed society in South Africa. He lived with Europeans, such as Kallenbach, in the South African ashrams. Slade came of age in several places across the world because of her father’s position in the British military, so she encountered new and exotic things, allowing her to be more acquainted with foreign cultures and perhaps be comfortable with people of other ethnicities.

Slade’s most significant role is that of Gandhi’s activist apprentice in \textit{swaraj}. One may consider Gandhi’s “job” to be passive resistance. He was responsible for developing strategy, ideology, and for being a figurehead. Slade accompanied Gandhi to learn \textit{swaraj} through experience, per the term of apprenticeship.\textsuperscript{246} Slade’s consistency in Gandhi’s
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methods after leaving the comfort of his ashrams and starting her own demonstrates this social maintenance. Her departure from Gandhi’s politics and focus on her own movement embodied the phase that comes after apprenticeship, the point where the apprentice has matured, a phenomena outlined by ethnographers of apprenticeship.247 Slade’s apprenticeship of Gandhian activism lasted approximately fifteen years while she lived at his ashrams until she founded her own. She completely changed her lifestyle to fit that of Gandhi and was dependent on him in many ways.

One of Gandhi’s lesser-known legacies is his impact on the modern-day environmental movement. One of the strongest links between Gandhi's turn-of-the-century, Hinduism-derived environmentalism and the present-day environmentalists is Slade. She refined Gandhi’s organic, Hindu version of environmentalism and translated it to the West, transforming Gandhi’s religion-derived environmental ethic into a cultural ideal. Such passing of wisdom from one generation to the next is symbolic of Gandhi and Slade's intimate, father-daughter, apprenticeship bond, per the model of Edward Simpson.

The dynamic of Gandhi and Slade’s relationship, a father-like Indian helping a child-like European learn the ways of Indian culture, was the result of a pattern established with Kallenbach. Kallenbach set a precedent for Gandhi’s relationship with some of his European followers; this precedent can be verified by comparing Kallenbach and Slade’s relationships with Gandhi.

Gandhi and Kallenbach do not fit in to the homosexual models outlined by Halperin, but they do fit into his male friendship model with elements of homosociality.

Their relationship was not complicated by the influence of women. Instead of being a couple, they had a very close fraternal friendship, as described by Kaplan and Yanay.

**Conclusions**

This study concludes that as the memory of historical figures fades, new generations remember only some, sometimes inaccurate, details of major figures. In Gandhi’s case, modern generations are aware of his non-violent campaigns, and thus think of him as a peacemaker. Kallenbach is a lesser-known figure in worldwide memory. But the public’s fading memory of Gandhi has also created negative images. Kallenbach’s lack of fame makes it easy to implicate him in such situations. This inaccuracy reflects an application of present-day cultural mores on to Gandhi and Kallenbach. *Great Soul* demonstrates that without the appropriate historical and cultural context, skewed perspectives may be written and confused images may live on. It is possible, though, to dispel this confusion and uncover a more appropriate understanding upon examination of homosexuality in the British Empire during Gandhi and Kallenbach’s time in South Africa, the cultural contexts of Gandhi and Kallenbach’s backgrounds, Gandhi’s letters to Kallenbach, and models of male relationships.

The British Empire in the late Victorian era stretched across the world. Its culture and laws spread to its colonies, such as South Africa. The British government was publicly critical of male same-sex sexuality; this criticism was consistent in the colonies. The Criminal Law Amendment Act of 1885 outlawed certain sexual behaviors among men and allowed men convicted of those behaviors to be punished. Gandhi was a public figure and thus if he had engaged in any of those banned behaviors, evidence would be
available to prove it. Thus, no evidence is known that demonstrates a sexual relationship between Gandhi and Kallenbach. Furthermore, their cultural backgrounds also detract from Lelyveld’s insinuations.

Gandhi and Kallenbach were raised in India and Germany, respectively, but matured British cultural surroundings. Indian, German, and British cultures all condemned male same-sex sexuality. Thus, both men were raised in and lived among cultures that held negative ideas about engaging in same-sex sexual behavior. With these negative cultural messages, both men disapproved of sex with each other, invalidating the conclusions drawn by Indian politicians and in productions like “I Was Gandhi’s Boyfriend” in the outcry over *Great Soul*. Furthermore, the common narrative surrounding Gandhi and Kallenbach’s dynamic necessitates further exploration, hopefully with more sources that originated with Kallenbach.

Many discussions about Gandhi and Kallenbach describe Gandhi as the dominant party and Kallenbach as a follower. While Kallenbach was a strong supporter of Gandhi’s South African *satyagraha* campaign, he was not the passive, awestruck, easily manipulated person some accounts describe. Kallenbach’s German culture and Gandhi’s Indian culture were actually quite compatible and similar in their ideals regarding masculinity. The writers who created the erroneous narratives do not take that into account, and thus see Kallenbach as an intellectually blindfolded person who followed Gandhi’s every whim. Gandhi’s letters allow readers to hear his voice much louder than Kallenbach’s. This skewed perspective is also supported by the availability of Gandhi’s letters to Kallenbach and a lack of Kallenbach’s letters to Gandhi.

Gandhi interacted with British culture so much that his letter writing styles
mirrored many trends of the Victorian era. Thus, his writings can be interpreted through a Victorian perspective. Through this perspective, it is evident that Gandhi expressed his feelings through a common, but contradictory framework of stating his feelings honestly, but in a limited way, as suggested by Victorian letter writing guides. His correspondence with Madeleine Slade mirrors Gandhi’s writing to Kallenbach. This consistency between the letters he wrote to in very different stages of his life demonstrates that a certain level of intimacy was not unique in his writing to Kallenbach, and thus assuming a sexual relationship between the two men based on those writings is false. Finally, Gandhi and Kallenbach’s relationship is further clarified by examining models of male relationships.

Models of male relationships take into account certain emotional and physical characteristics of two or more men’s association. Gandhi and Kallenbach’s friendship does not align with the prominent pre-twentieth century models of male homosexual relationships discussed, but it does fit into a framework that can be labeled as a homosocial fraternal friendship. They were clearly very close friends who experienced very stressful situations. They lived together and were involved in domestic and political activities together. In the epicenter of their personal lives and political campaigns were sites on which a new identity developed, that of the early satyagrahi. This identity and culture provided for a certain type of bond between men; however, this bond clearly rejected male same-sex sexuality. Therefore, the idea of a physically intimate relationship between Gandhi and Kallenbach was, based on existing evidence, impossible.
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