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INTRODUCTORY REMARKS

This cannot be a fair assessment of the American attitudes to the British-Indian Conflict in India between the years 1919 and 1935, inasmuch as it is strictly limited by the resources available to a student at the College of William and Mary in Virginia.

Furthermore, that the vigorous passions and prejudices of the times discussed in the following essay may well have found an echo in my judgments, is perhaps, to be expected; whether they have distorted my interpretations and vitiated my analysis is not for me to determine. What I have tried to do in the following essay was to develop the new type of attitude and the new type of scholarship described by Professor Northrop in The Meeting of East and West. This gives one reason for attempting to discover the American attitude

to British rule in India from 1919 to 1936 in a Master's essay. The Indian question has become a contemporary world problem of some considerable importance. Britain may have failed of its solution but she cannot be accused of failure in the larger sense of having low aims. America may, and certainly does, criticize British policy in regard to India but at least she considers it worthy of criticism.
CHAPTER I

SOURCES OF INFORMATION FOR THE AMERICAN ATTITUDES

The object of this essay is to study the American attitudes in the British-India conflict from 1919 to 1935 as expressed in the New York Times, The Review of Reviews, The Nation, The Outlook, and The New Republic. These periodicals were the only ones available for such a study but it has been assumed that they would be sufficiently representative to be significant.

The following chapter attempts to show the sources from which the editors of these magazines and this newspaper drew their knowledge. Propaganda is defined in Webster's New Continental Dictionary as particular doctrines or a system of principles propagated by an organization for the spreading of those doctrines or systems of principles. Information on the other hand is defined as knowledge communicated by others or obtained by personal study or investigation: knowledge derived from
reading, observation or instruction: or the process by which the form of an object of knowledge is impressed upon the apprehending mind so as to bring about the state of knowing.

Of the periodicals studied the Nation gave the most attention to the sources of information or propaganda in regard to the British Rule in India on which American opinion might be based. It was particularly insistent on the lack of source materials in regard to Indian affairs especially between the years 1921 to 1935. For example on 7th September 1921, the Nation first remarked that while Asiatic discontent with Western Imperialism was an important subject, the news associations had failed to enlighten the public. The next year it declared that it was dependent for news fragmentary and biased semi-official British dispatches. Yet, on the other hand,  

1. Nation, CXIII (Sept. 7, 1921), 251.  
the British Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs was reported by the New York Times\(^3\) as saying that his government endeavoured to make available correct information to persons in the United States who were interested in the subject. Six years later the Nation\(^4\) stated that in the past the reports from India had been too often unsatisfactory as to reliability and emphasis, but it was the view of the Nation, nevertheless, that despite government censorship in India, the news that leaked through the cables, together with British journalistic comments, made a very interesting picture to one familiar with the forces at work\(^5\); and that in the dispatches from India there were nuggets of news which were highly significant\(^6\).

\(^3\) New York Times (March 9, 1922), 8
\(^4\) Nation, CXXX (April 16, 1930), 439.
\(^5\) Nation, CXXX (June 18, 1930), 696.
\(^6\) Nation, CXXXI (July 9, 1930), 27.
Neither the *New Republic* nor the *Review of Reviews* made similar complaints. Indeed it would seem from this fact, together with the view of the *Nation* that it was not so much the New York papers as the official propaganda in India that was responsible for the distorted stories that reached America?; indeed American newspapers and periodicals were fairly well supplied with propaganda.

In 1922 and again in 1929 the *New York Times* reported British evidence that Indian "propaganda" far outweighed the British. First we had the report of a question being asked in the House of Commons on March 9, 1922 by the Unionist Member for the Melton Division of Leicestershire as to whether anything was done to prevent "The dissemination in America of calumnies of the British rule in India." Next S. K. Ratcliffe in an address to the East India Association in London on October 21, 1929

7. *Nation*, CXIII. (Nov. 30, 1921), 609.
said "The view of the American public upon Indian political questions has been influenced to no small extent by the active work of Indian writers and speakers."

Finally, in the same year, 1929, Sir Albion Banerji is reported as appealing for uncolored information for American readers.

Yet the New Republic stated that one important source of American opinion was the Indian news reports in the columns of the American press, reports which came chiefly from British sources through Reuter's, a British news source which had a cooperative arrangement with the Associated Press. It was the view of the New Republic that the consequent attitude of Americans was substantially that of many people in England.

It is interesting to note that in 1924 Lord Olivier in the Contemporary Review wrote of

the misleading character of the information supplied by the British press to the general populace of Great Britain. Lord Olivier complained of the partiality and incompleteness of such information which he considered to be responsible for diffusing a shallow complacency in regard to the expediency of shaping a definite policy in India and for creating an attitude of procrastination.

His view was supported by a British correspondent in the Nation,\textsuperscript{13} Yet as shown in the controversy in the New Republic\textsuperscript{14} over Mr. Edward Thompson's articles in the London Times on American opinion and India, there was a great need for a clear, unprejudiced and informed American opinion in regard to Indian matters. This was, according to the same issue of the New Republic, because the American attitude towards India was extremely important, both in regard to the friendly relations between Great Britain and the United States,

\textsuperscript{13} A. Fenner Brockway, "Government by Ordinance in India," Nation, CXXXIV (Feb. 24, 1932), 226.
\textsuperscript{14} New Republic, LXIV (Aug. 20, 1930), 5
and also as determining the attitude of some of the chief Indian leaders.

The most comprehensive factor in the Indian problem was that of self-government. It was in their relation to the demand for complete autonomy for India that Indian Nationalism; Mohandas Gandhi and Satyagraha took their places in Indian affairs. It therefore appears logical to continue this study of American attitudes to the British-Indian Conflict in India as expressed in regard to self-government for India.
CHAPTER II

AMERICAN ATTITUDES TOWARDS THE INDIAN DEMAND FOR SELF-GOVERNMENT

Prior to 1920 there was no self-government in India. The government was vested in the Crown and was exercised in England by the Secretary of State for India who, as a member of the Cabinet, was responsible to Parliament. He was assisted by the India Office and the Council of India (an advisory body with special control over finances).

In India the Supreme authority was vested in the governor-general or Viceroy in council. In the eleven major Provinces the governor, appointed by the Crown, worked through a Provincial Legislative Council but was still entirely subordinate to the Viceroy and his Central Executive Council. The minor Provinces were governed by High Commissioners who were also controlled by the Central Executive.

The situation in India was completely altered in 1919 by the reforms of this governmental system which were first proposed.
in the Joint Report on Indian Constitutional
Reforms, 1918 and subsequently embodied in the
Government of India Act of 1919.

This change in the situation in India has
been summarized as a releasing of the central­
ized Imperial control, and an attempt to
devise, in India itself, a quasi-federal system
of government, the reorganization of the
central legislature, the establishment of
dyarchy in the provinces, the creation of
central and provincial electorates, and an
effort to bring the government more directly
under Indian control.¹

Professor William Roy Smith ascribed
these changes in the government of India to
the Great War of 1914-1918². Indeed, it had
been expected by many that India would revolt
from under British rule at the outbreak of war.

Instead of this India supported Great Britain

1. William Roy Smith, Nationalism and Reform
in India. (New Haven, 1938), 99
2. Ibid, 88 "Mr. Montagu's famous declaration
of policy on August 20, 1917 ... was the
product of motives that were more or less
contradictory. India was to be rewarded
for her loyalty and at the same time bribed
to keep quiet while the Empire was fighting
for its life."
and consequently the British government announced that its goal in India was "The gradual development of self-governing institutions with a view to the progressive realization of responsible government in India as an integral part of the British Empire."³

The British government in India laid stress on the work "gradual" as it was considered that India could not carry out necessary reform and reconstruction owing to her lack of knowledge and to her inexperience in matters of administration. Furthermore Indian defense and security were matters of Imperial concern.

On the other hand Indian reformers demanded self-government for India as a right, not as a concession to submissive behavior, on the grounds that British rule in India was a deterrent to initiative, enterprise, and leadership.

³ Edwin Samuel Montagu, in a speech in the House of Commons, Aug. 20, 1917, quoted by William Roy Smith, Nationalism and Reform in India, 88.
It was also asserted on economic grounds that "Home Charges" drained the wealth of India to England and thereby caused agricultural depression and widespread poverty in India.

In regard to this issue of self-government an attempt will be made to show that American opinion was more favorably disposed towards the cautious British policy than to the Indian demands for immediate and complete independence. Although, as the Nation observed "no amount of good government inflicted upon a people by officials from another country can take the place of self-government."^4

On the other hand it was pointed out in the Review of Reviews^5 that the phrase "responsible government" had no meaning for the masses of the people in India for "it has no equivalent in any of the vernaculars."

5. Review of Reviews, LXV (April, 1922), 349.
While the *New York Times*\(^6\) in 1919 had mentioned the "apprehensions natural to those who wonder how much democracy is possible among caste-bound Hindus;" and said that there were "varying opinions as to India's readiness for self-government."\(^7\)

Yet, the *New York Times*, in 1922, attributed these reforms to the fact that there was in existence in India a minority of intellectuals who had been educated, often in Britain, or in the United States, who were the natural leaders of India and who ought, therefore, to be trained in the responsibilities of government.\(^8\) Nevertheless, this Government of India Act of 1919 was described as a somewhat imperfect means of education in self-government.\(^9\) However it was described as an effort to govern an Oriental people according to Western principles under conditions of unusual difficulty.\(^10\)

---

The Nation in 1919 quoted the London Herald as saying that Britain had discovered how impossible it was for 45,000,000 people to govern 400,000,000 against their will. The reforms were described as an honest, if excessively cautious, attempt to satisfy the aspirations of the people and it was said that the unanimous opposition of the conservative British elements in India and the Tories in England made it evident that the reforms were at least liberal in intent.

Simultaneously the Review of Reviews said of the new constitution of 1919 that:

Whereas we have been eager to develop self-government in the Philippines, ... the British have been comparatively slow in building up local and general home rule in India. The retention of British sovereignty would seem to depend upon the elasticity with which they can now respond to India's demands for self-government. That the wisely flexible statesmanship of Great Britain will accommodate itself to conditions in India ... may

be confidently expected in view of a comparatively long series of recent adjustments.\textsuperscript{13}

The \textit{Review of Reviews} also observed of this constitution that "made in America could be branded all over this new machine for the government of one-fifth of the human race."\textsuperscript{14}

The editor of the \textit{Outlook} in December 1921, stated that "British rule in India has been invaluable, ... it will continue to be necessary for India's welfare and ... will be the surest means of developing India to such a point that it will before very long become as independent within the Empire as is Canada or Australia or South Africa."\textsuperscript{15}

The \textit{Outlook} quoted with apparent approval a speech made at Princeton in February, 1922 by Dr. Shastri, of the University of Calcutta, in which he said "India cannot entirely exercise self-government under present conditions,

\begin{quote}
\textsuperscript{13.} \textit{Review of Reviews}, LXV (April, 1922), 349.
\textsuperscript{14.} \textit{Review of Reviews}, LXIII (Feb. 1921), 128.
\textsuperscript{15.} \textit{Outlook}, CXXIX (Dec. 1921), 634.
\end{quote}
as there would be mob rule."\(^{16}\)

This attitude of American support for the more cautious British policy of the "gradual" development of autonomy in India changed as time went on. An insistence on the right of the peoples of India to self-government at least, certainly on their right to obtain Dominion status, to which the British government in India had been pledged by the Government of India Act of 1919, appears to have developed.

For example, the New York Times, for 1928 observed of the Simon Commission that "it comes close to being a form of treaty negotiation of Indian nationality and of a priori right to complete self-government."\(^{17}\)

Also, the Review of Reviews for July, 1930 while remarking the "obvious good faith" of the British attempts to introduce a measure of

\(^{16}\) Outlook, CXXX, (February 22, 1922), 288.  
\(^{17}\) New York Times (February 6, 1928), 18.
self-government observed that

It is ... hard to see how millions of people can be denied their right to liberty, even to self-misgovernment, in an age of self-determination and the rights of peoples. It would seem to be the misfortune of the British in India as in Ireland, and indeed, as in America a century and a half ago, to give too little too late. 18

At the same time the Nation was writing

American liberals .... must continue to urge that the natives of India be given back their country, to rise or fall as they decide. Let it be known whether the Simon Commission has found for dominion status or not. Dominion status for India is but another test of our faith in democracy .. We cannot see how anybody who believes in American institutions and the principles underlying them can hesitate. India has just as much right to take over its own government today as Americans had in 1776. 19

The Review of Reviews observed that "Great Britain could afford to go a long way toward granting local self-government to the people of

18. Review of Reviews, LXXXII (July, 1930), 66.
India, but it would fatally disarrange the present economic program of the British government to allow India to exercise independence in foreign relations, financial affairs, and trade policies."20

Meanwhile the Nation declared that "all talk about 'equal partnership' was futile or worse when all that was offered to India in the name of autonomy is a government that is British at the center with a British controlled army, intolerably burdensome fastened upon the country from without," and that "unless by some miracle, Great Britain turns to the left, Indian independence ... will not be realized."21

The New York Times appeared to favor the continuation of British rule in India, together with the granting of a larger measure of self-government for India. On November 10, 1927, the editor observed "the confidence with which a larger measure of self-government is awaited,"

21. Nation, CXXXVII. (July 26, 1933), 87.
which confidence had been engendered by eight years of economic progress together with the increased Indianization of the Government services and of the Army."22

Three years later, an editorial in the New York Times remarked that "the dizzy variety of race, language, religion, and class in India constitutes a perfectly valid reason why India should not be permitted to enter upon full nationhood without the apprenticeship of dominion status."23.

In 1932 the New York Times observed, in appreciation of the conservative view, the "complete and sudden withdrawal of British supervision would 'spell untold evil' for the peoples of India."24 On November 22, 1930, the New York Times remarked that "there is not sufficient unity among the three hundred and twenty million people of India for full, immediate nationhood" and "the capacity for complete self-government in India still lags

behind the desire for it." 25

Both the minority problem and the problem of communal representation which were supposed to arise out of conditions peculiar to India were compared by the New York Times with "certain great issues with which the Founding Fathers of 1787 had to deal." 26 This same editorial remarked that "we are reminded of the great 'compromises' of the United states' Constitution." 27
CHAPTER III
AMERICAN ATTITUDES TOWARDS THE INDIAN NATIONALIST MOVEMENT.

Sir Frederick Whyte, late President of the Indian Legislative Assembly, attributed the recrudescence of the struggle for national status to the grant to the peoples of India of the beginnings of responsible government. He told a meeting of the Empire Parliamentary Association "you ask for responsibility in the preamble to the Government of India Act, but the manner in which you have given responsibility tends to place before those to whom you have given it an object of prior concern, that is the endeavour to secure greater control over the affairs of their country."¹

Before 1916 there had been non-national unity in India. The country was divided between the Mohammedan minority in India and the Hindus. Dr. Bruce T. McCully remarked that

Nationalism in India was largely Hindu in character and personnel.²

Professor William Roy Smith attributed this sectarian character of the struggle for Indian independence to the fact that Western culture and learning were welcomed to their inception by the Hindu peoples of India while only tolerated by the Moslem population.³ Professor Northrop, however, pointed out that members of a non-theistic religion were willing to establish friendly relations with other groups; whereas the orthodox follower of a theistic religion, such as Mohammedanism, was usually unwilling to do so.⁴

However, in 1916, the two major political parties in India, the All-India Congress and the Moslem League; agreed to, and signed, the Lucknow Pact. This was a plan of constitutional

³ William Roy Smith, Nationalism and Reform in India. (Yale, 1928), 71.
advance by which the crown was requested to recognize Dominion Home Rule as India's ultimate goal. This Lucknow Pact became possible because, at that period, the policy of the Indian Nationalists was aimed at limited, constitutional reform by means of a strictly legal agitation, and therefore, for the first time a measure of national unity had become possible. As a result of which the New York Times could observe in the issue for June 29, 1930 that "nationalism is today among the unifying forces in a diverse India."\(^5\)

According to Professor William Roy Smith, nationalism now became a cult followed almost with religious fervour, and even fanaticism. There was a kind of religious identification of nationalism with an incarnation of the Hindu God, Krishna, and members of the nationalist party found encouragement and justification in

---

both the revolutionary writings of Western authors as well as in Hindu Neo-Vedantism. 6

The Nation agreed with Professor William Roy Smith in attributing some of the growth of the spirit of Nationalism in India to the study, by Indians, of national movements in the West. In the issues for May 21, 19307 and for June 25, 19308 the Nation compared Gandhi with Emerson, William Lloyd Garrison and Henry Thoreau. The Nation for May 21, 19307 furthermore quoted Gandhi's personal acknowledgement of his debt to William Lloyd Garrison through the personality and writings of Tolstoi.

It is generally stated that this Nationalist movement in India in 1919 was restricted to the educated minority of the peoples of India and therefore the introduction of the British system of education into India was largely responsible for its inception. The Review of Reviews for

6. William Roy Smith, Nationalism and Reform in India, 68.
7. Nation, CXXX. (May 21, 1930), 608.
8. Nation, CXXX (June 25, 1930), 423.
February 21, 1921 observed that

Unrest in India turns on England establishing universities, but not public schools. Like our failure to establish vernacular schools on an adequate scale in the Philippines, so England, instead of beginning with educating the mass, has given the few the knowledge which unsettles, but it has denied the many the plain and simple education which stabilizes .... As it is, a film of discontent is spread over India by an educated class which has vast ignorant millions below it. 9

While Professor William Roy Smith stated that the leaders of Indian thought were educated along Western lines at a time when Western political philosophy was strongly nationalistic. 10

The New Republic for September 3, 1930, attributed the recrudescence of the Indian nationalism in the period 1919 to 1930 to the spirit of self-assertion that had developed. At the same time it compared the Indian and American struggles for independence in the following passage:

If a Simon Commission had been

9. Review of Reviews, LXIII. (Feb. 21, 1921) 129.
10. William Roy Smith, Nationalism and Reform in India, 207.
sent to the American colonies in 1775, it would undoubtedly have found that they would require many years of development before they were ready for independence. The leaders of the national movement were, many of them, fanatical, there were the problems presented by our long frontiers, ... by the intermixture of nationalities and religion in our population, by the institution of Negro slavery .... Such a report would have been true in detail .... but all this is irrelevant in view of that contagious spirit of self-assertion which came to dominate the colonies.11

The preceding quotations made above, taken in conjunction with Dr. Bruce T. McCully's findings in his Bibliographical article, "The Origins of Indian Nationalism According to Native Writers"12 would appear to indicate that Indian nationalism was of exotic growth. This hypothesis is also supported by Professor Northrop when he wrote that "modern Western nationalism has become a world issue in India, even gripping Gandhi and his followers."13 to

such an extent that Gandhi used it as the justification for his opposition to the British rule in India.  

CHAPTER IV

AMERICAN ATTITUDES TOWARDS M. K. GANDHI AS THE LEADER OF THE NATIONALIST MOVEMENT IN INDIA

Myrdall\(^1\) claimed that the American myth would seem always to have required a leader and this in spite of the belief of the United States that it is a democracy. In the periodicals scrutinised, Gandhi was unanimously selected from among the other Indian leaders for special comment. It is true that reference was made, from time to time, to these other Indian leaders. But

Mr. Gandhi was the sole Indian leader with the ability to conciliate warring minorities.... He has been invaluable as a negotiator, in both Eastern and Western camps.... The (Indian) leaders themselves have for a long time recognised the extraordinary ability of Mr. Gandhi to penetrate the Western mind, perceive its workings and answer its arguments in Western terms.... Mr. Gandhi has therefore been chosen as the spokesman to represent the various minorities in an united front to the British authorities.

The leaders, other than Mr. Gandhi, who were most frequently mentioned are C. R. Das and Lala Lajpat; C. R. Das presumably because he inherited the political leadership of the


\(^2\) Patricia Kendall, "Gandhi - Mountebank or Martyr", *The Outlook*, LX. (Jan. 20, 1932), 94.
nationalist movement from M. K. Gandhi and Lala Lajpat Rai as a consequence of his visits to the United States and because of his authorship and personality.

In an editorial article The Nation referred to C. R. Das as being "more of a politician than Gandhi" yet "beyond thought of self". A little earlier in the same year the Nation had referred to him as "the tempestuous Swarajist leader" and declared that "the outstanding fact on the surface of things in India was the transfer of political leadership of the Nationalist movement from Gandhi to C. R. Das." Finally at the very end of that same year the Nation again declared that C. R. Das was "a man of much political ability. His attitude was practical, expedient and that of a complete political strategist." His staunch adherence to the principle of non-cooperation which caused him to give up an income of $120,000 a year which he earned as a practising

---

3. Nation, CXXI. (July 1, 1925), 5.
5. Nation, CXX (April 29, 1925), 289.
barrister in the English courts was the occasion of much moment.

Lajpat Rai, on the other hand, was a frequent contributor to the Nation in which journal he is described as "one of the most distinguished leaders of the movement for constitutional reform in India." Alvin Johnson in the New Republic, in his review of Lala Lajpat Rai's book, The Political Future of India wrote of him "Lajpat Rai is on his road to India! .... His departure is our grave loss .... Our generation needed a real interpreter the more because we had taken Kipling's India for what it is not, a political and social reality." His obituary in the Nation stated that "He was a valuable leader, being practical as well as inspired."

The next most discussed leaders were the

7. Nation, CVIII (Feb. 1, 1919), 164.  
famous Ali brothers, who were referred to as "the recognised leaders of the Indian Mohammedan community,"\(^\text{10}\) "Gandhi's Moslem aides [who] are more interested in Pan-Islam than in an united India"\(^\text{11}\) and who were "impulsive, voluble, impetuous [and] roughly sincere."\(^\text{12}\)

In addition mention was made of Mr. Jawaharlal Nehru and Mr. Jinnah, Mr. Patel, Mrs. Sarojini Naidu, and of Sir Satyendra Parasanna Sinha - yet, as already stated, none of these Indian leaders were as widely publicised in the periodicals under survey as M.K. Gandhi.

The New York Times for January 9, 1921, commented on "the extraordinary personal hold" which Gandhi had\(^\text{13}\), and attributed this to the fact that he had both a program and a propaganda, which had "an explosive power and which needed to be handled carefully."\(^\text{14}\) While the Review of Reviews for March 1921 asserted that Gandhi was

\begin{itemize}
  \item 10. Nation, CXIV. (Jan. 4, 1922), 24.
  \item 11. Nation, CXIII (Dec. 21, 1921), 722.
  \item 12. Ibid, 722.
  \item 13. New York Times (Jan. 9, 1921), 2.
\end{itemize}
"perhaps the most influential public man in India today, and a tremendous force to be reckoned with."

The Nation for December 21, 1921 explained Gandhi's meteoric rise to importance as "a psychological miracle". Three months earlier the Nation had declared that "the national hero and leader of India is a saint whose singular devotion, unselfishness, and spiritual power have won him the almost superstitious reverence of his own people and the respect of the 'most sceptical critics'." While the Outlook for January 18, 1922 asserted

As has no other leader, he has known how to keep himself at the head of both Hindus and Mohammedans and thus to develop a common sentiment of citizenship. The people believe that, by reason of his experience in both England and India, he grasps the real situation. He has awakened universal confidence in his sincerity and incorruptibility; through his asceticism and fanaticism have not had the same universal appeal; they have nevertheless succeeded in winning for

---

15. Review of Reviews, LXIII (March 1921), 315.
16. Nation, CXIX. (July 16, 1924), 61.
17. Nation, CXIII. (Sept, 14, 1921), 61.
him the name "Mahatma" or "wonder worker" and "saint".

The New York Times said that Gandhi established himself as "the dictator of the Indian Nationalists" by raising the issue of race equality, and that "the Nationalist sentiment inflamed by the Rowlatt Acts in 1919 and a working alliance between the Mohammedans and the Hindus encouraged the Indian Nationalist Congress ... to invest Gandhi with full powers for putting into effect a campaign of non-violent resistance."

Professor William Roy Smith attributed Gandhi's power to two major factors: first he personified the racial and cultural antagonism of the Indians to the Europeans and so, to a certain extent, represented an Indian spirit of exaggerated nationalism. Secondly Professor Smith considered Gandhi to have been a clever politician, since he held the upper classes by advocating Home Rule; the lower classes by campaigning for the removal of untouchability;

工厂工人通过他的努力来改善社会和经济条件；农民通过努力来复兴家纺织业；纺织厂主通过抵制外国布料；穆斯林通过支持哈里发；以及所有人通过谴责 Punjab 和 Amritsar 的“暴行”在 1919 年特别。

The New York Times for May 4, 1930 observed that Gandhi was the product of the transformation of India and not the producer.

In regard to Gandhi’s outstanding personality the Nation for May 28, 1930, observed that

There prevails throughout North America ... a great eagerness to learn about the Mahatma’s personality and the faith that has inspired him during the campaign of the past ten years. Americans in the main ... want to know, first, what it is in the way of essential belief that Gandhi stands for, and secondly, whether that belief has any importance for the modern man and woman in the West.

The Review of Reviews for February, 1932

21. William Roy Smith, Nationalism and Reform in India, 115.
compared Gandhi to George Washington. 24

On the other hand, Patricia Kendall writing in the Outlook observed that "Mr. Gandhi has neither a constructive capacity nor prophetic vision. He has never offered a definite plan or program or constitution. His tools are barter and compromise. His weapons are a disarming smile, other men's creeds and the ability to give the other fellow what he thinks he wants." 25

Yet the Nation for December 21, 1921, said that Gandhi "has the energy of Roosevelt, the human sympathy of Debs and the philosophy of Tolstoi." 26

Gandhi himself acknowledged his debt to Tolstoi in the Nation, dated June 25, 1930. 27 He was claimed to be original however in that he adapted both the tool and the method of its use so fully and at just the correct

24. Review of Reviews, LXXV - LXXXVI. (Feb. 1932)
27. Nation, CXXX. (June 25, 1930), 423.
psychological moment that Gandhi was sometimes considered to be the discoverer of Satyagraha. In a lecture at the College of William and Mary Dr. Adair pointed out that it was a truism that the dynamic force of leadership could only be applied after a crisis. It was Gandhi's ability that recognised the crisis, and applied the force of his leadership to it.
CHAPTER V
AMERICAN ATTITUDES TOWARDS THE DOCTRINE OF "PASSIVE RESISTANCE".

Gandhi believed that both political and economic freedom were matters of moral character. Indian independence would be achieved as soon as an effective majority of Indians was strong enough to refuse to be flattered by the British, to refuse to pay taxes, to stand "lathi" charges without flinching or counter-violence, to go to jail, and to be willing to die non-violently for their cause.

We turn next to the American attitude to non-violence.

It was the Nation for June 25, 1930 that observed that

It should not be forgotten that the doctrine of non-cooperation and non-violence though they are at present taken far more in earnest and held against greater provocation in India than they have been anywhere else in the modern world are not exclusively Indian doctrines ... the doctrine of non-violence, ... owes a great debt to American thinkers. We find the doctrine clearly enunciated not only by Garrison but by Emerson and it was acted upon by Thoreau.1

1. Nation, CXXX (June 25, 1930), 243.
On the other hand the issue for February, 1921 of the Review of Reviews called "Satyagraha" "a course familiar in Oriental protest against despotism by commanding abstinence from all political action, by refusing government office, or resigning it, and by taking no share in elections as candidates or voters."^2

The New York Times wrote that non-cooperation was essentially Hindu because it was founded on "Satyagraha" which the editor defines as "soul-force exerted by a multitude of people all wishing hard for what they desire. In order to be in a position to wish hard they must divert themselves of their worldly possessions and of their earthbound desires."^3 The editor continued to say that a political movement based upon such an idea would seem "quixotic and impracticable" to an ordinary Mohammedan.

It was Gandhi's contribution to nationalism

---

to combine Western philosophy with Eastern thought and to produce a doctrine that was accepted by the All-India Congress in 1920 as a counter-attack to the Rowlatt Acts of 1919. These Acts were primarily designed to deal with terrorism. Unfortunately they were the signal for an outbreak of disorder in the Punjab which culminated in the massacre of Amritsar, which the Nation calls "the most hideous governmental crime of modern times." 4

Immediately the Rowlatt Acts were passed the All-India Congress became a revolutionary body. In 1920 it resolved that "Sawrau" or self-rule must be attained within one year by means of "Satyagraha" or "non-violent, non-cooperation", by civil disobedience to unjust laws in the first instance, enlarging if necessary into disobedience to any law, non-payment of taxes and complete non-cooperation with the British government in India.

It should be borne in mind, however, that

non-cooperation, as Professor William Roy Smith pointed out, affects only a small group of educated people: those who would ordinarily practise law; hold administrative and judicial posts; sit on the legislative councils or send their children to government schools.\(^5\)

Moreover, as the Nation\(^6\) observed India used "Satyagraha" to obtain her independence by means that are well adapted to Indian comprehension. Also Mr. Gandhi, the discoverer of "Satyagraha", regarded Western culture with disfavor; therefore if the British were to leave India art, science, letters, and Western political machinery would fall into desuetude also.

Briefly, Gandhi wanted all "Swarajists" to reject all their government titles and offices. He advocated the withdrawal of all Indian children from the British educational system and the establishment of special schools for them in which European culture would take second place at best as he believed that Western ideas corrupted the Indian mind. He also wanted to boycott

\(^5\) Smith, Nationalism and Reform in India, 123.
\(^6\) Helena Normanton, "The non-Cooperation Movement", Nation, CXIII, (Dec. 12, 1921), 721.
English forms/justice on the count that they were so alien to the India way of life that they created injustices. He also hoped that "Swadeshi" or homespun, would eventually replace foreign-made cloth. Consequently he wanted a ban on the importation into India of stimulating the hand-spinning of his followers. Thus the Nation had grounds for saying "this spiritual weapon is also intensely practical," and "India's new weapon is developing into a reality." 7

This policy of non-violent, non-cooperation was put in abeyance on the arrest of Mr. Gandhi in 1922 and remained in that state until 1929 when the All-India National Congress threatened to revive it as a means of gaining Dominion Status for India. However, the Nation 8 observed that though "Satyagraha" had failed as a policy Gandhi still retained a wide moral influence because of his chivalry.

As Mr. Miller observed in his article in

7. Nation, CXII (Jan. 26, 1921), 118.
8. Nation, CXX. (April 29, 1925), 489.
the Nation for June 25, 1930 one difficulty in regard to passive resistance was that "there is a vivid recollection of the methods of violence used successfully in Ireland, so that there is not complete unanimity about the use of non-violence." 9

9. Nation, CXXX. (June 25, 1930), Herbert Adolphus Miller, signed article, 323.
CONCLUSIONS

From this brief and tantalizing picture it would appear that up to 1935 "American opinion has not taken any definite trends as yet regarding the problems of India's political future." ¹

At the same time it is possible to present the hypothesis that America, while inevitably committed by her fundamental philosophical belief to support of India in her struggle for independence, yet has a certain sympathy for Great Britain who, confronted by an impossible task, does not turn away from it. If anything may be said, it is that America has such a high regard for Great Britain that she is bitterly disappointed when Great Britain falls short of the highly idealistic standards set by the United States, and is therefore led to castigate the British government in India more.

Any hypothesis evolved from these extracts from the few periodicals covering this period

¹. Review of Reviews, LXXIII (Jan. 1931), 432.
that were available at the College of William and Mary must needs be very tentative but it is possible to consider one general hypothesis in regard to the American attitude to the British-Indian Conflict in India. That is, that America was the victim both of circumstances and of her historic traditions.

In the first chapter it became fairly apparent that the population of the United States were kept supplied with propaganda, both Indian and British, as both parties in India were anxious for American approval and support. In fact Professor Gregory of Manchester University in a speech made on the problem of India at the Institute of Politics at Williamstown, Massachusetts, stated flatly that "Britain is fashioning its Indian policy to suit the United States." The Outlook commented that "his statement that any weakness in British policy may be attributed to the pro-Gandhi feeling in America is an interesting contribution to the Indian problem rather than a convincing one.

From this statement by Professor Gregory yet another hypothesis may be developed, namely that since American tradition is founded on individualism American opinion has attempted to deal with the whole Indian problem in the terms of some outstanding figure. Myrdal accounted for this by saying that the idea of leadership pervades all American thought and way of living.  

Again, as the *Nation* on February 8, 1933 observed "Americans have always been quick to lend support to oppressed peoples" and again Myrdal attributed this to the tradition of the United States handed down from her own Revolution. Yet it would appear from Chapter II that, in spite of American sympathy with the underdog, the Press recognized the need for British government in India.

These periodicals have each linked Gandhi's doctrine of "Satyagraha" with the philosophical theories of Americans such as Emerson, William Lloyd Garrison, Thoreau, and Henry George.

4. *Nation*, CXXXVI. (Feb. 8, 1933), 151
through the writings of Geroge Bernard Shaw, and Tolstoi. From this it might be held that American opinion seized more quickly upon situations in the Indian problem that referred back to its own experience.

American philosophy established itself under the rule of a Britain divided against herself by her Elizabethan mediaevalism, her Mercantile and Non-Conformist Protestantism and her Lockean urge to tolerance and democracy. From this it might be shown that American opinion, because of its inherent individualism, tends to support Indian national independence against government of any kind and simultaneously, because of her Puritan tradition is desirous of maintaining a strong government in order to maintain the security of the individual.
APPENDIX I

An outstanding fact is that editorial opinion increased in volume until the year 1930 when it begins to decrease. Using the editorials on politics and government in *The New York Times* as an example of this the following table serves as illustration.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Editorials</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1919</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1921</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1922</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1923</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1924</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1925</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1926</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1927</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1928</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1929</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1931</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1932</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1933</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1934</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1935</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The numerical figures show the editorials for each year.
APPENDIX II

The following is a list of the Western contributors of signed articles to the periodicals surveyed, together with the number of articles thus published.

These contributors have been classified into two groups; Americans and those who were British by birth.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AMERICANS</th>
<th>No. Articles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anderson, Vincent</td>
<td>An American journalist who has had long residence in India.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bisson, T. A.</td>
<td>A member of the Research Staff of the Foreign Policy Association.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown, W. N.</td>
<td>A member of the Department of Sanskrit at the Univ. of Pennsylvania.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kendall, Patricia</td>
<td>&quot;Gandhi - Mountebank or Martyr.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miller, H. A.</td>
<td>Professor Sociology at Ohio State University.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rezmie, T.H.K.</td>
<td>An American correspondent of the Bombay Chronicle and other daily papers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smedley, Agnes</td>
<td>An American journalist who has made a special study of the Hindu question.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ward, H.F.</td>
<td>The General Secretary of the Methodist Federation of Social Services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRITISH CONTRIBUTORS</td>
<td>No. articles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrews, C. F.</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He has lived in India for 15 years and is associated with the Tagore school</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolton, J.R.G.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A member of the Staff of the Times of India</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brailsford, H.N.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A member of the Independent Labor Party</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brockway, A. F.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Editor of the New Leader</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garratt, G.T.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formerly a member of the Indian Civil Service and on the executive committee of the Indian Information Service in London</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gregg, R.D.</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He has lived for 4 years in India</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MacDonald, J.R.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prime Minister of Great Britain under a Labor Government</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ratcliffe, S. K.</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slocombe, G.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On the Paris Staff of the London Daily Herald, and therefore a man of Labor Sympathies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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