GANDHI IN AMERICAN PUBLIC OPINION

a historical survey of American opinion towards Gandhi's struggle for Indian independence

(1929 - 1932)

BY

BAWA SATINDER SINGH

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

(History)

at the

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN

1959

"I have in America perhaps the largest number of friends in the West--not even excepting Great Britain. British friends knowing me personally are more discerning than the American. In America I suffer from the well known malady called hero-worship."

--Mahatma Gandhi

INTRODUCTION

There is wide agreement on the importance of public opinion in the United States. In its attitude towards other states and peoples, American opinion has not been constant in its likes and dislikes. The history of American opinion makes it evident that its attitude towards other peoples depend on their actions, ideals and policies. Such has been the attitude of the American public in the last century, in regard to Spain in 1898 and in regard to Germany in 1917. Till the beginning of the twentieth century American public opinion was usually expressed only in regard to American or European affairs. But since the Russo-Japanese War in 1904 American opinion has tended to take considerable interest in the Asian affairs also. By the beginning of the 1930's there was perhaps as much interest taken in the annexation of Manchuria by Japan as in the activities of Hitler and Mussolini in Europe. After World War I there was another sphere which also provided food for thought to the American people. This was the growth of nationalistic movements in many countries of Asia ruled by Europe. India was the first of these countries to start a struggle for independence. The man who led this struggle to a successful conclusion was Mohandas Karamchand Gandhi. He also is the man who was through his unique method of passive resistance responsible for arousing

sympathy and criticism for his country's cause in other nations of the world. The United States is one of those countries whose people took tremendous interest in Gandhi and his career.

There are many phases in Gandhi's struggle for independence, though it is difficult to draw a line dividing one from the other. I, however, intend to deal with the phase beginning with his demand for complete independence in December 1929 to his arrest in January 1932. I regard this as one of the most important periods in his life. It is true that during this period Gandhi did not achieve any of his demands from the British but he could derive great consolation not only from the fact that his unique method of fighting could be effective but also that the world at large had taken keen interest in his struggle.

The power and effectiveness of public opinion are often difficult to estimate. Public opinion usually follows the lead of its government in ordinary matters of foreign affairs, but this was a matter in which the United States Government did not take any direct, or in any case, open interest as it affected her relations with one of her best friends, Great Britain. Public opinion, on the other hand, was influenced by other forces at work. Many queries arise out of a situation like this. What was the American opinion on Gandhi and India before 1929? Why were Americans influenced by an issue with which they were

not directly concerned? What were the factors influencing the American opinion on this issue? What were the British and Indian influences affecting American opinion? Did the timing of Gandhi's Civil Disobedience Movement have any effect in the making of American opinion on India? Was the United States' opinion unanimously in favour of Gandhi and his movement? Among other things, this thesis is a reply to these questions.

I have divided my dissertation into four chapters. The first three chapters deal largely with the American reaction towards the Indian situation during and before the period of my study and the American influences affecting the public opinion. The final chapter not only evaluates the whole study of this subject but also deals with the British and Indian influences playing their part in the development of American opinion over this issue.

I agree with Frederick L. Schuman who says that the "daily press is doubtless the most significant mirror of opinion and the most important force in the stating of that opinion."[1] It would, however, be physically impossible for just one man or even a group of men to conduct a careful and substantial survey of the entire American press. My problem in this regard was the selection and limitation of the American newspapers. I have tried to assess the

---

[1]Frederick Lewis Schuman, International Politics (New York, 1933), p. 486.

general American opinion by selecting daily newspapers from all parts of this country. I have also been able to detect American sentiment in periodicals, books, addresses, debates, and the Congressional Record which have been used in the writing of this thesis. I have tried to let American opinion speak for itself on various issues involved with Gandhi and his struggle for Indian independence.

I wish to express my deep gratitude to my Major Professor, Dr. Fred Harvey Harrington, who not only suggested this subject for research to me but also gave me encouragement and counsel in the preparation of this thesis.

CONTENTS

CHAPTER I

INDIA UP TO 1929

"The history of India after 1919 is largely the story of Mohandas Gandhi."

--T. Walter Wallbank

On March 18, 1922, a judge while delivering judgment on a man charged with sedition at Ahmedabad, India, said:

> It will be impossible to ignore the fact that you are in a different category from any person I have ever tried or am likely to have to try . . . Even those who differ from you in politics look upon you as a man of high ideals and of noble and even saintly life . . . If the course of events in India should make it possible for the government to reduce the period and release you no one will be better pleased than I.[1]

The judge was an Englishman trying a seditioner named Mohandas Karamchand Gandhi. He was obviously embarrassed and regretful. Yet the defendant was sentenced to six years' imprisonment. It was news like this which was widely reported in the United States and made Gandhi famous in this country. Yet for a few more years to come he remained a strange, rather controversial figure amongst some sections of the American public. For Gandhi the period between 1922 and 1929 was a trial period.[2]

Most Americans first heard of Gandhi at the end of World War I when in 1918 he vehemently opposed the Rowlatt Acts which he said were laws disguised to rob the people of all freedom. Rowlatt Acts stood for the extension into peacetime of all the wartime rigours in suppression of free speech, and the right of assembly. Gandhi had instead expected liberal reforms as the hope had been given in the House of Commons in October 1917 by Mr.

---

[1] Catholic World, January 1931, p. 388.

[2] Harper's Monthly Magazine, July 1930, p. 226.

Montagu, Secretary of State for India, who praised the Indian sacrifices during the war and promised that India would ultimately be given responsible self-government. It was the Rowlatt Acts more than anything else that crystallized Indian nationalism after the war, set it in motion, and gave it a leader.[3] Till then Gandhi was a loyalist, and in fact during the war he had supported the British cause urging the people to enlist[4] and to subscribe for war loans.[5]

By 1919 Gandhi had become the leader of the Indian National Congress, the largest organization in the country. As advised by him, peaceful 'Hartals' were observed throughout India and meetings were held protesting against the Rowlatt Acts. At this juncture two events suddenly brought India's political, economic, and social problems before the United States. The first was the discussion of the Treaty of Versailles by the American Congress and the second was the Amritsar Massacre. The

---

[3]Thomas Walter Wallbank, India: a survey of the heritage and growth of Indian nationalism (New York, 1948), p. 76.

[4]Ibid., p. 71. "During the course of the entire war India recruited 800,000 soldiers and 400,000 non-combatants; and of these 60,000 were killed in action."

[5]Oscar MacMillan Buck, India Looks To Her Future (New York, 1930), p. 13. "India supplied more combatant troops than Canada and Australia put together and out of her poverty gave nearly a billion dollars in gifts and war loans."

discussion over the verification of the Treaty of Versailles naturally led to the study of Great Britain's treatment of her possessions, especially India. Special attention was paid to India and it became inter-mixed with sympathy because of the Amritsar Tragedy which took place in April 1919 in Panjab, India, as a result of an attempt made by the British authorities to crush the civil disobedience movement ruthlessly. A large, unarmed crowd, attending a pro-Gandhi political meeting was fired on, without warning, by a British commander, killing over 300 persons and wounding more than 1,000.

On October 8, 1919, Senator Joseph France from Maryland, while introducing a resolution in the American Senate in connection with the ratification of the Treaty of Versailles, dealt at length with the British rule in India in his speech. He referred to the shadow of starvation which always haunted India.[6] He quoted numerous British and Indian authorities to point to India's poverty.[7] He also

---

[6] Congressional Record, Volume 58, Part 7, 66th Congress, First Session, October 8, 1919, p. 6607. The Americans know of "the ghastly pictures of those weak, emaciated, poverty-stricken Hindus, human spectres, living skeletons, 50,000,000 of whom suffer the unceasing torture of hunger gnawing at their vitals as they live ever in the deep gloom of ignorance and sorrow and under the ever-haunting shadow of death by slow starvation."

[7] Ibid., p. 6608. He compiled figures from the World Almanac showing India's national income per capita at $9.75 in comparison to United States' $372.00 and India's national wealth per capita at $70.00 to United States' $2,154.00.

referred to the alarming percentage of illiteracy among Indians in comparison to the Filipinos ruled by the United States.[8] He summed this up by saying:

> Gentlemen of the Senate, we, the United States of America, cannot justify ourselves in signing and sealing an international agreement which thus sanctions and aims to make permanent the practical enslavement of a great nation /India/ and which, making the situation still worse, also gives and guarantees to Great Britain nearly 931,000 additional square miles of territory, to rule and exploit for British benefit, as India has been ruled and exploited.[9]

Again in the discussion of the same treaty in February 1920, Senator George W. Norris, from Nebraska, referred to the Indian services during World War I and said in turn they had been rewarded with the Amritsar Massacre. While speaking at length of the tragedy he said,"in peaceable assembly, they /Indians/ were shot down in cold blood by British machine guns."[10] There was a clash between him and Senator Edward J. King, from Maryland, who said that if India had not helped England and if Germany had triumphed, India would have gone under the autocratic government of

---

[8] Congressional Record, Volume 58, Part 7, 66th Congress, First Session, October 8, 1919, p. 6609. "Only 6,780,721 out of about 75,000,000 children in India attend school, and illiteracy among these people who are of the very highest intellectual capacity, is 93 per cent, whereas during our 20 years of rule in the Philippines we have reduced the illiteracy there to 56 per cent."

[9] Jabez T. Sunderland, India in Bondage (New York, 1932), p. 53.

[10] Congressional Record, Volume 59, Part 4, 66th Congress, February 27, 1920, p. 3569.

Germany. Senator King emphasized that Great Britain had done a great deal for dominions like Canada, and in the end may give India "local autonomy, and perhaps independence."[11] To this, Senator Norris retorted, obviously keeping in mind Montagu's 1917 declaration:

> Because England treats Canada right is no defense of England when she abuses India . . . I am complaining of taking over a nation of 31,000,000 people without their consent, against their will, in violation of every pledge that ought to be sacred between man and man and particularly between nations.[12]

The matter was also taken to the House of Representatives. Representative William E. Mason, from Illinois, while introducing a resolution expressing hope for self-determination for India,[13] said that it was a crime on the part of Great Britain to hold a great civilized nation in forced subjection and appealed to the American people to sympathize and extend moral support to India in her struggle for self-determination.[14] His resolution was sent to the Committee of Foreign Relations. These speeches were published throughout the United States and created immense interest in the Indian problems. Though it would be fantastic even to suggest that the American Congress refused

---

[11] Congressional Record, Volume 59, Part 4, 66th Congress, February 27, 1920, p. 3569.

[12] Ibid., pp. 3569-3570.

[13] Ibid., March 2, 1920, p. 3784.

[14] Sunderland, India in Bondage, pp. 53-55.

to ratify the Treaty of Versailles because of India, the Indian situation did embitter some of the members who voted against the ratification. Some feel that the Senators who referred to India in these debates cared little for her, and were merely using India as a way of attacking the foreign policies of President Wilson. It is quite clear that these Senators were opposed to the President but there is nothing to suggest that their sympathy for India was not genuine.

After April 1919 events in India moved fast. The Government brought in the 1919 Act promising very limited reforms but Gandhi refused to accept them. He boycotted the elections to the new legislature. In the All India Congress Session in 1921 he asked the Indian people to struggle for 'Swaraj'. He advocated its achievement through 'Ahimsa' and Satyagraha. This was, however, not the first time that Gandhi had applied the principle of non-violent passive resistance. He had done that before against the segregation policy of South African Government from 1906 to 1914 and had succeeded in forcing the Government to repeal some of its oppressive laws against Indians. He asked Indians to resign all public posts, students were to be withdrawn from schools, lawyers were to leave the courts and the British business was to be boycotted. The 'charkha' became the symbol of Gandhi's campaign. Even the Muslims joined hands with this movement which assumed

a country-wide character. About 40,000 persons were arrested in this political agitation.[15] For a moment it seemed Gandhi's experiment in India would succeed. But as the movement progressed some people in their enthusiasm became violent. At a place called Chauri Chaura an enraged mob killed twenty policemen. Hearing of the killings Gandhi immediately called off the movement. In 1922 he was tried for writing seditionary articles in the press and was imprisoned.

By now, however, Gandhi had won many friends in the United States. They aroused public opinion in the country in his favour. Many wrote books on him, some turned to the press, and others read addresses.

Many of these Gandhian American writers believed, and perhaps very justly, that he owed his debt for his creed of passive resistance, at least in part, to two American thinkers, Thoreau and Emerson. Thoreau and Emerson had both been students of Hindu culture.[16] Thoreau's essay on civil disobedience undoubtedly influenced Gandhi,[17] and

---

[15]Tarakanath Nath Das, India In World Politics (New York, 1932), p. 106.

[16]Frederick Bohn Fisher, That Strange Little Brown Man Gandhi (New York, 1932), p. 77.

[17]Haridas T. Mazumdar, Gandhi Versus The Empire (New York, 1932), p. vi. Thoreau is quoted: "If the tax gatherer or any other public officer asks me, as one has done, 'But what shall I do?' my answer is: 'If you really wish to do anything, resign your office. When the subject has refused allegiance and the officer has resigned his office, then the revolution is accomplished.'"

Gandhi himself acknowledged his debt to Thoreau.[18] It was recognized that Gandhi learned a great deal from Tolstoy too, but then it was argued that Tolstoy in turn acknowledged his debt to William Lloyd Garrison. The Nation wrote in an editorial that "the doctrine of non-violence, in short, though it has remained for India to give it by far the most remarkable application in our time, owes a great debt to American thinkers."[19] Others believed that Gandhi also had derived his ideas of 'Swaraj' from American leaders. One writer mentioned that Lincoln's influence was also apparent as his sayings in regard to the right of the people anywhere to rise and shake off an unjust government were often quoted in the literature of Gandhi's movement.[20] Another said that it was Woodrow Wilson who started the Indian Revolution by scattering over enemy land his ringing phrases about democracy, self-government, and the rights of small nations.[21]

Another factor which produced an early influence on Americans was Hindu Gandhi's attitude towards Christianity

---

[18] M. K. Gandhi, Non-Violence in Peace and War (Ahmedabad, 1944), Vol. 1, p. 466. Gandhi wrote: "Moreover, you have given me a teacher in Thoreau, who furnished me through his essay on the 'Duty of Civil Disobedience' scientific confirmation of what I was doing in South Africa."

[19] Nation, June 25, 1930, p. 723.

[20] Fisher, Gandhi, p. 84.

[21] William James Durant, The Case For India (New York, 1930), p. 119.

and the favorable impression created by Gandhi on American missionaries in India. At home these missionaries gave a good report of Gandhi and his ideals. The American missionary had become a sort of revolutionary element in India. These missionaries did not want to strike at the imperial government in India but they were stirred by the physical, economic and social degradation of the people.[22] Gandhi had been impressed by some of the Christian doctrines. He was greatly influenced by the New Testament, especially the Sermon on the Mount which he said "went straight to his heart."[23] One missionary wrote that it was on the passage of turning the other cheek that Gandhi's leadership developed a soul power so great as to seriously threaten the British rule in India. He believed that Gandhi had attracted the attention of his fellow-Hindus to the significance of the sufferings and death of Jesus.[24] Another speaker recognized that Gandhi's one claim to greatness and perhaps the real secret of his power lay in his Christlike willingness to sacrifice self for others.[25] E. Stanley Jones, an American evangelist who met Gandhi

---

[22]Fisher, Gandhi, p. 77.

[23]Garfield Bromley Oxnam, Personalities in Social Reform (New York, 1950), p. 121.

[24]Oscar Buck, India, pp. 187-189.

[25]An address by William Kirk in Sociology and Social Research, May 1930, p. 356.

in the early twenties, later went to the extent of saying:

> God uses many instruments, and He has used Mahatma Gandhi to help Christians unchristian Christianity.[26]

Many other Americans met Gandhi in India between 1917 and 1929. One of the first Americans to have met Gandhi in India was Frederick B. Fisher in 1917. His remark that "anyone who is not prepared to capitulate Gandhi had better stay away from him"[27] obviously meant that he capitulated to Gandhi. After mentioning that the Rowlatt Acts and the Amritsar tragedy turned Gandhi against the British he wrote:

> It is one of the greatest blunders of history that England failed to keep Gandhi loyal to the Empire . . . The British Government in India could have had the leadership of Gandhi for a great conciliatory, gradually developing program of Indian progress toward freedom. Instead they chose the way of armed repression, thus sowing the seeds of their ultimate defeat . . . for this blunder must ultimately cost them an empire.[28]

Oscar MacMillan Buck, a Professor of Missions and Comparative Religions in the Drew Theological Seminary, who was in India in 1925-1926, though saying that the solution of all India's problems lay in her conversion to Christianity, agreed with Gandhi's 'Swarjist' argument that if the thirteen American colonies, the French Republic and Germany

---

[26] Oxnam, Social Reform, p. 130. He quotes E. Stanley Jones.

[27] Fisher, Gandhi, p. 75.

[28] Ibid., p. 18.

after their early chaos, divisions and disorders could live happier today, why could not the Indians do the same. He said Gandhi's influence and reputation after 1920 had "shot up like a rocket."[29]

There were some who were converted to the Indian point of view after visiting India. Reverend Charles Cuthbert Hall, former President of the Union Theological Seminary of New York, said in a speech before the Bar Association Club House in New York on November 20, 1928, that before he went to India all his sympathies were on the English side. Now he declared:

> . . . But what I am saying now is the truth, and the truth must be told . . . the obvious fact stares us in the face that there is at no time, in no year any shortage of food-stuffs in India. The trouble is that the taxes imposed by the British Government being fifty percent of produce, the Indian starves that England's annual revenue may not be diminished by a Dollar.[30]

Another conversion was that of Professor Josef Washington Hall, Professor of Politics at the University of Washington. He said that he was ready to regard Gandhi as a mystic but after he met him in 1929 he changed his views.[31] He wrote a few books and many articles on Gandhi after his return home. He became convinced that Gandhi's was the only

---

[29]Oscar Buck, India, p. 29.

[30]Ibid., pp. 117-118.

[31]Josef Washington Hall, Eminent Asians (New York, 1930), p. 385.

contemporary career founded upon suffering and non-retaliation.[32] He was impressed that Gandhi's idealism took a very practical turn in its attack upon caste and creed prejudices in India.[33] In his book Eminent Asians he compared Gandhi to some of his contemporary Asians and said that he was the greatest makers of Asia, because, unlike other makers he would have sacrificed his nation's hope of independence rather than commit an act of violence to attain it.[34]

Gandhi's attitude towards the West, machines, 'charkha,' fasting and Bolshevism was also discussed. Gandhi had said that India had nothing to learn from the West and the traditional old implements, the plough and the spinning wheel were their wisdom and welfare. In an industrially advanced country like the United States such an approach by Gandhi was bound to create interest and surprise. There were various comments. Hall said Gandhi had wrongly been presented as a rebel against western culture and an Asian reactionary. To him Gandhi's spiritualization appeared to be a sure protection against the danger

---

[32] New York Times, January 19, 1930, sec. 5, p. 3. "Gandhi is picturesque--so picturesque that an average westerner must see him many times, before he can convince himself that he exists."

[33] Josef Washington Hall, The Revolt of Asia (New York, 1928), pp. 176-177.

[34] Hall, Eminent Asians, p. 510.

of Communism in India. He praised Gandhi for having accomplished more through fasting "than the whole police force of India."[35] He, however, believed that the spinning wheel was Gandhi's "disturbing narrowness" and his tilt against machinery will certainly fail.[36] William Kirk was, on the other hand, impressed and in an address before the Pacific Southwest Sociological Association said that the spinning wheel was at the centre of Gandhi's economic and political philosophy. He believed that this was not to injure British trade, primarily, but to promote the peace and prosperity of India. He argued that the spinning wheel would give to the Indian men and women something useful to do with their hands in the long periods of enforced idleness when life becomes dull and monotonous.[37] To Frederick Fisher the advent of the spinning wheel was the first step in the development of India's machine age. But he said India's machine age was not to be patterned entirely upon the West; it was to have a social emphasis, a human side, which, in his opinion, western civilization in its haste to coin material comforts and money forgot to take into consideration. He pointed out, and quite convincingly, that Gandhi's vitriolic invectives against the

---

[35]Hall, Eminent Asians, pp. 384, 475, 493.

[36]Living Age, June 1929, pp. 278-281.

[37]Sociology and Social Research, March 1930, p. 345. From Kirk's address entitled "Will India Follow Gandhi?"

machine age were not so much against the machine as against its abuse.[38]

However, there were people in America, though considerably smaller in number, who were pro-British and looked upon Gandhi's advent with suspicion and misgivings. Alden H. Clark in his book India on The March, though he praised Gandhi as a social and religious leader, said as a politician Gandhi had made Himalayan blunders "which have done measureless harm." He wrote Gandhi had failed both in his opposition to the British and his fight against Indian social evils. He believed Gandhi's great failure came from his indiscriminate rejection of everything from the West and argued "that men like Gandhi cannot build a Chinese wall around India and keep everything western out."[39] He thought that if Indians did away with the British rule at that juncture the result would be "terrible chaos and bloodshed" and would destroy India. Clark wrote emphatically:

> If the British should leave tomorrow, rivers of blood would indeed flow. Millions would starve as they have been doing in Russia. It would be a terrible calamity.[40]

Another writer, Philo M. Buck, a Professor at the Uni-

---

[38]Fisher, Gandhi, pp. 169-170.

[39]Alden Hyde Clark, India on The March (New York, 1922), p. 46.

[40]Ibid., pp. 47-48.

versity of Wisconsin, praised the British Government for sustaining the reforms of 1919 in India. He said Gandhi had led some of his followers from delirium to disorder and then to despair. He criticized his insistence on novel economic theories and non-cooperation. Clark believed Gandhi could not give India a program because he had none save the 'charkha' and in his opinion, he had "reduced the Indian National Congress to political impotence."[41]

But there are two books on India which stand more conspicuous than any others during this period and created an extraordinary impression in the United States. The first was Mother India, an anti-Indian book written by Katherine Mayo in 1927. She had met Gandhi in India in 1926. She presented India as a "sick man growing daily weaker, dying body and brain, of a disease that only himself can cure."[42] She emphasized that the history of British administration of India showed that reactionary disorders follow attempts at needed progress saying that the East resents being hustled, even in reforms. She charged Gandhi with killing the 1919 Act by turning upon it the full fire of his non-cooperative guns.[43] But she now treated Gandhi as a "former leader," a man who had made

---

[41]"Is This The Passing of Gandhi?" Virginia Quarterly Review, July 1926, p. 404.

[42]Atlantic Monthly, February 1928, p. 271.

[43]Katherine Mayo, Mother India (New York, 1927), p. 298.

his exit from the Indian scene. She wrote page after page about the Indian evils of poverty, famine, bad hospitals, child marriage and untouchability but blamed the Indians, not the British Government, for this. She mentioned that in her conversation with Gandhi he told her that "untouchability for me is more insufferable than British rule."[44] She, however, conceded that Gandhi's view on untouchability had won some ground but said few of his supporters ever followed him in his views on the problem.[45]

By August 1930, approximately 140,000 copies of this book had been sold.[46] Some praised the book for the information it provided about India,[47] but there is, however, no

---

[44]Mayo, Mother India, p. 168.

[45]Ibid., p. 167.

[46]Time Newsmagazine, August 25, 1930, p. 24.

[47]Here are some of the comments: (a) American Review of Reviews, July 1927, p. 108. "After reading Miss Mayo's book one can begin to understand why visitors to that country have hesitated to tell the truth, when it was revealed to them, particularly in regard to the treatment of women." (b) New Republic, September 21, 1927, pp. 127-128. "A great part of Miss Mayo's facts cannot be challenged; and yet the picture she has drawn is profoundly untrue. It is a libel upon a unique population and a people of extraordinary virtue, patience and spiritual quality." (c) New York Times, June 5, 1927, 1750 W, p. 1. "Her detachment is obvious. If she quotes she gives her authority. If she describes, it is as an eyewitness. The facts that she states are not likely to be disputed. The only question is whether she has stated the facts in their true proportion. Having seen life in India, has she seen it enough?" (d) New York Herald Tribune (Books), June 12, 1927, 1750 W, p. 1. "The potential value of Miss Mayo's book lies in this: It goes further than any other writer has yet dared to go toward that revelation; it presents facts which may easily be denied, but cannot, in their entirety, be disproved or shaken and which demand action."

proof to show that Mayo carried American opinion with her on the subject. Some book reviewers wrote appreciative comments on Mother India but various well acquainted persons with India severely condemned the book.[48] In India it became one of the most hated books and remains so to this day. Even in England it did not draw an appreciative response. The book is full of misrepresentations. Later under the pressure of criticism the author, though denying that her motive in writing this book was political, promised to withdraw a few misstated facts in her book.[49]

---

[48]Some adverse comments: (a) Atlantic Monthly, February 1928. An article by Rev. Alden H. Clark, an American missionary in India for seventeen years, entitled "Is India Dying? A Reply To 'Mother India.'" He said that Miss Mayo's chief sin against India was "her almost complete blindness to every evidence of sickness and decay" and that "'Mother India' has struck a blow both against truth and against interracial understanding and goodwill." (b) Current History, December 1927. An article entitled "India's Degradation Laid to British Misrule" by Prof. John J. Cornelius, former Professor of Philosophy in the University of Lucknow, India, pp. 361-368. The long article vehemently condemns Mayo's book as dishonest and mischievous. He says "she overstates, suppresses, misinterprets facts and distorts evidence to support her prejudices; she uncompromisingly condemns the moral and religious life of a whole people; she refuses to see anything good in the Indian Nationalist movement or anything bad in the British administration." He says 'Mother India' is so anti-Indian that, "though the hand be that of Katherine Mayo, the voice is that of the British bureaucrat." (c) Christian Century, February 2, 1928, p. 149. In a statement seven American missionaries in India, in high positions, deeply regretted that an American should write with such unfairness and apparent prejudice in presenting India. They by doing so expressed eagerness "to correct any false and unfair impressions created in America by Miss Mayo's book."

[49]New Republic, February 5, 1930, p. 304. C. F. Andrews saw Katherine Mayo in this connection and the latter

The second notable book of this period was India in Bondage written by Jabez J. Sunderland in 1929 and as the title of the book suggests it was a pro-Indian book. The author had twice visited India. His book was a long commentary on the curses of British rule in India running from her political enslavement to social and economic degradation. Though at places he went too far in condemning the British and in his book misquoted many facts, but took pains to disprove the widespread impression in America that the British rule in India was of unqualified good.[50] He referred to the increase of death role by famines during the British rule in India.[51] He referred to the terrible poverty and lack of food in the country.[52] He referred to India's impoverishment which had resulted through heavy

---

promised "to withdraw two grave misquotations about Tagore" and "she regretted what had happened." Mayo had accused the famed Indian poet of favouring infant Hindu marriages and praising the unrivaled merits of Aruvedic medicines. Mayo also believed that Gandhi favoured illiteracy and was against reforms.

[50] Sunderland, India In Bondage, p. 3.

[51] Ibid., pp. 11-12. Quoted W. S. Milly, British author that from 1800 to 1880, there were 18,000,000 famine deaths. In the first seventy years the number of deaths was estimated to be 400,000 and in the last twenty years it was reported to be from 15,000,000 to 26,000,000.

[52] Ibid., p. 14. Quoted G. K. Gokhale, member of the Viceroy's Executive Council who said: "From 60,000,000 to 70,000,000 of the people in India do not know what it is to have their hunger satisfied even once in a year."

taxation.[53] To him, however, the greatest injustice of all was the loss of India's liberty--the fact that she was allowed little or no part in shaping her own destiny.[54] He wrote of the distrust that Britain had of Gandhi. On the other hand, he called him Britain's best friend in India and suggested that by cooperating with Gandhi they could save Britain from enormous business and financial losses, and through him prevent the loss of India to the British Empire or the Commonwealth.[55]

India in Bondage was published in India and was promptly banned by the British Government. In India, however, it created a wonderful impression and many, including Gandhi, expressed gratefulness to Sunderland for his work.[56] The book received a very good response in the United States and the comment of the press was most favorable.[57] Of all

---

[53] Sunderland, India In Bondage, p. 15. Quoted Cathcart Watson's speech in British House of Commons, who said: "We know that the percentage of the taxes in India, as related to the gross product, is more than double that of any other country."

[54] Ibid., p. 21.

[55] Ibid., pp. 543-544.

[56] New Republic, December 25, 1929. Gandhi commented: "If Dr. Sunderland is seditious, it is a virtue to be in his company."

[57] New Republic, March 19, 1930. A few of the comments from the press are quoted: (a) New York Telegram: "A monumental work. This publication at this critical period in Indian affairs is fortunate." (b) Washington Post: "Cannot fail to impress the thoughtful." (c) Review of Reviews:

the books written until then in America on Gandhi's India, Sunderland's book created a greater interest amongst the American people to listen sympathetically to India's problems and Gandhi's aspirations.

Throughout these years the British Government watched with growing concern interest displayed by the American public in India. From Gandhi's arrest in 1922 to his return to active politics in 1928 a campaign of propaganda was conducted by the British in the United States that Gandhi's influence was dying out. It was intensified because Gandhi, after his release in 1924, had refused to return to active politics. Some Americans agreed with this point of view. Miss Mayo, of course, took the lead by saying that Gandhi's influence had everywhere lapsed into negligibility as a political factor but conceded that its crippling and embittering after-effects still dragged upon the wheels of progress.[58] Philo M. Buck wrote in the Virginia Quarterly Review, in an article entitled "Is This The Passing of Gandhi?" that Gandhi suffered from obstinate and irrelevant inconsistencies of interested politics,

---

"Probably no American and few Englishmen are as familiar with the facts as Dr. Sunderland." (d) Pacific Review: "A wealth of information even for those who thought we knew something about India." (e) Sacramento Bee: "Lays bare with devastating effect the actual result of British rule in India." (f) Daily Oklahoman: "Those who have read Katherine Mayo owe it to themselves to read Dr. Sunderland." (g) Time: "Vital, comprehensive, militantly fair."

[58]Mayo, Mother India, p. 298.

infirmity of human nature and blamed Gandhi for having lost respect by putting his faith in the 'charkha' since 1921.[59] Another writer, F. Brilten Austin, wrote in an article entitled "Will India Blow UP?" in the Saturday Evening Post that "not a dog barked" when Gandhi was arrested in 1922 and to him the Indian people seemed rather relieved than otherwise by that fact.[60] But there were many who disagreed with the 'Mayo school of opinion.' Frederick Fisher said the view that Gandhi was losing his hold on the Indian people was utterly misleading.[61] Nathaniel Peffer wrote that during 1922 and 1929 Gandhi as the agent of the spirit of the times and of a movement of history had marshalled something which constituted a tremendous fact and not a matter for abstract speculation.[62] William Hull, Professor of International Relations at Swarthmore College, denied that Gandhi had suffered political eclipse and said that the Annual Congress Session in 1928 had proved that he was a political star of the first magnitude in the Congress and the country.[63]

---

[59] Virginia Quarterly Review, July 1926, p. 390.

[60] Saturday Evening Post, June 7, 1930, p. 158.

[61] Fisher, Gandhi, p. 201.

[62] "The Twilight of Empire," Harper's Monthly Magazine, July 1930, p. 226.

[63] William I. Hull, India's Political Crisis (Baltimore, 1930), p. 30.

The controversy over this issue continued to be a subject of peculiar interest throughout these years. The 1929 Lahore Session of the All India Congress not only conceded that Gandhi was the dominant moral factor in their movement but also surrendered to him unhesitatingly the political leadership of India. The United States did not fail to notice this.

CHAPTER II

THE SALT MARCH

"Much of the world-wide furor created by the Salt March arose from sheer curiosity, mixed with incredulity--the twentieth century could not quite believe such things even when they happened in the most relentless blaze of public opinion."

--Vincent Sheean

In the London Daily Herald of October 17, 1927, Ramsay MacDonald, the leader of the British Labour Party, declared:

> The moral justification that has always been made for the existence of our empire amongst subject peoples has been that we are training them for self-government. The most typical of that is our Indian Empire. A thousand and one reasons are given for a little more tutelage . . . Now plain practical common sense should come to our rescue. Nobody can imagine that any harm will come from independence. Let independence be granted.

The British labour leader had obviously been impressed by the Indian demand for swaraj. Time and again he pleaded for India's cause.[1]

Americans had listened with interest to the pledges of MacDonald and when he came to power in July 1929 some hoped that the Labour Government would give India Dominion Status in the near future.[2] But it was soon found that MacDonald had no intention of keeping his promises and had decided to look upon the Indian problem from an entirely different angle. There were natural repercussions in India and the Salt March was one of the direct results of this 'change of heart' on the part of the new British

---

[1] Jabez T. Sunderland, India in Bondage (New York, 1932), pp. 480-481. In May 1928 he said in a message to the Hindu, Madras, that if the Labour Party came to power one of its early acts will be "to put India on a footing of Dominion Status." In July 1928, speaking at the British Commonwealth Labour Conference he expressed the same views.

[2] William I. Hull, India's Political Crisis (Baltimore, 1930), p. xii.

Prime Minister.

By 1927 it had become apparent that Indian nationalism was outrunning the reforms provided by the Act of 1919, and in consequence the conservative British Government appointed the Indian Statutory Commission under the chairmanship of Sir John Simon. Among other things, the purpose of this commission was to inquire into the development of representative institutions. But the appointment of the Simon Commission created a new wave of nationalistic agitation and resentment in India, especially as no Indian had been placed on the Commission. It was at this juncture that Mahatma Gandhi decided to re-enter the Indian politics.

When the Simon Commission arrived in India, it was boycotted by Gandhi and all important political parties in India. It, however, tried to continue its work under bitter opposition. Since 1926, the Viceroy was Lord Irwin, later to be the British ambassador to the United States. In November 1929, he announced for MacDonald's government that a Round Table Conference, to be attended by British and Indian representatives, would be held in London in October 1930 "to frame a scheme of Dominion constitution for India."[3] But later, MacDonald formally rejected Gandhi's request that the proposed conference should consider steps for the grant of dominion status to India. It

---

[3]Time, January 6, 1930, pp. 26-27.

was in retaliation to this rejection that the All India Congress Session held at Lahore on December 31, 1929, under the leadership of Gandhi, passed a resolution which asked for complete independence for India.

The passing of this resolution received immediate attention in the United States. The watchful weekly news-magazine, Time, referring to the Congress Session observed that it "had met with announced purpose of committing High Treason en masse, assembled as did 65 American colonists in 1776 to defy a British sovereign with a Declaration of Independence" and described the Congress leader, Gandhi, as "indisputably the most adored and potent man in India."[4] Another newsweekly, Nation, commented editorially that the Indian situation was dynamite of the most explosive kind and believed that if once that power train began to explode neither Gandhi, nor the British Raj, nor all the counsels of moderation in the world would be able to stop it.[5] New Republic referred to the British argument that India was not ready for dominion status--that it would lead to inefficient administration, a decrease of trade and

---

[4] Time, January 6, 1930, pp. 26-27. "A wild familiar Irish tune was in the air. It shrilled and banged from the oriental instruments of an outlandish procession . . . Even with 500 British special constables skulking outside, the 30,000 Nationalists (physically weak and meekly timid though they are) felt safe behind their barricade."

[5] Nation, January 8, 1930, p. 29.

even to civil war, and replied:

> Many people have paid a price for freedom, and if the Indian people are willing to do so, theirs should be the decision . . . If the Labour Government, controlled by fear of hypothetical dangers, should follow a niggardly policy toward India, this vast empire will be irretrievably lost to the British Commonwealth of Nations. If, on the other hand, it shows real generosity in making, not promises but actual concessions to the overwhelming demand for Indian homerule, it may keep a self-governing India within the Empire, and thus safeguard it from outside molestation.[6]

American writers, in the later years, have continued to comment on the Indian resolution. Vincent Sheean wrote that the American Declaration of Independence and a passage in Abraham Lincoln's second inaugural address both echo in this document, which declared inalienable rights for the people and their right to abolish a government which denied them freedom.[7] Herrymon Maurer wrote that with the passing of this resolution "enthusiasm again covered the land; dissenters gave away quibbling; and Indians grew together around Gandhi."[8]

Incidentally, Jawahar Lal Nehru, who moved the independence resolution and became from that time Gandhi's closest associate in his movement, received attention for the first time in the United States.[9] Sherwood Eddy, then

---

[6] *New Republic*, January 8, 1930, p. 184.

[7] Vincent Sheean, *Lead Kindly Light* (New York, 1949), p. 146.

[8] Herrymon Maurer, *Great Soul* (Garden City, 1948), p. 83.

[9] D. G. Tendulkar, *Mahatma* (Bombay, 1952), Vol. III, p.1.

writing from India, described Nehru as "a man of high honor, a sensitive conscience, holding very much the same attitude to the British Empire that Thomas Jefferson did in 1776."[10] Herbert Miller referred to Nehru as an uncompromising socialist but said he radiated sincerity.[11] Others called him an extremist for his demand for independence and a socialistic pattern of society and said "he is a sign of the times."[12]

Perhaps the most important reaction in the United States to Gandhi's new step came from Senator John James Blaine, who was Governor of Wisconsin from 1921 to 1927. Senator Blaine introduced a resolution in the American Senate on January 6, 1930, concerning the Indian struggle for Indian independence. His resolution put emphasis on two main propositions:

1 - That the American Senate should convey the deep interest of the American people to the Indian people in their struggle to establish their liberty.

2 - That the Senate should pledge constitutional support to the President of the United States whenever he recognized the sovereignty and independence of India.[13]

---

[10] Christian Century, January 8, 1930, pp. 44-46.

[11] Nation, April 23, 1930, p. 502.

[12] Eston Everett Ericson and David Eric Ericson, India in Revolution (Chapel Hill, N.C., May 1937).

[13] Congressional Record, Volume 72, Part 2, 71st Congress, 2nd Session, January 6, 1930, p. 1096.

The resolution never reached the stage of voting but it did show the interest taken by the Senate in this matter.

In February 1930, Time predicted that Mahatma Gandhi was thinking of calling another civil disobedience movement and believed that vast trouble would follow.[14] Time's prediction came true. On March 2, 1930, Gandhi addressed a long and friendly letter to Viceroy Irwin that the solution to the economic problems of India must be found. He pointed to the cumbersome revenue system that hit the Indian ryot hard and to the cost of British administration in India which he described as "the most expensive in the world." He informed the Viceroy that if the latter would not take any immediate steps for the elimination of such abuses, he would once again start the satyagraha from the 11th of March by disregarding the provisions of the Salt Tax being levied by the Government.

The Salt Tax was one of the most hated features of the entire Indian Revenue system. According to the provisions of this law an Indian could not make salt from the sea water. Although India had four of the world's best rock salt areas and could locally manufacture all the salt necessary for her, the British Government 'dumped' some

---

[14] Time, February 24, 1930, p. 24. "Some observers predict /it/ will be the worst world-trouble of this decade."

600,000 tons in the Indian market annually which provided tonnage for British shipping and England received $20,000,000 annual revenue from India. The monopolized salt was sold to Indians at prices sometimes 2,000% of production cost.[15] In 1929 the Salt Tax amounted to $25,000,000 out of total tax of $800,000,000 collected from India.[16]

Lord Irwin promptly replied to Gandhi in a brief letter, made no reference to the questions raised by him, and regretted that Gandhi should be "contemplating a course of action which is clearly bound to involve violation of the law, and danger to the public peace." Gandhi lamented the Viceroy's cold reply but declared with confidence:

> I know that the salt tax has to go and many other things with it, if my letter means what it says. Time alone can show how much of it was meant.[17]

This exchange of letters was given prominence in the

---

[15] Time, March 24, 1930, p. 23.

[16] New York Times, April 16, 1930, p. 28:6.

[17] Living Age, May 1, 1930, pp. 264-270. Gandhi had written to Irwin: "Take your own salary. It is over Rs. 21,000 per month besides many other indirect additions. The British Prime Minister gets . . . Rs. 54,00 per month . . . You are getting over Rs. 700 per day, against India's average income of less than two annas per day. The Prime Minister gets Rs. 180 per day, against Great Britain's average income of nearly Rs. 2 per day. Thus you are getting much over five thousand times India's average income . . . On bended knee I ask you to ponder over this phenomenon . . . what is true of Viceregal salary is true generally of the whole administration."

American press. Living Age, which printed every word of these letters, commented that "they are indeed the stuff of which living history is made."[18] However, the influential New York Times editorially condemned Gandhi's letter calling it obscure and, curiously enough, this newspaper discovered in Gandhi's letter "a desire to threaten the British Government with violence." It was quick to give advice to Gandhi:

> Gandhi must be aware that resistance to constituted authority cannot be preached to several hundred million people without speedily resulting in overt acts . . . But unquestionably it would be better for his cause if the Nationalist campaign could be conducted wholly without civil disobedience.[19]

As announced by Gandhi the civil disobedience movement was proclaimed on March 12, 1930, and the same day he began his Salt March. He started from Sabarmati, accompanied by seventy-eight members of his ashram and the party was to march to a place called Dandi, about 200 miles away on the western seacoast of India and make salt from the sea. Throughout Gandhi's march which lasted twenty-four days Gandhi was greeted on his way by thousands of cheering Indians. The country stood solidly behind the Mahatma and the excitement throughout India had perhaps never been equalled before.

---

[18] Living Age, May 1, 1930, p. 270.

[19] New York Times, May 10, 1930, p. 20:1-2.

The outside world watched with keen interest the progress of the Salt March. In the United States interest in Gandhi was immediately revived. The American press was flooded with news reports, editorials, and articles on this subject. The New Republic, in an editorial, referred to the peaceful conditions in India despite the March and said that in no other country in the twentieth century would millions of people, who were seething with hatred of the foreign invader, be willing to stand by while this ritualistic and symbolic pilgrimage took place, and said even in India it was only possible because of the personal power of Gandhi.[20] The Nation said that in challenging the government monopoly of salt Gandhi had chosen a simple and clear-cut issue. It added that a tax on salt was indefensible in any case since it worked a greater hardship on the poor than on any other class.[21] For successive weeks during Gandhi's March, Time continued to give comments on the event and praised Gandhi by commenting that he was "not like an imaginary Statesman Stimson trudging to London /for the Naval Conference/." It published various statements given by Gandhi on his way to Dandi.[22]

---

[20] New Republic, March 26, 1930, p. 137.

[21] Nation, April 16, 1930, p. 438.

[22] Time, March 24, 1930, p. 23. Time said: "Indian farmers who take cattle to the seashore at night to let them lick whatever salt is deposited, thereby run the risk of imprisonment." Time quoted one of Gandhi's more important speeches to Indians at Boriavi: "Money alone

There were, of course, people in the United States who did not think highly of Gandhi's March. Ralston Hayden, Professor of Political Science, University of Michigan, called Gandhi's March a 'revolt' and said it was a failure because it had failed to reach the inhabitants of India.[23] But the foremost of Gandhi's critics was once again Katherine Mayo. In a long article entitled "Gandhi's March Past" she criticized the publicity that had been given to the Salt March in America and said the Americans had ignored Gandhi's role as a social reformer shown by successive events in that brief trip. She brought about rather grotesque charges against Gandhi, the essence of which is as follows:

1 - That Gandhi's seventy-eight companions were not vaccinated and "after the first ten days of Gandhi's march, while the Bombay Presidency as a whole reports a decrease in cases of small-pox, the figures rush upward in that particular section through which Gandhi is moving."

2 - That Gandhi did nothing to stop the rush of child

---

will not win self-government. If money could win, I should have obtained it long ago. What is required, therefore, is your blood." March 31, 1930, pp. 25-26. Time said: "He insists upon mixing up Religion, Economics, and politics into something before which the Anglo-Saxon stands puzzled and aghast, unwilling and unable to give it an English name. If Englishmen were Germans they would call what Mr. Gandhi is driving at 'recpolism' (R--eligion, EC--onomics, POL--itics)."

[23] Current History, June 30, 1930, p. 549.

marriages which were taking place in India at that time because of the Sharda Act which prohibited child marriages and was about to be implemented. "All along his route, in the villages where he rested between his brief daily stages, the people's most pressing interest was that of wedding their girl babies. And yet, in spite of the facts daily and nightly dinned into his ears by the marriage drums, Gandhi seems to have acknowledged no duty to use his own great influence toward staying that grim sacrifice."

3 - That though Gandhi had called untouchability as 'the shame of Hinduism' and wanted its abolition, the untouchable had declared that he does not need Gandhi's sympathy and that the former believed "that his only earthly hope lies under the British flag."[24]

Mayo concluded her article dramatically--"Sedition is the Mahatma's mission--that and that only."[25] Her charges are characterized by extravagant eccentricity. Her first charge cannot be proved because she had no sources or statistics to present to prove her point of view. Even the British Government did not bring such a charge against Gandhi. Her second charge is disproved by the fact that Gandhi was a great opponent of child marriages. As Time reported, even during his march he condemned, at Tresela

---

[24] Atlantic Monthly, September 1920, pp. 327-333.

[25] Atlantic Monthly, September 1930, p. 333.

on March 25, the rush of some Indian parents to marry off their children because of the Sharda Act. He had said:

> Oh foolish ones! Without understanding this law you are busy marrying off little children. Shame, shame! You are so ignorant, and ignorance is the cause of your slavery to Great Britain.[26]

As regards Mayo's third charge, only history was to prove that it was untrue.

Some American visitors in India at that time also sent reports about Gandhi's march. Herbert Adolphus Miller, Professor of Sociology at Ohio State University, who had been in India for several weeks and stayed with Gandhi for three days before the latter started his march, wrote on March 15 that after meeting all shades of opinion in India he was convinced "that there are only two real forces in India--the Government and Gandhi."[27] Perhaps the only American to have marched with Gandhi in certain stages of the Salt March was one Newton Phelps Stokes. Later in an article entitled "Marching with Gandhi" he referred to the spirit in Gandhi's prayer meetings during the march and said, "it seemed as if such faith could really move the mountain of British rule."[28]

Later American writers have continued to comment on the famous Salt March and its significance. Vincent Sheean

---

[26] Time, April 7, 1930, p. 24.

[27] Nation, April 23, 1930, p. 501.

[28] Review of Reviews, June 1930, p. 36.

wrote that Gandhi broke the Salt Law because salt was the commonest of necessities and salt was something every peasant could understand.[29] Bromley Oxnam was impressed by the fact that Gandhi, with the power of soul, tried to transform his opponents during the Salt March. Walter Wallbank observed that never before this event "had Indian nationalism been stirred so deeply."[30]

After reaching Dandi, Gandhi and his followers broke the Salt Law by making salt at the seashore on the morning of April 7, 1930. The news was splashed on the front pages of American newspapers on the morning of April 7, 1930 and there were widespread comments. The New York Times' correspondent wired from India:

> Mr. Gandhi has put Dandi on the map. A few weeks ago scarcely anyone even in India had heard of the place.[31]

The Baltimore Sun commented that Gandhi had contrived, by the simplest strategy, to put the game of crisis making squarely into English hands.[32] The New Republic feared an outbreak in India after Gandhi's defiance because of growing emotional strain and said, "at any moment, an outbreak

---

[29]Vincent Sheean, Mahatma Gandhi (New York), p. 136.

[30]Thomas Walter Wallbank, India: a survey of the heritage and growth of Indian nationalism (New York, 1948), p. 118.

[31]New York Times, April 7, 1930, p. 1:1.

[32]Baltimore Sun, as quoted by the Literary Digest, April 19, 1930, p. 12.

may occur which will bring the conditions of the Indian Mutiny of 1857."[33]

While commenting on the Dandi salt-making, many drew comparisons of the event with the Boston Tea incident of 1773. The Literary Digest was of the opinion that by dipping up briny water from the sea to make free salt Gandhi had reversed the "Boston-Tea-Party."[34] The Chicago Daily Tribune said that the stubbornness which made the salt tax and tea tax issues out of proportion to their economic importance in the American colonies would seem to have a lively survival in India. It said that whatever the governmental justification, the Salt Tax had the fundamental defect of being levied upon an essential article of universal use and of being directly felt by a people under alien control and in that respect it was worse than the tea tax.[35] The Catholic World said that compared with Gandhi's salt-making episode, the ever memorable Boston Tea Party was violent and expressed surprise that a few Americans, though idealizing the forerunners of their Revolution, refused Gandhi his right to rebel, especially when he rebelled so gently.[36] The New York Times indulged in more explicit

---

[33] New Republic, May 7, 1930, p. 312.

[34] Literary Digest, April 19, 1930, p. 12.

[35] Chicago Daily Tribune, May 5, 1930, p. 1:3.

[36] Catholic World, July 1930, p. 483.

comparisons. In an editorial the paper said:

> In Gandhi's campaign against the British Government, salt is confessedly a political symbol rather than a concrete grievance, Indian salt would thus stand closer to Boston Harbour tea than to the beer tax about which the Bavarian people grow restless every little while, or the ancient iniquities of window tax, salt gabelle and signeur's baking monopoly in France.[37]

After Mahatma Gandhi defied the Salt Law, the Government did not immediately arrest him. Following his lead, thousands of Indians made salt along the vast seacoast of India. Gandhi's Congress Party organized the illegal sale of salt on a great scale throughout the nation and money thus collected went into the party funds. Mass meetings took place throughout India where the boycott of British cloth and goods was pledged. The Government started a campaign of repression and within a month 60,000 satyagrahis had been jailed. The censorship was imposed on the Indian press. Among the Indian leaders arrested were Nehru, Rajagopalachari and Rajendraprasad. Then Gandhi was suddenly arrested on the midnight of May 14 under an ordinance promulgated in 1827. He was immediately removed to the Yervada Jail.

The Indian leader's arrest made top headline news on the front pages of many American newspapers. The New York Times reported--"GANDHI SEIZED BY BRITISH FOR INDEFI-

---

[37] New York Times, April 16, 1930, p. 28:2.

NITE DETENTION."[38] The Chicago Daily Tribune announced--"BRITISH ARREST GANDHI! LEADER OF INDIA REVOLT," and in an editorial condemned the Government action by saying there was no proof that the British had changed much since the American revolution and said that events showed "that the old stiff neck had become more pliable."[39] The San Francisco Chronicle headlined the news--"BEACH SETUPS RAIDED, INDIA JAILS GANDHI." In an editorial, this newspaper said that the effects of Gandhi's "arrest will be incalculably greater upon hundreds of millions of people living in Mother India."[40] On the other hand, Nashville Tennessean, after reporting at length Gandhi's arrest on the front page said in an editorial that it was erroneous to assume that Gandhi spoke for the great majority of the people of India and said that India was in no way ready for self-government. It kept the Philippines in mind and commented:

> Truly the white man's burden is a heavy one. As a rule he receives little compensation from the subject people whom he endeavours to assist in the solution of life's problems. Our own experience in the Philippine Islands is proof of this fact.[41]

The first press correspondent to have met Gandhi after

---

[38] New York Times, May 5, 1930, p. 1.

[39] Chicago Daily Tribune, p. 1:3; p. 14:1. It said Indian revolutionaries were out of luck, as unlike American colonies they do not have foreign friends like France and Spain.

[40] San Francisco Chronicle, May 5, 1930, p. 1; p. 4:2.

[41] Nashville Tennessean, May 6, 1930, p. 4:2.

his arrest was an American named Negley Farson. This correspondent claimed to have met him only five hours after Gandhi's arrest in the train carrying him to Yervada. Gandhi was reported to have asked Farson to "tell the people of America to study the /Indian/ issues clearly and to judge them on their merits."[42] Gandhi, who was being interviewed by Farson in the presence of two British police officers, could not have said more.

Gandhi's arrest led to nationwide hartals and strikes. The satyagraha was offered all over India and among other places the Gandhian revolutionary zeal was at its zenith at Bombay, Calcutta and Poona. There was serious trouble at Mymensingh, Calcutta, Karachi, Lahore, Lucknow, Multan, Delhi and Peshawar. On May 7 the people of Sholapur in Bombay state took possession of that town for a week, till the Government proclaimed Martial Law. In the Northwest frontier province the British used aeroplanes and tanks against the Muslim Pathans. However, the movement continued till Gandhi was released from the jail in January 1931. About 100,000 persons were imprisoned during this period.[43]

To the American newspapers and newsmagazines the taking over of Sholapur by the 'Gandhi rebels' and the Bombay satyagraha provided much material for 'flashy' news.

---

[42] San Francisco Chronicle, May 5, 1930, p. 1.

[43] Maurer, Great Soul, p. 85.

The taking over of Sholapur on May 7 by its citizens was splashed on the front pages by most of the American newspapers. Some of the headlines ran like this:

> The San Francisco Chronicle: "GANDHI FORCES SEIZE INDIA CITY IN BATTLE."[44] The Nashville Tennessean: "REBELS SEIZE SHOLAPUR; MORE TROOPS SENT."[45] The Chicago Daily Tribune: "REBELS SEIZE CITY IN INDIA, BRITISH RUSH TROOPS TO CURB HUGH UPRISING."[46] The New York Times: "GANDHI FORCES SEIZE CITY IN FIERCE FIGHT."[47]

There was also widespread editorial comment. The Chicago Daily Tribune was critical of the British. It said:

> Into the soreness of Indian pride and nationalism England has rubbed salt for many years . . . Gandhi, who seems to combine somewhat the character of St. Francis and Prime Minister Disraeli, leads India to a new status in respect to Britain . . . with salt he may win his people's freedom.[48]

The New York Times wrote five editorials on Gandhi during May 1930, and decried Gandhi's attitude and methods.

---

[44] San Francisco Chronicle, May 9, 1930, p. 1. Front page headlines on other days, May 12, 1930: "TROOPS RULE INDIA DURING GREAT MUTINY ANNIVERSARY"; May 13, "INDIA RIOTERS SEIZE CITY"; May 14, "INSURGENTS PLAN TO SPREAD REVOLT IN INDIA."

[45] Nashville Tennessean, May 13, 1930, p. 1.

[46] Chicago Tribune, May 8, 1930, p. 1.

[47] New York Times, May 9, 1930, p. 1. Front page headlines on other days: May 6, 1930, "TROOPS HOLD INDIA ALERT FOR ANY MOVE, SITUATION IS TENSE"; May 8, 1930, "CRISIS PAST IN INDIA, IS VIEW IN SIMLA"; May 10, "EUROPEANS ABANDON ANOTHER TOWN IN INDIA"; May 11, "INDIA IS LESS TENSE"; May 13, "SHOLAPUR REPORTED IN RIOTERS' HANDS"; BRITISH RUSH TROOPS"; May 14, "MARTIAL LAW ENDS REVOLT IN SHOLAPUR."

[48] Chicago Tribune, Part I, p. 14. The Indian news was covered for this paper by its own correspondent, Charles Dailey.

In one of its editorials the New York Times said:

> To set out to win India's independence by non-violent means was to attempt the impossible . . . /Gandhi/ initiated a revolutionary movement, and the only way in which bloodshed could have been avoided was by complete and immediate British surrender. To have expected this was to have expected the impossible.[49]

It was, however, an interesting coincidence that Gandhi, without reading the New York Times editorials, was to reply to her criticism to this newspaper's correspondent in India, George Slocombe, who was the first press correspondent to visit Gandhi in the Yervada jail. Slocombe's interview with Gandhi was immediately reported in the New York Times. One of his observations was:

> I am an optimist. In ofrty years of struggle I have frequently been told I was attempting the impossible, but invariably I have proved the contrary . . . we shall fill all the jails of India with our passive resisters and breakers of the salt laws, and we shall make administration impossible by our opposition.[50]

Referring to the latest Indian situation Nation wrote that England could not forever weigh the scales in her favour with the artificial weights of regiments and cruisers.[51] New Republic feared that in a few weeks India may be plunged into a violent revolution.[52] Current

---

[49]New York Times, May 11, 1930, sec. 3, p. 4.

[50]New York Times, May 21, 1930, p. 1.

[51]Nation, May 14, 1930, p. 561.

[52]New Republic, May 14, 1930, p. 336.

History said the arrest of Gandhi intensified and extended but did not change the character of his campaign.[53]

Out of the many American and foreign correspondents covering the Indian events after Gandhi's imprisonment, Negley Farson and Webb Miller--both American news reporters--stand most conspicuous. Negley Farson was the correspondent of the Chicago Daily News and Webb Miller represented the United Press. They were often successful in breaking through the strict British censorship in sending news to the United States. Their news despatches were quoted by a large part of the American press and have been re-quoted by later writers. Farson and Miller could be credited with considerably influencing the American public on Gandhi's movement. Especially, their eyewitness accounts of 'amazing spectacles' by the people in face of police violence at Dharnasalo and Bombay touched human sentiment and aroused sympathy. It is impossible to give a complete account of their reports in this brief chapter but two of their typical messages are quoted here.

Miller, reporting the punishment meted out by the police to 2,500 satyagrahis at Dharnasala Salt Works, cabled:

> Not one of the marchers even raised an arm to fend off the blows. They went down like ten-pins. From where I stood I heard the sickening whack of the clubs on unprotected skulls. The waiting crowd

---

[53]Current History, June 30, 1930, p. 549.

> of marchers groaned and sucked in their breath in sympathetic pain at every blow. Those struck down fell sprawling, unconscious or writhing with fractured skulls or broken shoulders. . . . The survivors, without breaking ranks, silently and doggedly marched on until struck down.[54]

Farson, who was the first correspondent to have met Gandhi after his arrest, reporting one of the mass beatings after satyagrahis at Bombay, cabled:

> I stood within five feet of the Sikh leader as he took the lathi blows . . . The blows came--he stood straight. His turban was knocked off . . . He closed his eyes as the blows fell--until at last he swayed and fell on the ground . . . /other Sikhs/ wiped away the blood streaming from his mouth. Hysterical Hindus rushed to him bearing cakes of ice to rub the contusions over his brown eyes. The Sikh gave me a bloody smile--and stood up for more . . . For two hours these unbelievable scenes went on . . . The Sikhs had told the police that if the police left first they would leave, too. The police did, and at 9 o'clock the survivors of the Sikhs, not one of whom was not covered with blood stains and with some part or another of his clothes torn, led the triumphant procession of Gandhi's non-violent Congress followers down the streets. . . .[55]

The Civil Disobedience Movement was at its height in June, when the Simon Commission published its report. The Commission which cost $700,000, and paying practically no attention to the existence of Gandhism, recommended no immediate steps for India's constitutional advancement.[56]

---

[54] Sheean, Mahatma Gandhi, p. 159.

[55] Time, July 7, 1930, p. 23.

[56] New Republic, July 9, 1930, pp. 199-201. Savel Zimand's "India Rejects the Simon Report." The Commission said: "the object now to be aimed at is a reformed constitution which will not necessarily require revision at stipulated intervals, but which provides opportunities for natural development."

There was almost unanimous condemnation of the Simon Report in the United States. As soon as the report was published, Time, making an analysis of the Indian situation, reported that it was "sure to anger Indian moderates (20%) and to render Gandhites (100%) blue-purple with disgruntled rage."[57] The New York Times discussing the report at length criticized that there was not "even a hint of surrender by Great Britain--indeed, of concession--to what is involved in the Gandhist challenge" and believed that India would reject the Simon Report.[58] Nation described the report as 'utterly inadequate' and expressed the opinion that it puts the final seal upon the long struggle which began with Gandhi's march to make salt, and would not end until the Indian peoples were in complete control of their own destiny.[59] New Republic was perhaps the bitterest in its criticism of the Simon Report and said that it was "a crushing blow to those who had hoped that it might have an important effect in ending the terrible situation which exists in India" and concluded that "this document on which so much labor has expended is dead at

---

[57] Time, June 30, 1930, p. 26.

[58] New York Times, sec. 3, p. 5. "The anger aroused by Miss Mayo's 'Mother India' is thus revived in a measure by what is held to be, in part, a similar analysis of India's difficulties."

[59] Nation, July 2, 1930, p. 1.

birth; and the Indian revolution would go on."[60] Two Americans, with long understanding of the Indian affairs, also disapproved of the Report. The first, Richard Gregg, condemned the report for giving little consideration to Gandhi and his party in its discussion of the Indian political history since 1920.[61] The second, Savel Zimand questioned the practicability of the reforms proposed and said that on the whole the scheme would have very little in common with "what we call a constitutional government."[62]

In the United States the Simon Report was regarded as the solution offered by MacDonald's Labour Government to the Indian problems. The Indian policy of the Labour Government was seriously discussed--condemned and praised.

Senator Blaine introduced another resolution in the American Senate on July 8, 1930, urging independence for India. Keeping in mind the violently repressive policy of the British Government in India, Blaine brought a series of indictments against the British of using armoured cars, patrol tanks and aeroplane bombings against the peaceful Gandhi agitators resulting in massacres of the people and said that "Britain has replaced the rule of law by the rule

---

[60] New Republic, July 2, 1930, pp. 165-166.

[61] Nation, July 18, 1930, pp. 36-38.

[62] New Republic, July 9, 1930, p. 201. Zimand said: "The central legislature (proposed by the commission) far from being the basis of the federal parliament, would resemble a Russian Duma, but with more limited rights."

of the sword." Blaine tried to emphasize that by doing so England had violated the Treaty of Versailles and the London Naval Treaty.[63] This resolution was also not discussed in the Senate. The Wisconsin Senator was criticized in certain quarters for introducing the anti-British resolution and fears were expressed that such American sentiment could create an unpleasant situation for the American influence in the South American countries.[64] However, the criticism of the British policy continued. New Republic referred to MacDonald's advocacy for Indian independence before 1929 and said:

> . . . the flame of revolt /in India/ are being fanned by a ruthless policy of suppression which is indistinguishable from that of the blackest Tory government of modern times.[65]

Nation was equally bitter:

---

[63] Senator Blaine Papers, Document Section, Wisconsin State Historical Society. The United States Senate, 71st Congress, Special Session, Resolution No. 326, July 8, 1930.

[64] New York Times, July 21, 1930, p. 14. "If the Wisconsin Senator thinks this quite right, he would doubtless be ready to approve a resolution of the House of Commons directing the British Foreign Office to protest against the oppressive military rule of the United States in Santo Domingo, Haiti, and Nicaragua."; September 30, 1930. Charles A. Richmond, an American, wrote from India: "Apart from the impertinence of such a resolution, its amazing stupidity and its abysmal ignorance must strike anyone who has the least knowledge of the situation in India . . . Thoughtful Indians do not want independence . . . Of course any American senator can introduce any resolution he pleases--even one looking toward the establishment of a black republic in our Southern States."

[65] New Republic, June 18, 1930, p. 112.

> It is not Gandhi who is the disturber but those countrymen of MacDonald's who insist on keeping India in tutelage.[66]

On the other hand, the New York Times praised MacDonald for being more conservative than 1924 and for his telling India that she should not entertain any false expectation from the Labour Government.[67] The Nashville Tennessean also supported MacDonald and believed that the condition in India was more than a threat to the British Empire, it was a condition that menaced the peace and order of a good part of the world. In one of its editorials the paper wrote:

> There is profound sympathy with England in its troubles in India . . . The world, civilization itself, has a vital stake in the outcome in India. Great Britain has a responsibility there it cannot shirk. It must bear a heavy burden but it cannot be recreant to its obligation.[68]

During this new struggle most of the American missionaries once again sided with Gandhi. Many Christian magazines also began to take interest in Gandhi. After his arrest the Christian Century wrote that his being in jail weighed heavily upon the conscience of mankind. F. W. Sikes, a former missionary of the Methodist Episcopal

---

[66] Nation, June 11, 1930, p. 669.

[67] New York Times, May 2, 1930, p. 22. "World opinion will agree with Mr. MacDonald on the suffering and destruction that can be wrought by revolutionists in a hurry, as against the slower but surer methods of success.

[68] Nashville Tennessean, May 14, 1930, p. 4.

Church in India, in an article entitled "Gandhi Converts A Missionary" said that Gandhi was the greatest spiritual figure in the world at that time. Blanch Watson believed that Jesus was 'winning India' through Gandhi. E. Stanley Jones wrote of the tragic political conditions in India and said the situation had come to the point where Britain could give very little to India.[69]

The Roman Catholics, perhaps for the first time, also displayed considerable interest in the Indian struggle. Commonweal, a Catholic magazine, in an editorial praised Gandhi as a man actuated by a passion for sanctity but decried his methods and said that in that new struggle to imagine that India was emerging in any real unity was "like imagining that the Tower of Babel might have decided to learn Esperanto." Elizabeth S. Kite, a Catholic, condemned the editorial and wrote in reply that it was indeed easy to rail against Gandhi, to point out his absurdities, to seek to belittle the movement of which he was the soul but to quell his movement was a very different matter.[70] Another Catholic magazine, Catholic World, wrote in an editorial that if there was a noble experiment in progress in any country at that moment, it was the sublime, though

---

[69]Christian Century, May 21, 1920, p. 647; June 11, p. 747; July 23, 1930, p. 919; September 3, 1930, pp. 1058-1059.

[70]Commonweal, May 21, 1930, pp. 65-66; June 18, 1930, p. 191.

perhaps quixotic attempt of Mahatma Gandhi to win freedom for some 300 million people without making a war. And then the magazine was suddenly overwhelmed by religious fervour and while saying that there had been no great pacifist victory since the days of Diocletian it ridiculed the Christians by saying:

> It remained--be it said to our shame--for a Hindu /Gandhi/, a heathen, 'sucked in a creed outworn' to make the second attempt to vindicate, on a majestic scale, the philosophy of the Sermon on the Mount.[71]

It is important to note that by the beginning of this new phase in Gandhi's life the American Protestant missionaries were playing a greater role than any other foreign mission in India. In 1930 there were 2,679 American missionaries in India, in contrast to the 2,585 British missionaries.[72] The British Government was concerned with the liberalism displayed by the American missionaries and a sort of discrimination was carried on against them.[73] This policy reached its peak when the British authorities ordered Reverend Ralph Keithan, an American missionary, out of India in June 1930, because of his sympathy with the political struggle being waged in the country.[74]

---

[71] Catholic World, July 1930, p. 482.

[72] A British-India Merchant, India On The Brink (London, 1931), p.

[73] Frederick Bohn Fisher, That Strange Little Brown Man Gandhi (New York, 1932), pp. 82-83.

[74] New York Times, June 22, 1930, p. 14.

The American opinion was also expressed by other means. In November 1929, the India Independence League of America was formed in New York to lend moral support to the independence struggle in India. This League has continued to exist until today, though it has functioned under a different name since 1947. The League held various dinner meetings where Gandhi's methods were praised by various American speakers. In one of its important meetings on May 11, 1930, Judge Daniel F. Cohalan condemned the British arrest of Gandhi and called Gandhi the true leader of the Indian people.[75] The All-World Gandhi Fellowship was founded in New York in September 1930 and it also formed a special committee of about 100 prominent Americans and non-Americans. Its Secretary, Alma L. Lissberger, took a very active part in trying to influence Americans in favour of Gandhi's ideals.[76] Another organization known as The Threefold Movement, held a meeting in New York on October 9 and endorsed Mahatma Gandhi's non-violent revolutionary methods in India as an experiment which, it believed, if successful would offer the best solution for world peace. Speaking at the meeting Reverend Robert Horwood, Rector of St. Bartholomew's Protestant Episcopal Church, extolled Gandhi for his "stand for truth and courage."[77]

---

[75] New York Times, May 12, p. 9.

[76] New Republic, September 24, 1930, p. 155.

[77] New York Times, October 3, 1930, sec. 2, p. 20.

Perhaps the most interesting, but symbolic, of the tributes paid to Gandhi in the United States was one by Raymond Duncan, 'New York's best known wearer of Grecian robes.' He marched to the sea at New York on the evening of May 27, 1930 to make salt. The police did not interfere. After a five mile march by Duncan and some other admirers of Gandhi on the streets of New York, the party found 5,000 'ardent sympathizers' gathered for the occasion at the sea. When the affair was over the weary marchers took taxicabs with their buckets of sea water and went to Duncan's place and made salt with him. Duncan planned to send the salt to Gandhi in India. Referring to Duncan's march the New York Times reported "that the great parade of sympathy with down-trodden India was a success."[78] However, a demonstration planned by a group of Communists, headed by Jay Lovestone, in front of the British Consul General's office in New York on October 18 in protest against the death sentences passed upon three Indian nationalists, was forbidden by the police. The Communists later held a meeting at the foot of Whitehall Street, where Bert Miller, a Communist leader, denounced the New York police for their action and sympathized with the Indian struggle for independence. The small groups of people picketed in front of the British Consul General's office with placards, some of which read, "Down with British Rule in India" and

---

[78] New York Times, May 28, 1930, p. 12.

"Down with MacDonald The Executioner."[79]

As the events moved fast and the American public opinion continued its interest in the Indian problem, the time grew closer for the holding of the First Round Table Conference in London during October 1930. The Americans noted with interest the attempt of the British Government to impress upon Gandhi in prison, during August, to attend the Round Table Conference and end the passive resistance, and the failure of this approach, as the British Government refused Gandhi's proposal that the R.T.C. should consider the grant of a Government only responsible to the Indian people. Nation appreciated the Government's negotiations with the prisoners of Yervada and commented "he holds the power, and they know it."[80] The New Republic said that in declining to accede to Mahatma Gandhi's conditions for a cessation of a passive resistance, the British Government had assumed the responsibility for continuing the struggle against Indian nationalism and said the October Conference now seemed doomed to failure.[81] On the other hand, the New York Times suggested that though without the presence of Gandhi the conference would hardly live up to the character of a constituent assembly for India, it could never-

---

[79] New York Times, May 28, 1930, p. 2.

[80] Nation, September 17, 1930, p. 284.

[81] New Republic, September 17, 1930, p. 109.

theless make its contribution to a settlement by formulating an alternative to the Nationalist programme and submitting it for the judgment of public opinion in Great Britain and in India.[82]

Throughout the period from December 1929 to October 1930, the British carried on propaganda in the United States that Gandhi was only a religious fanatic, that he represented only a minority of the population of India, that he had no sense of practical statesmanship, that his struggle had caused no serious economic problems to the British Government, and that his influence would die out.[83] There was, however, hardly anyone in the United States who now believed that Gandhi would disappear from the Indian political scene but the British propaganda did succeed in making Americans speculate over the consequences of Gandhi's movement, being carried on under such extraordinary circumstances. Four questions were often asked and opinions expressed.

The first question was: What was now the influence of Gandhi? In reply Nation wrote that Gandhi's influence upon his people was unshaken.[84] Nathaniel Peffer wrote that Gandhi, as the agent of the spirit of the times and of a movement of history, had marshalled something which

---

[82] New York Times, September 8, 1930, p. 20.

[83] New Republic, September 3, 1930, p. 234.

[84] Nation, September 3, 1930, p. 234.

constituted a tremendous fact and not a matter for abstract speculation.[85] Later, Maurer wrote that Gandhi had shown that in India he had the power of making heroes from clay.[86] But W. H. Roberts, Professor of Philosophy, University of Redlands, reached the conclusion that Gandhi was tragically unfitted for Indian leadership because in his opinion he did not understand the importance of economic and industrial development of his people.[87]

The second question was: How had the Indian people reacted to Gandhi's satyagraha?

Replying to this question the New Republic said that the results of Gandhi's struggle had proved that it was not merely the affair of a few fanatical leaders, but the uprising of a people.[88] The Review of Reviews commented that the people who were out to defy the law were the most orderly and progressive of the entire Indian population.[89] Current History was impressed by the struggle and called Gandhi's movement as 'one of the greatest dramas of our time."[90] A. S. Blackwell wrote that the long pressure to

---

[85] Harper's Monthly Magazine, May 1930, pp. 225-226.

[86] Maurer, Great Soul, p. 86.

[87] Current History, June 1930, pp. 495-509.

[88] New Republic, August 27, 1930, p. 28.

[89] Review of Reviews, July 30, 1930, p. 66.

[90] Current History, June 30, 1930, p. 549.

which the people had been subjected tending inevitably to sap courage and self-respect, it was amazing to see the heroism shown by thousands of Indians in Gandhi's struggle, and the discipline and self-control that they had manifested.[91] George Slocombe believed that there was no mistaking the truly national character of the Nationalist movement in India and that nationalism had extended to all classes--bankers, millowners, lawyers, professional men, bazaar traders, millworkers and peasants.[92] Richard B. Gregg, who was in India in 1930, wrote that most of the Muslims, Sikhs, Harijans, and moderate Indian liberals were with Gandhi.[93] Professor William Kirk, in a speech, expressed the same view by saying that a whole nation of different races, of differing temperaments and ideals was joining hands to follow a saint though this was a modern miracle and possible only in India.[94] On the other hand, F. Britten Austin though conceding that Gandhi's non-violent propaganda "creates precisely the atmosphere which makes revolution possible" said that only 3,000,000 politically conscious Hindus out of the then Indian population

---

[91] Nation, September 24, 1930, pp. 323-324.

[92] New York Times, October 22, 1930, pp. 661-662.

[93] Nation, June 4, 1930, pp. 661-662.

[94] Sociology and Social Research, March 1930, p. 343.

of about 330,000,000 supported Gandhi.[95] C. G. Elsam, who claimed to have been in India for forty years, said that Gandhi's Nationalist Party was purely Hindu and was sure that the movement would turn violent resulting in "bombings, assassinations and widespread riots."[96]

The third question was: What was the economic effect of Gandhi's movement?

It was observed in the United States that until 1930 40 per cent of Indian exports went to England and 70 per cent of India's imports came from the British empire.[97] Business Week referred to the cutting down of the sale of English clothes in India by half and while describing Gandhi as essentially a businessman said the economic consequences of his movement were of tremendous significance to India, the British Empire and the world.[98] The Nation wrote that Gandhi had hit hard the British import goods and said that import of piece goods dropped from 215,000,000 in April 1929 to 165,000,000 in April 1930.[99] The New Republic accepted the fact that civil disobedience had hit Lancashire badly and the British trade with India had fallen

---

[95] Saturday Evening Post, June 7, 1930, pp. 157-161.

[96] Christian Century, April 9, 1930, p. 467.

[97] Catholic World, July 1930, p. 482.

[98] Business Week, May 14, 1930, p. 28.

[99] Nation, July 9, 1930, p. 27.

at least 40 per cent.[100] Webb Miller reported from India that "British trade in India is being slowly strangled to death."[101] The Literary Digest reported that because of the Indian boycott of British goods the American and other foreign goods were invading India more than ever before.[102]

Naturally, the final question was: What would be the result of such a movement?

Many opinions were expressed--many prejudices and sympathies displayed. W. H. Roberts wrote that despite its splendid vision and magnificent possibilities, Gandhi's movement must fail because no great wars of human beings was capable of such exaltation and sacrifice as was demanded by Gandhi's programme and non-violent disobedience.[103] Writing in the same sympathetic strain, the Christian Century though comparing Gandhi's appearance before the British Empire to Christ's before the Roman Empire 1900 years ago, doubted if Gandhi would be able to control the movement he had launched.[104] But the Philadelphia Inquirer seriously

---

[100] New Republic, August 27, 1930, p. 28.

[101] Nation, August 27, 1930, p. 213. "Mills are closing, ships are lying idle, large orders are being cancelled, huge stocks are encumbering warehouses, profits are evaporating."

[102] Literary Digest, August 30, 1930, p. 13. "Dealers and customers demand American drugs, American motor tires, American soap, and other American commodities."

[103] Current History, June 1930, p. 501.

[104] Christian Century, April 16, 1930, p. 490.

doubted the correctness of Gandhi's approach and said his attitude had made even Dominion Status all but impossible at least for some years to come.[105] Britten Austin was one of those who succumbed to the worst of British propaganda that Russia was behind the trouble in India and the aim of Russian agents in India was "to push the British Empire into a corner where it cannot help but fight a foredoomed battle."[106] The Birmingham News was one of the few American newspapers which tried to brush aside Gandhi by saying that if he had been born in the deep South, he might have been a revered and devoted preacher part of the time, but during hours of leisure "he would have made an extraordinary cunning and successful horsetrader."[107]

But others were impressed by the progress of Gandhi's movement and predicted brighter prospects for his success. The New York Times wrote that the leaders and rank and file of India were displaying qualities of tenacity that "seriously modify the contemptuous tradition of 'KIPLING'S Bandarlog' /monkey people/."[108] The New Republic believed that the spirit of Indian nationalism was such that would endure and rebel until it was satisfied and appealed that

---

[105] Saturday Evening Post, June 7, 1930, p. 165.

[106] Philadelphia Inquirer, as quoted by the Literary Digest, September 27, 1930, p. 10.

[107] Birmingham News (Alabama), as quoted by the Literary Digest, September 27, 1930, p. 10.

[108] New York Times, July 6, 1930, sec. 3, p. 1.

pressure of public opinion should be exerted on Great Britain to satisfy the Indians.[109] The Nation wrote that every bit of unprejudiced evidence that came out of India showed "that British rule is shaken to its very foundations" and India could not remain loyal to a foreign power.[110] The Review of Reviews reached the conclusion that one of the most brilliant and magnificent of the British imperial adventures was steadily drawing to a close.[111] The Washington Post expressed the belief that Gandhi's demands were not that of a man looking for an easy way out of a difficulty but of one who believed that he had only to stand firm to attain ultimate victory.[112]

As October approached, Mahatma Gandhi continued to stand firm and the satyagraha continued. The British Government decided to hold the Round Table Conference without Gandhi. The United States watched with interest this new struggle between London and Yervada. The enigma remained--could the proposed conference solve the Indian problems without the imprisoned leader of India?

---

[109] New Republic, September 3, p. 114.

[110] Nation, September 3, 1930, p. 114.

[111] Review of Reviews, July 1930, p. 67.

[112] Washington Post, as quoted by Literary Digest, September 27, 1930, p. 10.

CHAPTER III

RETURN TO YERVADA

"Mahatma Gandhi is one of the outstanding figures of this century. In every country the thought of India and the name of Gandhi are matters of grave interest."

--Justice Daniel F. Cohalan

On December 12, 1930, Mr. Winston Churchill, while addressing the inaugural meeting of the Indian Empire Society, declared in London:

> The truth is that Gandhi-ism and all it stands for will, sooner or later, have to be grappled with and finally crushed. It is no use trying to satisfy a tiger by feeding him with cat's meat. The sooner this is realized, the less trouble and misfortune will there be for all concerned.[1]

As the time for the First Round Table Conference approached, Mr. Churchill, a conservative member of the British Parliament, became utterly dissatisfied with the conduct of the Labour Government and the liberal Viceroy, Lord Irwin, towards India. With his brilliant oratory he bombarded the House of Commons and emphasized he had no sympathy with Englishmen who took steps towards granting India any degree of self-government. With a view of influencing British public opinion, he organized the Indian Empire Society.

The name explains the purpose of this society. Churchill commended strongly the relationship defined between England and India by Lord Beaconsfield who had once told his country that "the key of India is London; the majesty of sovereignty, the spirit and vigour of your Parliament, the inexhaustible resources, the ingenuity and determination of your people."[2] The speeches of Mr.

---

[1]Winston S. Churchill, India (London, 1930), pp. 46-47.

[2]Ibid., p. 4.

Churchill on Mahatma Gandhi and his struggle in India were read with interest--but not approval--in the United States in 1930 and 1931.

The Mahatma was still in prison when the First Round Table Conference opened in London on November 12, 1930. Events had crowded upon events after Gandhi's arrest in India in March 1930. The Civil Disobedience Movement was still continuing; the Simon Report had been rejected by all political parties of India; there were disturbances along the frontier from the Khyher in the far north to Waziristan in the south; and there was a recrudescence of political assassination in Bengal by non-Gandhi Nationalists.

While events were taking their own shape, Viceroy Irwin had persuaded the British Government to hold the Round Table Conference on India in London late in 1930. The Viceroy tried to persuade Gandhi and the other imprisoned leaders of the Congress Party to attend the Conference. Gandhi asked that the proposed conference should meet only to draw up a scheme of Government for India, which should be equal to full Dominion Status. Irwin replied that he was unable even to discuss such a demand.[3] The Conference was, therefore, to be represented only by the Indian Princes and political leaders representing

---

[3]Round Table (London), Volume XXI, December 1930 to September 1931, p. 68.

small political parties. Except for Mr. Jinnah, the leader of the Muslim League, none of these delegates could be regarded of any political significance. Now that Gandhi was not joining, the British were quick to claim that as far as the Round Table Conference was concerned "it was the Congress Party against the rest."[4]

There were comments in the United States on the representation in the Conference and chances of its success. The New York Times, in an editorial entitled "India To The Fore," predicted that there would be very little time wasted on the extremist claims of absent Gandhi and his Nationalist followers, formidable though the movement might be which they represented.[5] Time wrote that British India was represented at the Conference by a group of had-been statesmen chairmaned by the frankly British-subsidized Aga Khan.[6] The Nation said editorially that the Indian delegates and the British know that the power of the Indian case lay not in declamation or argument but in the will of Gandhi and the Congress Party. It added that the possible threat of the Indian delegates which would carry most weight with the British would be: "If you do

---

[4]John Coatman, India: The Road To Self-Government (London, 1941), p. 101.

[5]New York Times, November 12, 1930, p. 22.

[6]Time, November 24, 1930, p. 22.

not do as we ask, we shall go back and join Gandhi."[7] The New Republic, in an editorial entitled "The Chance In India," said that at the Conference even non-Gandhists would demand what Gandhi wanted.[8]

The Conference opened on November 12, 1930. There were some eighty delegates from India representing, according to the British Government, "all races and religions and classes of India."[9] They sat around a table with a British delegation representing all the political parties and both Houses of the Parliament.[10] The Conference was inaugurated by King George V and was presided by the Prime Minister, Mr. Ramsay MacDonald. At the opening session the Prime Minister said that Great Britain's work in India was to prepare her for self-government and declared, "we are now at the very birth of a new history."[11] Though the Conference was lost in the intricate problems of the protection to minorities in India, and the uplift of the untouchables, the non-Gandhi Indian delegates made their views clear on the more important question of self-government. Mr. Jinnah, political enemy of Mahatma Gandhi,

---

[7]Nation, November 19, 1930, pp. 543-544.

[8]New Republic, November 19, 1930, p. 7.

[9]Round Table (London), Volume XXI, p. 239.

[10]Coatman, India, p. 103. In his opinion, "the summoning of the Round Table Conference wiped out forever the tutelage of India."

[11]Time, November 24, 1930, p. 20.

reminded Mr. MacDonald of his past declarations for Indian independence, and said: "I must emphasize that India now expects the translation of fulfilment of these declarations into action."[12] The Maharaja of Bikaner told the first plenary session of the Conference that the Indian Princely States could best make their contribution to the greater contentment and prosperity of India as a whole through a federal system of government composed of the Princely States and British India, which was not to be responsible to the British Parliament.[13] The Maharaja quoted Abraham Lincoln while demanding an India as a co-equal partner in the British Commonwealth "with malice toward none, with charity for all, with firmness in the right as God gives us to see the right."[14] The other Princes surprised the British with their attitude.[15] Most of the other Indian speakers spoke in favour of complete

---

[12] Time, November 24, 1930, p. 21.

[13] Coatman, India, p. 104.

[14] Haridas T. Muzumdar, Gandhi Versus The Empire (New York, 1932), p. 131.

[15] Time, November 24, 1930, p. 20. Time wrote that correspondent Raymond Gram Living of the New York Evening Post was overawed by the Princes' appearance at the opening session and cabled home: "In color, costume and bearing, in the lines of some of their ascetic, sensitive faces they were the ones who seemed to be the superior race. Beside them the pallid little Englishmen dressed in the dull sobriety of bank clerks were little subordinate assistants. Even King George in morning coat minus the accustomed white carnation in his buttonhole, was more like a company director than a monarch."

self-government. But the British would not say that they were ready to grant India self-government. Moreover, the Conference was in no position to take a decision in the absence of Gandhi and representatives of the Congress Party. When the Conference concluded its sessions on January 19, 1931, it had failed to accomplish agreement on either the principles and conditions in which the All India Federation was to be based, or the minority problem, or the question of untouchability.

Throughout the period of the Conference, its activities received space in the American press. Editorials discussed the problems faced by the Conference and advanced their own opinions. The New York Times wrote on November 12, 1930, that the Conference laid too much stress on the distinction between the two-thirds of India under the British rule and the one-third under the native Princes. It referred to the important fact that "the native states have not been immune to the sweep of Nationalist sentiment."[16] Ten days later, in another editorial, this newspaper returned to the subject and said that the old British argument that the claims of the Indian Nationalists must be reconciled with the demands of the Indian Princes had failed, as it was sufficient answer that the Princes at the Conference were talking straight Nationalist. Referring to the question of minorities and the problem of the untouchables, the New

---

[16]New York Times, November 12, 1930, p. 22.

York Times said that despite the British arguments to the contrary the Muslims and the untouchables now demanded Dominion rule rather than to continue under the present British Raj.[17] Time, however, believed that the untouchables would favour the British "because although championed by St. Gandhi, they still feel that India's democratic trend has not gone far enough to protect them from oppression by higher castes."[18] The newsmagazine doubted if the British would give India self-government.[19] The Nation said in an editorial that the British must either break the power of Gandhi or obtain the co-operation of the Congress Party in framing the new constitution for India. It added that the first alternative seemed entirely beyond achievement and "the second seems almost as hopeless as the first--but not quite."[20] The New Republic in an article entitled "The Chance In India" said what was now needed was an immediate and unqualified declaration by England that they meant to give India full Dominion Status, to begin the process at once and terminate their rule within a definite

---

[17] New York Times, November 22, 1930, p. 16.

[18] Time, November 24, 1930, p. 22.

[19] Ibid., January 5, 1931, p. 15. It said the Irishmen asked for independence but were content with the Irish Free State which had a President and a Senate. "If Indians would be content with so little, it is still not likely that Britons would grant it."

[20] Nation, January 28, 1931, pp. 89-90.

brief period of years.[21] The Catholic World appealed to England that she still had a chance and she should act with good grace and at once deal with Indian demands.[22]

As mentioned in the beginning of this chapter, Mr. Churchill carried on his crusade against the work of the Round Table Conference. The American press had comments for the conservative leader too. The New York Times said that "Mr. Churchill represents the Conservative Party no more than the assassins of Calcutta represent the Indians assembled around the Round Table."[23] Time called Churchill the leader of the 'diehard conservatives.' When his son, Randolph Churchill, called Ramsay MacDonald a traitor to England for his Indian policy, while on a lecture tour of the United States, Time rebuked the younger Churchill as "hot-headed, loose-lipped"--[24]a compliment which can still be paid to him. The Nation, while referring to criticism

---

[21]New Republic, November 19, 1930. In the same editorial the magazine refers to the British criticism of the United States. It said, "our critics maintain that American opinion is having an important effect on the attitude of the Indian Nationalists; that the New Republic is one of a group of American periodicals and individuals encouraging them in an intransigence which might quickly disappear without that encouragement" and remarked that Gandhi had millions of followers and had waged a fight for many years and "to suppose that such a group will base its tactics on advice from a few Americans seems to us to show that our English friends are guilty of wishful thinking."

[22]Catholic World, January 1, 1931, p. 359.

[23]New York Times, December 15, 1930, p. 20.

[24]Time, January 19, 1931, p. 18.

of Gandhi and Churchill as extremists by the Manchester Guardian, an English newspaper, said that "Gandhi, for better or for worse, wields tremendous power and cannot be dismissed as slightly as a Churchill at home."[25] The New Republic referred to the support which the British Conservative and Liberal Parties gave to the Labour Government in the debate on the Round Table Conference in the House of Commons, and said "only the egregious Winston Churchill raised his voice in favor of the policy of the mailed fist."[26]

Time, which has a tradition of selecting a 'Man of The Year,' selected Gandhi as that man for the year 1930. The newsmagazine considered, among others, Ramsay MacDonald, Stalin, Hitler, and 'the world's most potent criminal,' Alphonse Capone, for the title, before awarding it to Gandhi. Time explained:

> Curiously, it was in a jail that year's end found the little half-naked brown man whose 1930 mark on world history will undoubtedly loom largest of all . . . It was in March [1930] that Britain jailed him at Poona. Last week he was still there, and some 30,000 members of his Independence movement were jailed elsewhere. The British Empire was still wondering fearfully what to do about them all, the Empire's most staggering problem.[27]

At the beginning of the year 1931 the Civil Disobedience Movement in India was nine months old and still in

---

[25] Nation, February 11, 1931, p. 143.

[26] New Republic, February 4, 1931, p. 309.

[27] Time, January 5, 1931, p. 14.

progress. By the third week of January the London Conference had concluded. It had achieved nothing because of the unrepresentative nature of such an assemblage, the uncertainty of its machinery and, above all, the fact that the strongest man in India, and his overwhelmingly powerful political organization, had refused to have anything to do with the Conference. There was nothing for the British Government to do, except to offer Mahatma Gandhi a truce. Gandhi, Nehru and other high Congress leaders were released on January 26, 1931, with a view to exploring further possibilities of securing Congress participation in a future conference.

The news of the release of Mahatma Gandhi made front page headlines in United States newspapers of January 26, 1931. Some of the headlines read as such:

> The New York Times: "RELEASE OF GANDHI ORDERED BY VICEROY; CONGRESS BAN LIFTED." The Chicago Daily Tribune: "BRITAIN ORDERS FREEDOM FOR GANDHI, FEAR HOLY MAN MAY REFUSE TO LEAVE." The New York Herald Tribune: "GANDHI FREED, LORD IRWIN LIFTS BAN ON CONGRESS." The Washington Post: "UNCONDITIONAL RELEASE OF GANDHI IS ORDERED." The Birmingham Age Herald (Alabama): "BRITAIN ORDERS GANDHI BE FREED." The Mimes Picayune (New Orleans): "GANDHI'S RELEASE IN INDIA ORDERED BY BRITISH CHIEF."

Commenting on the release of Gandhi, the Baltimore Evening Sun said that it marked another victory for the most curious sort of fighter this century had known.[28] Beatrice Barnsby, writing in the New York Times, hailed

---

[28] Baltimore Evening Sun, as quoted by Literary Digest, February 7, 1931, p. 8.

Gandhi's release and said that again all India awaited his word to act.[29] The New Republic commented that the release of Gandhi and other Congress leaders was not an act of justice, but of expediency.[30] The Nation said that the decision of the Congress Working Committee would be the next important development in the Indian drama.[31] The Chicago Daily Tribune welcomed Gandhi's release and said:

> In Gandhi is centered the significant revolt of modern times against imperialism and misgovernment . . . In spiritual temper and in living points of views India is more remote than early history ever can make her. India is remote, profound, always human. Gandhi is India's voice.[32]

After his release, Gandhi wrote to Viceroy Irwin, thanking him for his act and asking if they could not talk things over. They met, and on March 5, 1931, they ended a series of conversations with a great deal of hard, detailed bargaining and some long weary disagreements. Despite the bitter criticism of these meetings by Mr. Churchill[33] and

---

[29]New York Times, February 8, 1931, sec. 5, p. 6.

[30]New Republic, February 4, 1931, p. 309.

[31]Nation, February 4, 1931, p. 113.

[32]Chicago Daily Tribune, May 3, 1931, Part I, p. 14.

[33]Herrymon Maurer, Great Soul: The Growth of Gandhi (Garden City, 1948), p. 86. Mr. Churchill said: "It's alarming and also nauseating to see Mr. Gandhi, a seditious Middle Temple lawyer, now posing as a fakir of a type well known in the East, striding half naked up the steps of the Viceregal Palace while he is still organizing and conducting a defiant campaign of civil disobedience, to parley on equal terms with the representative of the King Emperor."

some other British conservative leaders, the Viceroy and Gandhi signed a pact on March 7, 1931. By this truce, the British agreed to (1) release all political prisoners arrested during Gandhi's campaign and restore all their confiscated property, (2) repeal the Salt Tax, (3) withdraw all arbitrary ordinances and repressive legislation, and (4) recognize the people's right lawfully and non-violently to picket liquor, opium and foreign cloth dealers' shops. Gandhi on his part agreed to (1) forego demand for investigation into police brutalities, (2) suspend the civil disobedience movement, and (3) participate in a Round Table Conference to be held in 1931 in London, with a view to hammering into shape a Swaraj constitution for India on the basis of Federation.[34]

Both during the Gandhi-Irwin discussion and after their agreement, the Americans discussed the various aspects of the negotiations,[35] and the implications of the truce. Discussing the differences on three points in the

---

[34]Muzumdar, Gandhi Versus Empire, pp. 133-134.

[35]Frederick B. Fisher, That Strange Little Brown Man Gandhi (New York, 1932). Fisher mentions a lighter side of the negotiations. He writes: "Rumour has it that one day shortly after he had persuaded the government to legalize his contraband salt, he was having a conference with his friendly enemy, Lord Irwin. The Viceroy being a typical Englishman wanted his tea at four o'clock and invited Gandhi to join him.

'Thank You,' said the little patriot, unwrapping a paper parcel, 'I will put some of this legalized salt into my tea to remind us of the famous Boston Tea Party.'"

Anglo-Indian discussions--police excesses in the Civil Disobedience Movement, boycott of British goods, and the Salt Tax--the Nation commented that the Nationalists, with their avowed aims of sovereignty, could scarcely withdraw their demands and the Empire, being an Empire, could scarcely grant them. It expressed the hope that the two might be able to achieve their ends by good will and patience.[36] Time, while discussing Irwin's refusal of Gandhi's demand for wholesale enquiry of British police's beatings of Gandhist Satyagrahis, commented that the method of the latter was always "to put a claw-like finger as publicly as possible upon whatever he thinks Britons are ashamed of."[37] The New Republic, though criticizing Gandhi as a difficult man to deal with because he was an extremist and not a practical opportunist, said if negotiations broke down, and affairs in India got worse, the British could be quite

---

[36] Nation, March 11, 1931, p. 259. The magazine commented: "Perhaps the deficit of almost $55,000,000 in the Indian budget now before the legislative assembly has some bearing also on this matter of the salt tax, which yields about 7 percent of the Indian revenues."

[37] Time, March 2, 1931, p. 18. Referring to Gandhi's visit to the Viceregal Lodge, the newsmagazine said: "In India, the Viceroy preserves, if possible, a moral regal dignity than George V himself . . . But last week dignity went by the board when small, brown St. Gandhi clattered up to the Viceregal Palace at New Delhi in a cheap American automobile and alighted wearing a blanket to which was pinned a dollar watch. As his tiny guest had stipulated, the excessively tall Viceroy met him 'as a man, not Viceroy,' and St. Gandhi, looking up and up, exclaimed smiling: 'My dear friend.'"

as much to blame as the Indians.[38] The Christian Century welcomed Gandhi-Irwin meetings and said they both depended on God for success.[39]

After the agreement had been announced, the New Republic called it a tremendous step forward. It added that "not the least important aspect of this agreement is the recognition by the British that the little, bespectacled, half-naked man is still the most important person in India."[40] The Nation, welcoming the Agreement, said that after a year of intense and bitter strife this seemed to constitute a firm beginning toward a solution of British-Indian dilemma.[41] Years later Vincent Sheean wrote that the essential character of the Pact was that it was an agreement between equals, and in that respect it constituted a tacit acknowledgment of independence.[42]

The Gandhi-Irwin Pact, however, had to be approved by the All India National Congress, which met in Karachi in the last week of March 1931. The younger leaders of the

---

[38] New Republic, February 18, 1931, p. 1.

[39] Christian Century, April 15, 1931, p. 525.

[40] New Republic, March 18, 1931, p. 113.

[41] Nation, March 18, 1931, pp. 289-290. It added: "What the new Indian Conference will bring forth no one can tell. It may mean deadlock and a resumption of civil disobedience. But at least it will mean that the real combatants will meet. And that is a step forward."

[42] Vincent Sheean, Mahatma Gandhi (New York, 1955), p. 162.

Congress, and especially the Communist element in the Party, were known to be opposed to Gandhi's concession to the Viceroy that no enquiry be held into the conduct of police during the Civil Disobedience Movement. The situation became tense, when just before the Congress met on March 24, it became known that three Indian revolutionaries had been executed by the Government. The Congressmen had made frantic pleas for the commutation of their death sentence.[43] The emotion aroused was extraordinary, and it was widely believed that this incident would make it impossible for Gandhi to secure the assent of the Congress Party to the ratification of the Delhi Agreement. Many foreign correspondents covering the Congress proceedings were not sure "if St. Gandhi was drawing near his Waterloo."[44] Nothing, however, more clearly demonstrated the astonishing hold which Gandhi had obtained over the whole body of Congress. On March 30, when the resolution dealing with the Delhi Agreement came before the open Congress, it was passed without a single dissendent vote amongst 6,000 delegates. Just before the voting, Gandhi turned towards the Communists who had upbraided him for 'betraying India' by his pact with the Viceroy. A correspondent of Time, who listened to Gandhi's speech, reported:

---

[43] Round Table, Volume XXI, pp. 596-597. The victims were Bhaghat Singh and his two comrades who were accused of murdering 6 police officials in December 1928.

[44] Time, April 6, 1931, p. 19.

> Gently but in moving words the Mahatma answered. Little by little he set the Communists to sniveling, some even sobbing aloud.[45]

During this period Gandhi's methods on achieving his goal by non-violence continued to be discussed by Americans. In the end of 1930 William James Durant published his popular book The Case For India and, despite its inaccuracies, made a painstaking study of Gandhi.[46] Referring to the fact that Gandhi's way of thinking seemed alien to Americans, Durant replied that that was so because their way of thinking would be maladapted to India, and as "the unifier of India could not be a politician, he had to be a saint."[47] He rejoiced over the fact that Gandhi rejected Bolshevism as alien to the character and purpose of India.[48] Kenneth Saunders wrote in the Saturday Review of Literature that nearly a billion Asiatics were questioning Western ethics, and Gandhi was their voice.[49] Bishop J.

---

[45]Time, April 6, 1931, p. 19. Time quotes Gandhi's speech. "You say I have betrayed India. I shall not complain if you beat me. I have no bodyguard. God alone keeps vigil over me. Some men think me crazy and a fool because of my love for my enemies, but that is the very foundation of my whole life's work and creed. . . ."

[46]William James Durant, The Case For India (New York, 1930), p. 106. For instance Durant's judgment on Jawaharlal Nehru was unsound. He wrote: "His newer aides, like the younger Nehru, are eager to arm the Hindus and follow Russia's example. . . ."

[47]Ibid., p. 117.

[48]Ibid., p. 76.

[49]Saturday Review of Literature, October 4, 1930, p. 176.

McConnell, President of the Federal Council of Churches, who had recently returned from India, wrote that the non-violence method was far from ideal, but agreed that it had brought the agreement between Gandhi and the British Viceroy.[50]

Mahatma Gandhi was to be the only representative of the Congress Party at the Second Round Table Conference to begin in September 1931. But when the time came for Gandhi to sail for London in August, he suddenly decided that he might not go after all. Events had occurred in India since Gandhi's pact with the Viceroy which dismayed him. In April, Lord Willingdon, an extreme conservative, took over from Lord Irwin as the new Viceroy; Hindu-Muslim differences now appeared in the picture; a strong group of the Princes suggested objection to the idea of an All India Federation; and the Government by refusing to bring any land reform for the poverty stricken peasants, constituting 90 per cent of the inhabitants of India, had invited sporadic agrarian disorders in many parts of the country. In turn the British Government in India was disturbed by the extensive and persistent decline of her revenues and income tax.[51] The Government regarded that as a direct result of

---

[50] Christian Century, May 27, 1931, p. 739.

[51] Round Table, Volume XXI, p. 834. It wrote that the Indian Customs from April to June 1931, despite the increase in duties, yielded only Rs. 1042 lakhs as against Rs. 1233 lakhs during the corresponding period of 1930. The

the actions of Gandhi's followers, though they believed that Gandhi himself had been sincere in his endeavours to implement the agreement with the British.

There was American press reaction to Gandhi's hesitation to go to London. The New Republic expressed regret to hear of the news and the hope that the coming Conference could achieve much was now much reduced.[52] Time commented that without the "strange, quibblesome little Mahatma Gandhi" it would be virtually impossible for the London Conference to effect its aims. It added that by his decision "another monsoon threatened the political jungle of India."[53] The New York Times suggested that the art of creating and maintaining suspense has been superbly manifested in the reports about Gandhi's journey to England.[54]

As without the Mahatma's attendance there seemed little chance of the Conference accomplishing its aims, gentle pressure began to be directed towards him. As the delegates from other political parties, who had already sailed in early August, drew nearer London, they made strong appeals to Gandhi to join the Conference. The

---

gross earnings of State-owned railways during April, May and June in 1931 were estimated at Rs. 2219 lakhs, as compared with Rs. 2534 lakhs in 1930 and Rs. 2604 lakhs in 1929.

[52] New Republic, August 26, 1931, p. 29.

[53] Time, August 24, 1931, p. 18.

[54] New York Times, August 4, 1931, p. 20.

British Secretary of State for India, William Wedgwood Benn, insisted that the reluctant Viceroy Willingdon meet and conciliate the Indian leader. The Viceroy invited him to Simla, then India's summer capitol. They met. The Viceroy assured Gandhi that he would give close attention to the latter's grievances. Gandhi then decided to go.[55] Before he left he told his people:

> I shall not disappoint the nation, and on my return, if you are inclined to feel that I have let you down, it is open to you to expel me . . . I am a crippled man; but it is natural that a crippled nation should be represented by a crippled delegate.[56]

The Chicago Daily Tribune welcomed Gandhi's decision and praised the British by saying that the agreement with Gandhi was itself an evidence that the British diplomacy had lost none of its finesse.[57] And the New York Times commented that in a physically unimpressive exterior, Gandhi seemed to embody one of the most dramatic personalities of the world.[58] The Nashville Tennessean called Gandhi the great wise man of India and commented his

---

[55]Time, September 23, 1931, p. 23. The newsmagazine reported Gandhi's departure from Simla in its own stereotyped style: "Robbers retreated, tigers turned tails as a rickety automobile sped out of the Himalayas late one night last week. In the car was little bald-headed, feather weight Mahatma Gandhi."

[56]Time, September 16, 1931, p. 23.

[57]Chicago Daily Tribune, September 10, 1931, p. 10.

[58]New York Times, August 4, 1931, p. 20.

inaction had proved powerful.[59] And to Reverend John Haynes Holmes, Gandhi's coming visit to England was like the visit of a victor. He said that "if ever Britain was in peril, it was in peril now, when for the third time in two thousand years there was coming an alien to dictate terms of peace." Obviously Holmes had in mind Caesar and William of Normandy, as the other two.[60]

The Second Round Table Conference opened on September 14, 1931. From the very beginning it seemed that the Conference would not succeed. For one thing, despite Gandhi's presence and his ten speeches before the subsequent sessions of the Conference, he was in the minority of one. The rest of the delegates had been 'selected' by the British Government and they hardly represented anyone. But the Conference proved to be only a debating body with the privilege of majority voting on its own views. No wonder then the Conference could reach no decisions on the important question of the formation of an All India Federation. All wanted a Federation but of a differing nature. The Princes wanted their states to be completely independent in the Federation with no affiliation to England--obviously dreaming of a return to their autocratic rules before the British preponderence in India; the minorities wanted complete safeguards for them against the overwhelming Hindu

---

[59] Nashville Tennessean, September 14, 1931, p. 4.

[60] Muzumdar, Gandhi Versus Empire, p. 136.

population in the Federation; and whereas the British wanted a loose Federation with strong powers vested in the British Viceroy in New Delhi, and direct allegiance to London.[61] Only Gandhi, though he was prepared to give large concessions to the Indian minorities, demanded Dominion Status in the British Commonwealth of Nations. Prospects for the success, therefore, already seemed dim, when the Conference received its death-jolt by the Conservative victory in Great Britain's General Elections in October. A 'national' government was then formed by Mr. MacDonald, and he was made to appoint Sir John Simon, the author of the unpopular Simon Report, as the Foreign Secretary. In the House of Lords the old backwoodsman spirit immediately found expression "in a demand for expelling Gandhi from England or sending him into exile."[62] The British Prime Minister concluded the Conference on December 1, and declared that it was His Majesty's Government's desire to reaffirm their belief in an All India Federation as offering the only hopeful solution of India's constitutional problem. Gandhi promised to re-study MacDonald's statement but concluded ominously that if it meant the same as was found by him in the proceedings of the Confer-

---

[61] D. G. Tendulkar, Mahatma (Bombay, 1952), Vol. III, p. 162. Gandhi told MacDonald: "I am grieved to have to say that up to now I have not been able to discover a common definition for the terms that we have been exchanging during these weary weeks."

[62] New York Times, August 26, 1931, p. 26.

ence, he and Mr. MacDonald had come on the parting of ways. The Prime Minister shot back: "My dear Mahatma, let us go on with this way of co-operation. It may be the only way."[63]

Gandhi's visit to London was watched with real interest in the United States. The American newspapers had special correspondents assigned to cover the Round Table Conference. Gandhi met American journalists at a lunch given by them for him.[64] Hardly a day seems to have passed when there was no news on Gandhi in the American press between September 14 and December 1, 1931. For instance, this is how Gandhi's first speech before the Round Table Conference was headlined by some American newspapers on their front pages on September 16, 1931:

> The Chicago Daily Tribune: "GANDHI TWISTS LION'S TAIL BY FREEDOM CRY, ASKS PARTNERSHIP IN BRITISH EMPIRE." The New York Times: "GANDHI FOR EQUALITY WITH BRITAIN, HEARERS FORGET HIS RAGS." The New York Herald Tribune: "GANDHI'S PLEA FOR FREE INDIA STIRS LONDON." The Washington Post: "GANDHI SUBMITS HIS DEMAND FOR INDIAN FREEDOM."

There was editorial comment when the Conference was still in session. The New York Times praised Gandhi for

---

[63]Tendulkar, Mahatma, pp. 163-164. Gandhi had told MacDonald that "I would like to study your declaration once, twice, thrice, as often as it may be necessary, scanning every word of it, reading its hidden meaning, if there is a hidden meaning in it, crossing all the t's, and if I then come to the conclusion as just now seems likely--that, as far as I am concerned we have come to the parting of ways."

[64]Muzumdar, Gandhi and The Empire, p. 154.

the tributes paid to him by the minority delegates and said that the safeguards for the minority communities in the proposed new Indian constitution were like the American Compromise of 1787 or the Canadian Constitution of 1867.[65] In another editorial the New York Times criticized Gandhi for his attitude on Dominion Status and said that "one may start out with something less than 100 percent nationhood."[66] The Chicago Daily Tribune also had a comment on the minority issue and believed that the Indian chances of liberty were going up in smoke as races differed with each other.[67] The Commonweal criticized Gandhi's role and believed that India could really be emancipated in his way was growing more and more doubtful.[68]

Gandhi met with criticism by the American press, usually favourable to him, after the Conference failed. The San Francisco Chronicle said Gandhi did not have the saintly prestige to sway the non-Hindu minority in India, and remarked it was hard to make a nation out of a people who had never before tried to feel as a nation and who still felt first as Mohammedans, Hindus and Likhs.[69]

---

[65] New York Times, November 26, 1931, p. 6.

[66] Ibid.

[67] Chicago Daily Tribune, October 9, 1931, p. 10.

[68] Commonweal, September 30, 1931, p. 511.

[69] San Francisco Chronicle, October 9, 1931, p. 10.

The Nashville Tennessean said that Gandhi was always a 'Mr. X' and what his inner voice told him to-day, it will certainly tell him tomorrow not to do. It, however, agreed that Gandhi's influence in India showed no signs of abatement with the breakdown of London talks.[70] The New York Times defended MacDonald's attitude and said the "deadlock at the London Conference was between Indians and Indians."[71]

But others defended Gandhi's role in the Conference. Professor Sunderland wrote that Gandhi did not oppose in London any plan of Great Britain which he believed aimed to give India Dominion Status or real self-government.[72] Mr. Bruce Bliven wrote in the New Republic that the cards were already stacked against Gandhi in advance and the holding of the Conference was something like the appointment of the Wickersham Commission in America.[73] In later years Marc Edmund Jones commented that Gandhi presented his own political views at the Conference with a definitiveness not brought to a point of similar clear focus either before

---

[70] Nashville Tennessean, December 9, 1931, p. 4.

[71] New York Times, December 6, 1931, p. 1.

[72] Jabez T. Sunderland, India In Bondage (New York, 1932), p. 511.

[73] New Republic, January 7, 1932, pp. 206-207. Bliven met Gandhi just after the Conference failure and asked the latter if it would be "desirable to have India's independence guaranteed by the League of Nations or by a concert of the Great Powers." Gandhi promptly replied that "such a thing was wholly unnecessary" and added that "no one can win freedom for anybody else."

or afterwards.[74] And Vincent Sheean wrote that Gandhi had not expected much from the Conference but the result was worse than he had anticipated.[75]

American press also gave some space to Gandhi's other activities in England. For instance, many newspapers and newsmagazines devoted some space to Gandhi's address to the members of the House of Commons, his meeting with Charlie Chaplin,[76] his visit to the Buckingham Palace in "the same frayed sandals that carried St. Gandhi on his illegal salt march,"[77] his dress of loin cloth,[78] and his visit to Lancashire which had been hard hit by the Indian boycott of British clothes.[79] American press made little or no comment on these activities, but innumerable cartoons on Gandhi appeared during this period.

---

[74]Marc Edmund Jones, Gandhi Lives (Philadelphia, 1948), p. 15.

[75]Sheean, Gandhi, p. 168.

[76]Time, October 5, 1931, p. 18. After meeting him Charlie Chaplin said: "Gandhi is a tremendous personality, tremendous! He is a great international figure! More, he is A GREAT DRAMATIC ACTOR."

[77]Ibid., December 16, 1931, p. 19.

[78]Sheean, Gandhi, p. 164. He writes: "When an East End child called out at him in the streets: 'Hey, Gandhi, where's your trousers?' the Mahatma's laughter was cabled everywhere."

[79]New Republic, October 7, 1931, p. 191. It commented, "The Indian boycott of British cloth is not solely Mr. Gandhi's work; it could never have been achieved if millions of Indians did not feel a quite legitimate burning sense of indignation."

Also, throughout the period between Gandhi's release in January 1931 up to his departure for England, the American people continued to take interest in Gandhi. Some tried to get personally into contact with him. In March 1931, several hundred American tourists hurrahed Gandhi in New Delhi, snapped their cameras at him and asked for his autograph. One, Mrs. Hattie Belle Johnston, from New York, asked:

> When are you coming to America? They will go wild about you there, simply wild!
>
> Mr. Gandhi: After India has her independence.
>
> Mrs. H.B.J.: How long will that take?
>
> Mr. G.: Oh, perhaps not so long as it took America to get her freedom.[80]

In May 1931, for the first time in his life, Gandhi posed for an American newsreel talkie:

> Louder, Mr. Gandhi! Louder please, wailed the talkie men.
>
> Lisped the Mahatma: If I go to America I should like to travel not as a freak or object of curiosity in a penny peep show.[81]

In the same month the New York Times reported that Gandhi had been forced to enlarge his secretarial staff and his office because of a flood of letters from the United States, "many of them from cranks or religious fanatics, but most of them from sober-minded persons."[82] The Indian

---

[80] Time, March 30, 1931, p. 14.

[81] Ibid.

[82] New York Times, May 10, 1931, p. 10.

leader's correspondence with Americans was thrice that with any other nationality. The post office had to keep a constant record of Gandhi's movements, as a number of letters from the United States had indefinite addresses. Some were sent merely to 'Mr. Gandhi, India,' and the others were forwarded through King George of England or the Viceroy of India. One envelope received bore only a newspaper picture of Gandhi with the one word 'India,' another was sent to 'India's Greatest Man,' with no address.

The American correspondents of these letters sent Gandhi advice, appeals and abuse in queer or naive letters. The Indian leader very often published these letters in his own newspaper, Young India, with his replies. In other cases he personally replied to those letters. For instance, an American asked Gandhi to try to prevent lynchings in the United States. Gandhi replied:

> I do not pretend to have any influence over American opinion, but I have no doubt that the people of that continent are fully alive to the evil and are trying to remove this blot on American humanity.[83]

Another writer took the Mahatma severely to task for his attire and asked him to accept foreign clothes. He sent him a copy of the Bible and said:

> When you have read this you will find that God's first aid after the fall of our first par-

---

[83] New York Times, May 10, 1931, p. 10. Many of the letters bore salutations as "Dear Saint, Dear Brother, Beloved Soul of Mankind, Reverend Savior of India."

ents and the expulsion from Paradise was God's gift of coats of skins of animals to aid them to make an independent living.[84]

Gandhi replied:

> My correspondent's sincerity is as clear as his ignorance. The reason why I answer this letter is to show how, even in the enlightened West, people can be mistaught. In this letter there is ignorance of history and, if I may venture to say so, ignorance of the Bible.[85]

There were rumours about Gandhi's health too. In June Victor A. Grevlach, editor of Optimist, Mount Vernon, Ohio, enquired from the editor of Time magazine if Gandhi had contracted tuberculosis.[86]

In September, 21-year-old Nilla Cram Cook became the first American to join Gandhi's sisterhood in his model colony on the banks of the Sabarmati River at Ahmedabad, in India. She was the daughter of George Cram (Jig) Cook, author, playwright, onetime director of the Provincetown Players.[87]

While in London, Gandhi was persuaded to speak to the

---

[84] New York Times, May 10, 1931, p. 10.

[85] Ibid.

[86] Time, May 11, 1931, p. 26. Optimist enquired: "Will you please inform us when St. Gandhi contracted the disease and what his condition is at present, if those rumours are true."

[87] Ibid., September 23, 1931, p. 24. The newsmagazine described Nilla Cook as "beauteous, of classic mold, she is first U. S. addition to the Mahatma's platonic harem. She speaks Indo-Aryan and other oriental languages, recently made a novel of her own eventful life."

American people on the radio on the evening of September 14. When the microphone was turned towards him, this being his first experience in speaking by radio, he asked in a low voice, "Do I talk into this thing?" These words were heard all over the United States.[88] Gandhi spoke for half an hour. He spoke of the disunity among Indians themselves and explained the means adopted by the Indians in their fight for liberty. He gave assurance that he would wait for ages rather than attain Indian independence through bloody means. In conclusion he asked the American people:

> May I not then, on behalf of these semi-starved millions, appeal to the conscience of the world, to come to the rescue of a people dying to regain its liberty.[89]

Gandhi's address was listened to by numerous Americans. Many newspapers published the full text of his speech. In editorial comment, his speech was commended. The New York Times expressed surprise that it was the disunity of India that the Mahatma chose to emphasize, and said his straightforwardness and sincerity created a lasting effect.[90] The Nashville Tennessean said Gandhi employed the simple language which all could understand and appealed to the simple feeling of brotherly love which the high and low

---

[88] Tendulkar, Mahatma, p. 145.

[89] Ibid.

[90] New York Times, September 15, 1931, p. 24.

shared.[91] Commonweal said that Gandhi's speech showed that he held that freedom could only be secured through spiritual powers of which the most essential was courage.[92]

The most numerous among the foreign callers on Gandhi in London were Americans, many of whom pressed him to visit the United States. He seems to have been impressed by an invitation from Adolf S. Ochs, James Adams, John Dewey and a long list of signers "begging him to visit their country before he returns to India."[93] Earlier in the year the Mayor Curley of Boston had also announced:

> We will give Gandhi a royal reception here. He's one of the world's great figures. Boston will be proud to entertain him.[94]

But soon after his statement, the Boston Post reported the statement of M. H. Crowley, Superintendent of Police of Boston, who said that though he was an admirer of Gandhi, he would insist that he be suitably clothed. He added: "We can't let anyone appear in the streets of Boston in very much less than a one-piece bathing suit."[95]

In the beginning, Gandhi seemed really to have been interested in visiting America after the Conference. But

---

[91] Nashville Tennessean, September 17, 1931, p. 4.

[92] Commonweal, September 30, 1931, p. 511.

[93] New York Times, September 19, 1931, p. 3.

[94] Time, April 20, 1931, p. 20.

[95] Ibid.

according to Tendulkar, Gandhi's official biographer, Roger Baldwin and Reverend John Haynes Holmes counselled him against it, feeling certain that his mission would be subordinated to American preoccupation with his dress and diet.[96]

The New Republic expressed deep regret to hear of this and characteristically commented:

> But should Mr. Gandhi shrink from visiting us because of inevitable reactions? In the service of an idea, which has broken British power in the Orient, he has faced much worse things than ridicule. . . . the leader of insurgent India might help immensely to dissipate ignorance with regard to his own country. The value of such exchanges may be incalculable.[97]

Perhaps undue importance has been attached to Gandhi's worry about American ridicule of his dress, and this as a reason for his not visiting the United States in 1931. The more important reason seems to be that Gandhi had to change all his plans with the breakdown of London negotiations. Had he not had to return home immediately because of that he would probably have visited the United States. Many

---

[96]Tendulkar, Mahatma, p. 165.

[97]New Republic, October 21, 1931, pp. 244-245. The newsweekly agreed: "To be sure, barbarion scenes will follow his arrival in New York. He will be given an official welcome by the inmitigable Jimmie Walker; ticker-tape will be showered upon him from the skyscrapers of lower Broadway; a regiment of cameramen will hound his steps; reporters from the tabloid press will besiege him for his opinions on everything under the sun, from the phallic turret of the Empire State Building to the fox-hunting hats of our stenographers. . . ."

years later in an open letter to his American friends Gandhi made a reference to the proposed visit and said he almost came to the United States "but fates had ordained otherwise and I could not visit your vast and great country with its wonderful people."[98]

Gandhi continued to be discussed by Americans in different phases of life during this period. A testimonial dinner was held in his honour at the Hotel Astor in New York. The dinner programme was put on the air by WJZ with a National Broadcasting Company hook-up and was heard by Gandhi on radio at Bombay. Speaking at the occasion former Supreme Court Justice, Daniel F. Cohalan, said that Mahatma Gandhi was one of the outstanding figures of this century. Using the famous phrase of Gladstone, the former Justice said:

> India is seriously seeking freedom and has given word to England that she must clear out, bag and baggage, and leave to the Indians the Government of that huge land from which, in 170 years, England has garnered treasure beyond price.[99]

Speaking at the same dinner, Upton Close said that if Gandhi were to come to America "he would draw the greatest audiences in the history of this country and that they would not come chiefly out of sarcastic curiosity."[100]

---

[98] M. K. Gandhi, Non-Violence In Peace And War (Ahmedabad, 1944), Vol. I, p. 66.

[99] New York Times, June 5, 1931, p. 25.

[100] Ibid.

Preaching in Manhattan, Reverend John Haynes Holmes said that Gandhi was not ugly but had the dignity of a King.[101] Another preacher, Reverend Doctor George Maylim Stockdale, pastor of Saint James Methodist Church in New York, said that Gandhi despite being a Hindu was a true Christian. He added that Mahatma Gandhi had remarkably re-discovered in the twentieth century the way of Jesus in the first century.[102] At a dinner given by the All-World Gandhi Fellowship in celebration of Mahatma's birthday on October 2, 1931, Professor Shephard of Columbia University characterized Gandhi as a saint and a colossal historical figure. But at the same dinner Gandhi met with a rebuke from Dr. Rabbi-Wise, Chairman of the Political Committee of the Zionist Organization of America, on the former's statement on Zionism. Gandhi had said in London that Zionism, in its spiritual sense was a lofty aspiration, but Zionism meaning the reoccupation of Palestine had no attraction for him.[103] Dr. Rabbi asked: "What would Gandhi say if that answer were made to him by the British Government respecting India?"[104]

Professor Herbert A. Miller, in the Department of

---

[101] *Time*, October 19, 1931, p. 40.

[102] *New York Times*, December 7, 1931, p. 22.

[103] *Ibid*.

[104] *Ibid*.

Sociology of Ohio State University, ran into trouble with the Board of Trustees of his University for carrying pro-Gandhi views. While on a visit to India early in 1931, he spoke at a Nationalist rally in Bombay, where Gandhi was present. During the speech he had said:

> I know that the whole world is looking forward toward the noble experiment that Mahatma Gandhi has started and they are trying to discover two things. The first is, how much you are interested in the movement, and second, how will you settle the differences between you . . . I feel that this movement is very characteristic of the history of India. . . . The success of this movement will be the greatest contribution that India would ever make to human affairs.[105]

The Board of Trustees accused Professor Miller for "inciting the natives (of India) to civil disobedience" and dismissed him. The New Republic which reported the incident criticized the action of the Board and asked, "Since when has it been a crime for an American college professor to express sympathy with a movement such as Gandhi's?[106]

With the breakdown of the London Conference, Gandhi sailed back home. His return to Bombay on December 28, 1931, was triumphal from the point of view of public

---

[105] New Republic, June 10, 1931, p. 113.

[106] Ibid. New Republic said: "Mr. Miller was not a member of the diplomatic corps; thousands of other Americans in comparable walks of life--including some college professors who are lucky enough not to teach at Ohio State--have gone very much farther in the same direction than he has done."

demonstrations, but the news he learned at disembarkation was anything but good. The Government had started a new campaign of repression and numerous arrests had taken place. Jawaharlal Nehru had been put in jail two days before Gandhi's homecoming. Gandhi at once tried to see the Viceroy, Lord Willingdon, but he refused to meet him. Gandhi decided to face Government repression with another civil disobedience movement. The Viceroy's next step was Kingly. He ordered the Government of Bombay state to arrest Gandhi in the dead of night on January 3, 1932 and lodge him before dawn him in Yervada Jail. Gandhi and his followers expected it. When Gandhi was being taken away by police thousands of immobile, non-resistant Indians who had waited all night around the tenement house made no move to interfere except to chant "like a litany, Victory! Victory! Victory!"[107]

The American newspapers which had been carrying news of the Japanese invasion of Chinchow and seizure of Manchuria for the past few days, immediately turned to give prominent attention to news of Gandhi's arrest. The issues of January 4, 1932 and the succeeding days were full of news stories from India. The newspapers of January 4 splashed the news in banner headlines on their front pages. Some read as follows:

---

[107] Time, January 11, 1932, p. 19.

> The New York Herald Tribune: "GANDHI IS ARRESTED; STERN BRITISH MOVE TO CURB FOLLOWERS." The Washington Post: "BRITISH SEIZE GANDHI AND PREPARE TO MEET NON-VIOLENT REVOLT." The New York Times: "GANDHI SENT TO JAIL; ALL INDIA QUITS WORK." The Mimes-Picayune (New Orleans): "GANDHI ARRESTED AS INDIA GIRDS FOR RENEWAL OF NON-VIOLENT WAR." The Birmingham News (Alabama): "GANDHI ARRESTED, NATIONALIST INDIA GIRDS FOR NON-VIOLENT WAR ON GREAT BRITAIN."

Gandhi had returned to Yervada. But this was the beginning of another phase in his life. The events between 1929 and 1931 had brought the Indian leader to the international scene, more so in the United States than in any other country. And the American reaction to the events of the coming new phase in his life was once again to display that the name of Gandhi had come to stay in the United States.

CHAPTER IV

EVALUATION

On January 29, 1914, the former President of the United States, Mr. W. H. Taft, while addressing the Toronto Empire Club in London, declared:

> When I think of what England has done in India for the happiness of those people; how she found those many millions torn by internecine strife, disrupted with constant wars, unable to continue agriculture or the arts of peace, with inferior roads, tyranny and oppression, and when I think what the Government of Great Britain is now doing for the alien races, the debt the world owes England ought to be acknowledged in no grudging manner.[1]

This was only one of the tributes paid to the British rule in India by eminent Americans before the start of the First World War.[2] An American in the street had hardly any reason to disagree with the opinions expressed by their leaders. But with the end of the war such complimentary language was seldom used. Things in India had begun to change with the return to the country in 1917 of Mohandas Karamchand Gandhi. Suddenly, Americans began to realize that all was not well in India. But as the study of the preceding pages of this dissertation suggests, the change of opinion, first brought to light in the discus-

---

[1] Times (London), July 30, 1914, p. 6.

[2] Some American Opinions on The Indian Empire, pamphlet (London, n.d.), p. 3. Theodore Roosevelt, referring to British administration in India, said in 1909: "It is the greatest feat of the kind that has been performed since the break up of the Roman Empire"; P. G. Sherwood Eddy had said: "What would happen if Great Britain left India to-day? . . . India would welter in blood, with hopeless internal wars."

sion by the United States Senate of the Treaty of Versailles, was slow and gradual. But with the events such as the Amritsar Massacre, Gandhi's trial, the failure of Gandhi's first Civil Disobedience Movement and the British refusal to give India any responsible form of self-government, Americans became more and more interested in the unique non-violent struggle initiated by Gandhi against the British to grant his country independence. And then, Gandhi's Salt March, his journey to London, his return and arrest caused immense excitement and sympathy for India throughout the United States.

This extraordinary interest in Gandhi, and his movement in India, by Americans invites quite a few questions. I raised some in the Introduction and we should now turn to them.

The first question is: Why were the Americans influenced by an issue with which they were not directly concerned?

It is necessary, I believe, to remember that the right to discuss and debate has held a strong place in the mind of an average American. The majority of Americans like to reach conclusions on political matters which interest them and which are placed before them. These conclusions are held as a matter of reason rather than by instinct. For instance, there has always been in the United States an academic approval of any movement that worked for liberty. *Also, Americans in the case of two contending parties*

always like to give serious consideration to the contentions of the weaker party. They further consider that any ruling class, in whatever part of the world, is certainly capable of abusing its power. They also tend to associate political dependence with commercial exploitation. It is necessary to remember that on all questions of Colonialism before the Second World War American criticism took on a sharper and more pointed form. Americans were by tradition anti-imperial, though not anti-British. This line of reasoning was effectively applied towards British rule in India.

The second question is: What were the factors influencing the American opinion on this issue?

The first factor was the American press. The American had become keenly interested in Gandhi and he was eager to find out more than he knew. The American press took up this job and performed it well. Not only did American correspondents, representing various American newspapers, appear in India to watch Gandhi's Civil Disobedience Movement on the spot, but some were able to gain interviews with him while he was imprisoned. For months American correspondents were the only pressmen who were able to bring authentic news out of India, in view of the censorship imposed by the British authorities on any news going out of the country regarding the Indian unrest. American correspondents were also sent to London to cover the activities of Gandhi at the Second Round Table Conference.

Such headlines on front pages as: GANDHI ARMIES CAPTURE SHOLAPUR; GANDHI'S PLEA FOR FREE INDIA STIRS LONDON and BRITISH SEIZE GANDHI AND PREPARE TO MEET NON-VIOLENT REVOLT became common in almost all the American newspapers. Though almost all the press rejoiced in 'twisting the lion's tail,' a great mass of the press in America endeavoured to preserve impartiality as far as possible. For instance, views of Gandhi and the British Labour Government were usually presented and discussed side by side. Many American periodicals also published numerous articles on the situation in India. All in all, the American press played a major part in moulding American public opinion. Secondly, many books were written by American authors and published during this period on Gandhi and India, reference of which has been made in the preceding chapters. Almost all unanimously agreed that the economic condition of India was the inevitable corollary of its political exploitation. Some observed that India was an important nation with which the United States had a right to have free and unrestricted political, commercial, and industrial intercourse.

Thirdly, most of the American Christian missionaries who had worked in India, commended Gandhi's ideals and struggle at home. The attitude of most of the missionaries was sympathetic to Gandhi. The American missionary had become a sort of revolutionary element in India. Though in the beginning he did not want to strike at the imperial

government in India, his views were gradually changed by the social degradation of the people which the British failed to uplift. Christian magazines also expressed sympathy for Gandhi's movement.

Fourthly, many American intellectuals, teachers and tourists travelled in India and met Gandhi during this period. They often were converted to Gandhi's point of view. On their return some of them wrote books and articles, or lectured expressing support for India.

Fifthly, there was in certain parts of the United States sectional influence of a kind which could be regarded as hostile to England. This was perhaps exerted by the Irish Americans. A British visitor to the United States, Professor Rushbrook Williams, stated in 1930 that "Irish Americans of the second, or even of the third, generation are often animated by a hostility to Britain."[3] Eamon de Valera, the Irish leader's open support to Gandhi's struggle was widely reported in the United States press, and undoubtedly made the Irish Americans sympathetic towards India.[4]

Sixthly, another factor that now began to impress the

---

[3] Asiatic Review (London), July 1930, p. 483.

[4] New York Times, January 27, 1930, p. 17. The Irish leader told Gandhi in a message: "Republican Ireland salutes you and sends warmest expressions of sympathy with you and your comrades in your renewed effort to smash the power of the invader."

Americans was the fact that India suddenly had become conscious of the fact that the United States had thrown away the same European power against whom they now were struggling. Indian nationalists made a study of the revolt against Britain by the American colonies, though they chose a different path to achieve the same goal. American leaders like Washington, Lincoln and Patrick Henry were often quoted with respect at mass meetings held in India. And this was despite the fact that Indians were never given adequate information about American achievements in the realms of science, arts and letters. In fact, in educated circles the British encouraged the notable tendency to belittle American achievements in these fields, and by contrast to indulge in excessive eulogy of European and particularly British achievements.

Seventhly, the introduction of two resolutions in the United States Senate asking for Indian independence had a unique effect of its own. Though the resolutions were not passed, they were published all over the United States. The unusual step of introducing such a subject in the Senate over which the Senate had no jurisdiction, had an effect of its own on the American people.

And lastly, Gandhi himself proved to be the most important influence on American opinion. There were many reasons for this. One, non-Christian Gandhi impressed Americans on his attitude towards Christianity. He had

been greatly influenced by the New Testament. Many Christians believed that the real secret of his power lay in his Christlike willingness to sacrifice self for others. Two, many Americans believed that Gandhi owed his debt for his creed of passive resistance to some extent to the American thinker, Thoreau. The latter's essay on civil disobedience undoubtedly influenced Gandhi. He often was found reading Thoreau, and acknowledged that he had learned a great deal from the American writer. Three, the Americans were amazed by the method of passive resistance so effectively put into practice by the Indian leader during the Civil Disobedience Movement. They were sincerely touched by the struggle of the Indian leader who was followed into British prisons by over 30,000 followers in 1930 and again in 1932. And four, it was nothing less than a stroke of genius on Gandhi's part to seize upon the Salt Tax as the central point of his campaign. Though he did not anticipate this effect, the analogy between his solemn manufacture of illicit salt and the famous Boston Tea Party proved too tempting to be passed over by the American people. It was often said that Britain lost America through tea and was about to lose India through salt.

The third question is: What were the British and Indian influences affecting American opinion?

This could be a part of the second question, but it has its peculiar importance and, therefore, it requires separate attention.

In the United States a kind of unofficial competition was going on between Great Britain and India to win over America to their respective point of view. Great Britain had especially become conscious of the sympathy shown by the United States towards Gandhi and his struggle in India. England's concern could be noted from the statement of Prime Minister MacDonald who angrily had declared that his country was "not possessed by the sinister designs which Nationalist propagandists in India and the United States in particular so habitually attributed to it."[5] There was, therefore, a strong effort on the part of many distinguished Englishmen to try to reverse that opinion. Many of them wrote articles to American periodicals and some even came to the United States on lecture tours and took part in debates on India. The most important work in this respect, among these Englishmen, was done by Lord Meston, Marquess of Zetland, Professor Edward Thompson, S. K. Ratcliffe and G. T. Garrett.

Lord Meston, former British representative of India in the Imperial War cabinet, read three papers before the Institute of Politics at Williamstown in Massachusetts in August 1930. He bitterly criticized Gandhi and the Indian movement. He cynically called Gandhi and his followers "useful texts for ferment oratory to impress on outer

---

[5]A British Indian Merchant, India on The Brink (London, 1931), p. 46.

world."[6] To him Gandhi was like a crusader around whom orthodox Hindus had rallied. His papers were ultimately published in the form of a book entitled Nationhood for India.[7] Marquess of Zetland, who served as Governor of Bengal from 1917 to 1922, contributed quite a few articles on India to the Foreign Affairs Quarterly during this period. He maintained that only England could solve the problems of India in its own way. He bitterly criticized Gandhi's role at the Second Round Table Conference and called his farewell speech "a mischieviously pessimistic utterance shot through with bitterness."[8] Professor Edward Thompson taught Bengali in the University of Oxford. In July 1930 he published a series of articles entitled "America And India" in the Times (London) and bitterly criticized American sympathy towards Gandhi and his struggle in India.[9] These articles were later offered in a small com-

---

[6] Nation, August 27, 1930, p. 213.

[7] Lord Meston, Nationhood for India (Oxford, 1931), pp. 78-79. Meston said: "If, at the time of the Crusades, contemporary opinion had been collected regarding Peter the Hermit, it would probably have sounded very much like the expressions which Mr. Gandhi's name evokes to-day."

[8] Foreign Affairs Quarterly, April 1932, pp. 369-381. He wrote: "Emerson found the Englishmen to be of all men who stood firmest in his shoes; 'he has stamina,' he wrote, 'and can take the initiative in emergencies.' It is a display of these two capacities that is called for in India today; and it is in the Englishman's continued possession of them that rests the best hope for the Indian peoples in the critical years that lie before them."

[9] Times (London), July 21, 1930, p. 13; July 22, 1930, p. 15; and July 23, 1930, p. 15.

pact pamphlet by the London Times to United States citizens to call their attention to the widely circulated misrepresentations on India.[10] Thompson often wrote to the New Republic. He believed Gandhi was a very difficult man to negotiate with as, according to him, he mixed up primary demands with others that were personal or sentimental, and in any case secondary. He maintained that England was on the way to a settlement in India and "Mr. Gandhi is far and away the biggest obstacle at present."[11] S. K. Ratcliffe, a former Civil Service official in India, contributed articles to the Nation and the New Republic. He came out with the view that England could not take India into the Commonwealth because the other members might object to it.[12] He believed that India had rejected the central doctrine of their Mahatma--Ahimsa. According to him the march to the sea, followed by the ritual act of defiance, was a final desperate move designed to test the possibility of non-violent revolution, and it had failed miserably.[13] G. T. Garrett, a member of the British Labour Party, wrote many articles for Asia. He believed that Gandhi and other Indian leaders were doing their best to make it as diffi-

---

[10] Time, August 25, 1930, p. 24.

[11] New Republic, August 20, 1930, pp. 102-103.

[12] Ibid., October 22, 1930, p. 243.

[13] Nation, May 28, 1930, p. 628.

cult as possible for the English to meet their views.[14]

There were other Englishmen of significance whose articles were published in the American press during this period. Lord Olivier of Ramsden, Secretary of State for India in Ramsay MacDonald's ministry, in an article in Asia expressed worry that the most significant force in India then was the increasingly diffused determination to eliminate Europeanism. But he did not expect Gandhi to succeed. He believed that the Indians were greatly divided in their opinions concerning the political course to be taken and were only giving professedly unanimous lip-homage to Gandhi.[15] Sir John Campbell said that England is ruling for the good of India and she expects Americans to understand the situation. He justified England's keeping in India 60,000 British troops, 150,000 British Indian troops and 34,000 reservists because of the country's geographical and political situation.[16] Sir Basil Blackett wrote in the Foreign Affairs Quarterly that the vast majority of the Indian people lived so near starvation that they

---

[14] Asia, July 1930, pp. 477-481. He quipped: "H. G. Wells once compared the Englishmen in India to a man mounted on a runaway elephant, which he cannot control but from which he cannot get off. It may be assumed that the Englishman has made up to get off somehow, but the elephant, instead of slowing down a little, has gone rampaging away much faster than before."

[15] Ibid., February 1930, p. 98.

[16] Atlantic, November 1930, pp. 569-580.

could have scarcely a thought beyond the immediate problem of keeping alive. But at the same time he declared that the unrest in India had nothing to do with economic conditions. He warned that "if the strong hand of the British were withdrawn, the Indian ryot would murder his landlord as readily as the Russian peasant."[17] Henry S. Lunn wrote from London to the New Republic, on behalf of Lord Lytton, that if it were not for the services of the Indian soldiers and officials, and the adquiescence of the Indian people, the British Government in India could not last for a month. He said Gandhi was seditious and asked how any government could exist which tolerated sedition?[18] C. F. Strickland, another former Indian Civil Service official, said that an Indian usually left his destiny to high powers unless mystic Gandhi directed him to commit some act of defiance. He asserted that Gandhi's movement would never benefit the Indian peasant.[19]

The United States also was visited by many Englishmen during this period who advanced their country's point of view on the Indian situation. In his address to the American Federal Bar Association, Sir John Simon, author of the Simon Report, said in 1930 that the difficulty with India's

---

[17]Foreign Affairs Quarterly, October 1929, pp. 44-50.

[18]New Republic, August 21, 1930, p. 17.

[19]Foreign Affairs Quarterly, October 1931, pp. 70-80.

constitutional problem was that the mass of Indians knew nothing of Western political conceptions, and yet the educated minority was urging a rapid application of representative institutions based on Western models in an Eastern continent whose traditions of Government were Oriental.[20] The British Bishop of Bombay, speaking in New York at a Methodist Episcopal Church, warned that the Americans seemed to have an idea that all India was out for independence. He said it was a wrong assumption. He declared that there was an 'American Gandhi' who really had never existed.[21] Professor Rushbrook Williams, a minister in the Indian princely state of Patiala, made an extensive lecture tour of the United States in the first part of 1930. All along he said that Gandhi was not the real political leader of India and that India could not be unified because it was composed of many peoples and many cults. He also predicted that Gandhi's movement would be all over by October.[22] Sir Aurel Stein, of the Indian Archaeological Survey, said in New York in March 1930 that if India overthrew British rule, it would resemble China in political and economic unrest.[23]

---

[20] Nation, September 10, 1930, p. 258.

[21] Time, September 15, 1930, p. 22.

[22] New Republic, June 25, 1930, p. 2.

[23] New York Times, March 18, 1930, p. 10.

There were other less known English writers who were often getting a place in the American press. For instance, one E. M. E. Blyth wrote that Gandhi was the first and last rebel and charged him with "colour prejudice, amounting at times to an obsession where English rule is concerned."[24] Another Englishman named Earle Welby wrote that Gandhi regarded British rule as 'Satanic' and that the presence of Satan was necessary for his sort to recoil into virtue.[25] Mrs. Rosamond Wilcockson, wife of a British officer, wrote from India that Gandhi's followers had no principles and were "more sheep-like in their mob spirit than an occidental crowd."[26] Another Englishman, who liked to keep his name anonymous, wrote that Gandhi's party represented only 1 per cent of the Indian population. To him the basic cause of the trouble in India was interference by the Parliament of Great Britain with the Viceroy's Government in India. He said that the tradition of India was monarchical and autocratic and, therefore, he believed that as a remedy, if a son of the British Royal family were "nominated as King of British India, the whole of India

---

[24] Quarterly Review, April 1931, pp. 388-401. He said England was fighting for India's needs and such an attitude was "the outcome not of Mr. Gandhi's ideals or Mr. Gandhi's actions, but of the vision of the Englishmen for India, the Englishman's love for India, and the Englishman's will to serve India."

[25] Portnightly Review, May 1, 1930, pp. 616-622.

[26] Blackwood's Magazine, December 1930, p. 770.

would rally to him."[27]

But there were other Englishmen of repute who during that period influenced the American public opinion on behalf of the Indian movement. The foremost amongst these men was Charles F. Andrews, an English missionary who served in India for twenty-five years, and was a life-long friend of Gandhi and Tagore. In 1930 he lectured a great deal in the United States. During the same year he published two books in the United States entitled Mahatma Gandhi's Ideas[28] and India And The Simon Report.[29] He also edited the American edition of Gandhi's autobiography, Mahatma Gandhi His Own Story and published it in New York.[30] In these books he explained with documentary evidence the main principles and ideas for which Mahatma Gandhi stood. The main conclusion drawn in Andrews' books was that he was convinced that what Gandhi had wonderfully affected in a comparatively small scale through the programme of Soul-Force in action, could be applied with a much larger programme and for the solution of far wider issues in India. He also strongly expressed the view that the time

---

[27] Blackwood's Magazine, August 1930, pp. 282-288.

[28] C. F. Andrews, Mahatma Gandhi's Ideas (New York, 1930).

[29] C. F. Andrews, India And The Simon Report (New York, 1930).

[30] C. F. Andrews, ed. Mahatma Gandhi His Own Story (New York, 1930).

had come for India to govern herself and to exercise within her own dominion her own national freedom. In addition to these books Andrews contributed articles on Gandhi in various American periodicals. In the Yale Review he wrote that Gandhi had through his entire forgetfulness of self won from others a wealth of loyalty and affection, and he returned it in full measure.[31] In an article in the New York Times, he wrote that Gandhi's Salt March against the Salt Tax was the first step in Civil Disobedience to do away with the taxes to reduce people's poverty.[32] Writing in Asia he said that Gandhi was one man of modern times who was trying to carry through a political struggle with absolute simplicity of purpose.[33] In the Nation he referred to the arrest of Gandhi after the Salt March and said that his fellow Englishman, Lord Irwin, had blundered by doing so.[34] And in the New Republic Andrews bitterly criticized Katherine Mayo's Mother India as a deliberate and provocative attack on Gandhi's private character.[35]

There was another Englishman who was second only to

---

[31] Yale Review, March 1930, pp. 491-507.

[32] New York Times, April 6, 1930, sec. 10, p. 6.

[33] Asia, March 1930, p. 157.

[34] Nation, January 1, 1930, pp. 25-27.

[35] New Republic, January 8, 1930, p. 199.

Andrews in expressing his sympathy for the Indian struggle in the United States. This man was H. N. Brailsford, a British journalist who went to India to watch Gandhi's movement in the second part of 1930. He contributed numerous articles to the New Republic. It is interesting to note that before Brailsford went to India he very much praised the work of Lord Irwin and was critical of Gandhi's attitude.[36] But with his visit to India he changed his views. Writing from India in an article entitled "India Under The Lathi," he described the situation in that country before the First Round Table Conference in 1930. He wrote that Lord Irwin was imposing Ordinance after Ordinance, peaceful crowds were being lathi-charged, trade was at a standstill, there was hartal in busy industrial towns, and 60,000 followers of Gandhi were in prison. He was convinced that without the approval of Gandhi it was vain to expect that India would even discuss the Constitution which might be drafted by the London Conference.[37] In another article from India entitled "The Indian Peasant Strikes Back," he said that the peasant was behind Gandhi and his movement.[38] He continued to support Gandhi's stand after his release and attendance of the Second Round Table Conference in London. In 1931 he published a book

---

[36] New Republic, November 27, 1929, pp. 8-10.

[37] Ibid., December 10, 1930, p. 90.

[38] Ibid., December 31, 1930, pp. 183-185.

entitled Rebel India in the United States. He brought forth the belief that non-violence had succeeded in India because for the first time in her recent history she had gained in Gandhi a leader who based himself on her silent assumptions, the beliefs that had moulded her body.[39] Brailsford also hit hard at Katherine Mayo's book. He said the book was written on the slightest acquaintance with the people whom she assailed and said it was an attempt to set everything Indian in a context of mingled pity and contempt.[40]

On the other hand, the Indian case does not seem to have been presented as vastly as the British by the Indians in the United States. However, it did not go entirely unrepresented. Three Indians seem to stand out as spokesmen for Gandhi's movement in India during this period.

The first was Dr. Haridas T. Muzumdar, a graduate of the University of Wisconsin. He was the first person to have written a book on Gandhi in the United States. That book was entitled Gandhi The Apostle and was published in 1923.[41] He also edited Mahatma Gandhi's Sermon on The Sea which was published in the United States in 1924.[42]

---

[39]H. N. Brailsford, Rebel India (New York, 1931).

[40]New Republic, June 10, 1931, p. 103.

[41]Haridas T. Muzumdar, Gandhi The Apostle (Chicago, 1923).

[42]Haridas T. Muzumdar, ed., Sermon on The Sea (Chicago, 1924).

He visited India in 1930 and marched with Gandhi on his Salt March, and Gandhi was reported to have requested him to return to the United States as he could serve India better there. He again met Gandhi in London in 1931. In early 1932 he published his book entitled Gandhi Versus The Empire. This was perhaps his most popular book and was written especially for the American reader. Despite the fact that he was often swayed by nationalistic sentiments,[43] he worked hard and presented an extensive account of Gandhi's struggle, the British administration, and Gandhi's negotiations with the British Government in India and Great Britain. He appealed to the American people to point out to "the jingoistic British press and ignorant Britishers that the British rule is making a hasty exit from India."[44]

Another Indian, Professor Sailendranath Ghose, formed the American branch of the Indian National Congress in New York. He spoke at various meetings and espoused the cause of India. He appealed that a committee of distinguished Americans should be constituted to represent the sympathy of the United States to give encouragement to Mahatma

---

[43]Haridas T. Muzumdar, Gandhi Versus The Empire (New York, 1932), p. 334. He claimed in his book that Lord Wellingdon would be the last Viceroy sent out by England to India, and by the end of 1932 the All India National Congress would become the de jure successor to the British Raj in India.

[44]Ibid., p. 334.

Gandhi and his associates.[45]

The third Indian, Dr. Syud Hossain was perhaps the most emminent of the three Indians. He was living in the United States in self exile and had left India for political and personal reasons. Hossain was a close friend of Jawaharlal Nehru, and on India's attaining independence served as her ambassador to Egypt. Unlike Muzumdar and Ghose, he led a quiet life in the States. But every now and then he wrote articles for the American press. For instance, during our period of study he praised the American press for the fair presentation of news from India, despite the fact that most of the day to day news in India was sent to the United States by the British-owned Reuter News Agency.[46] While Gandhi was attending the London Conference, Hossain wrote a series of articles on Mahatma Gandhi in the Washington Post, which were published by the newspaper on its front page. He gave a very fair account of Gandhi's early life, his philosophy and his renunciation of material things.[47]

During this period some of the Indian and British visitors mentioned above also tried to influence American opinion through debates, usually organized by the Foreign

---

[45] New York Times, June 5, 1931, p. 25.

[46] New Republic, October 22, 1930, p. 260.

[47] Washington Post, September 15, 1931, pp. 1, 5; September 16, 1931, pp. 1, 7; and September 17, 1931, pp. 1, 4.

Policy Association. One such discussion was organized in New York in February 1930 between Sailendranath Ghose and Edward Thompson.[48] Another was organized by the Association in Philadelphia between the two in March 1930.[49] Perhaps the most interesting debate was held in New York in November 1930. The speakers were Haridas Muzumdar and C. F. Andrews who spoke for India; and C. F. Strickland and Miss Cornelia Sorabji, an Indian Barrister, who spoke for England. These debates attracted very large American audiences, and were followed by numerous questions from the listeners. Miss Sorabji is the only Indian on record during this period who stated her case against her country in the United States. She had to face some rough questions from American listeners.[50] The Foreign Policy Association published all these debates in the form of pamphlets.

Thus we find that both Englishmen and Indians had the opportunity to influence the Americans through the press, lectures, debates and their books. The American

---

[48] India, pamphlet (New York, April 1930).

[49] New York Times, March 16, 1930, p. 19.

[50] India, pamphlet (New York, January 1931), p. 29. An American listener told Miss Sorabji, "We simply cannot understand what can bring a person at considerable expense from another country to visit a foreign shore to decry his or her own country . . . If an American were to go at his expense or the expense of others behind him to India to express hatred against Americans, we would be surprised."

press was often blamed by many circles in England for not giving enough space to the British point of view. After having gone through a considerable portion of the press of this period, I am convinced that the American press gave enough space to British writers--certainly more space than it gave to the Indian writers. It was another matter if the anti-Gandhi point of view was not able to make any headway with the American public opinion.

The fourth question is: Did the timing of Gandhi's Civil Disobedience Movement have any effect in the making of American opinion on India?

Psychologically, yes, despite the fact that it was coincidental. Firstly, the United States had been hit by the depression at that time, and she could appreciate a little better the economic degradation of the Indian people which was brought to light by Mahatma Gandhi. And secondly, India was lucky that when American opinion was so enthusiastically supporting her struggle for freedom there was no real danger of Communism to the Western World--an issue over which England could have warned the United States for her attitude, threatening to cause a crack in the Western Alliance. An example at present could be provided by French occupation of Algeria, and American hesitation and reluctance to support the latter, because the United States is in no mood to alienate her ally in the face of danger from Russia.

Our last question is: Was the United States' opinion unanimously in favour of Gandhi and his movement?

It was largely so. The American Government had nothing to say, but significantly it had no words of sympathy or encouragement for her friend across the Atlantic in her troubles in India. The press throughout the United States, through its editorials, showed its overwhelming sympathy for the Indian cause. So did most of the American missionaries and teachers. But there was a section of the American press which clearly showed its pro-British views. I have in mind magazines like Harper's, Atlantic and the Foreign Affairs Quarterly which did not once publish an article during this period on India which could be regarded as sympathetic to Gandhi. Also, a minority of the American missionaries opposed Gandhi bitterly because they thought that with the elimination of the British Government in India, the work of Christian missions in the country would suffer. All in all, in my opinion there was no such thing as anti-British opinion in the United States. But pro-Indian opinion was far more prominent throughout the country as a whole than pro-British opinion.

In conclusion, it may again be said that the major factor in attracting sympathetic American public opinion towards Indian struggle for independence was Gandhi himself. Gandhi was no magician and, therefore, did not act like a magic charmer on the American people. On the other hand, the Americans took him at his face value. During

the 1920's they had recognized him as a rising star on the Indian political horizon. Between 1929 and 1932 they found he was the most luminous and his brilliance showed no signs of decline. Americans, therefore, from then onwards came to regard Gandhi as the unquestioned leader of his country, a fact which they never lost sight of.

APPENDIX A

Senator Blaine's Resolution entitled 'Independence of India' introduced on January 6, 1930, in the United States Senate

INDEPENDENCE OF INDIA

Mr. BLAINE. Mr. President, I desire at this time to introduce a resolution which I ask may be read. I also desire to give notice that at the appropriate time I shall direct some remarks to the resolution concerning the struggle of India for independence and the struggle of the Philippine Islands for their independence, and the relationship of these struggles to the naval conference about to convene in London. I ask that the resolution may be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the resolution will be read.

The resolution (S. Res. 193) was read, as follows:

Whereas the people of India are spontaneously moving toward an adoption of self-government, under a constitutional form, with popular approval, and seeking national independence. Be it

Resolved, That the Senate of the United States, mindful of the struggle for independence that gave birth to our Republic, participates with the people of the United States in the deep interest that they feel for the success of the people of India, in their struggle to establish their liberty and independence, and be it further

Resolved, That the Senate of the United States pledges its constitutional support to the President of the United States whenever he may deem it proper to recognize the sovereignty and the independence of India, and recommends early recognition thereof.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Wisconsin desire that the resolution be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations or that it be on the table?

Mr. BLAINE. I ask that the resolution may be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(Congressional Record--Senate, 71st Congress, 2nd Session, Volume 72, Part 2, Monday, January 6, 1930, p. 1096.)

APPENDIX B

Gandhi's Radio Address to the United States delivered from London, September 14, 1931

In my opinion, the Indian struggle bears in its consequences not only upon India but upon the whole world. It contains one-fifth of the human race. It represents one of the most ancient civilizations. It has traditions handed down from tens of thousands of years, some of which, to the astonishment of the world, remain intact. No doubt the ravages of time have affected the purity of that civilization as they have that of many other cultures and many institutions.

If India is to revive the glory of her ancient past, she can only do so when she attains her freedom. The reason for the struggle having drawn the attention of the world I know does not lie in the fact that we Indians are fighting for our liberty but in the fact that the means adopted by us for attaining that liberty are unique and, as far as history shows us, have not been adopted by any other people of whom we have any record.

The means adopted are not violence, not bloodshed, not diplomacy as one understands it nowadays, but they are purely and simply truth and non-violence. No wonder that the attention of the world is directed toward this attempt to lead a successful bloodless revolution. Hitherto, nations have fought in the manner of the brute. They have wreaked vengeance upon those whom they have considered to be their enemies.

We find in searching national anthems adopted by great nations that they contain imprecations upon the so-called enemy. They have vowed destruction and have not hesitated to take the name of God and seek divine assistance for the destruction of the enemy. We in India have endeavored to reverse the process. We feel that the law that governs brute creation is not the law that should guide the human race. That law is inconsistent with human dignity.

I, personally, would wait, if need be, for ages rather than seek to attain the freedom of my country through bloody means. I feel in the innermost recesses of my heart, after a political experience extending over an unbroken period of close upon thirty-five years, that the world is sick unto death of blood-spilling. The world is seeking a way out, and I flatter myself with the belief

that perhaps it will be the privilege of the ancient land of India to show the way out to the hungering world.

I have, therefore, no hesitation whatsoever in inviting all the great nations of the earth to give their hearty co-operation to India in her mighty struggle. It must be a sight worth contemplating and treasuring, that of millions of people giving themselves to suffering without retaliation in order that they might vindicate the dignity and honor of the nation.

I have called that suffering a process of self-purification. It is my certain conviction that no man loses his freedom except through his own weakness. I am painfully conscious of our own weaknesses. We represent in India all the principal religions of the earth, and it is a matter of deep humiliation to confess that we are a house divided against itself, that we Hindus and Mussalmans are flying at one another. It is a matter of still deeper humiliation to me that we Hindus regard several millions of our own kith and kin as too degraded even for our touch. I refer to the so-called "untouchables."

These are no small weaknesses in a nation struggling to be free. And hence you will find that in this struggle through self-purification we have assigned a foremost place to the removal of this curse of untouchability and the attainment of unity amongst all the different classes and communities of India representing the different creeds.

It is along the same lines that we seek to rid our land of the curse of drink. Happily for us, intoxicating drinks and drugs are confined to comparatively a very small number of people, largely factory hands and the like. Fortunately for us, the drink and drug curse is accepted as a curse. It is not considered to be the fashion for a man or a woman to drink or to take intoxicating drugs. All the same, it is an uphill fight that we are fighting in trying to remove this evil from our midst.

For it is a matter of regret, deep regret, for me to have to say that the existing government has made of this evil a source of very large revenue, amounting to nearly twenty-five crores of rupees. But I am thankful to be able to say that the women of India have risen to the occasion in combatting it by peaceful means, that is, by a fervent appeal to those who are given to the drink habit to give it up, and by an equally fervent appeal to the liquor dealers. A great impression has been created upon those who are addicted to these two evil habits.

I wish that it were possible for me to say that in this, at least, we were receiving the hearty cooperation of the rulers. If we could only have received that cooperation, without any legislation, I dare say that we would have achieved this reform and banished intoxicating drink and drugs from our afflicted land.

There is a force which has a constructive effect and which has been put forth by the nation during this struggle. That is the great care for the semi-starved millions scattered throughout the 700,000 villages dotted over a surface of 1,900 miles long and 1,500 miles broad. It is a painful phenomenon that these simple villagers, through no fault of their own, have nearly six months in the year idleness upon their hands. The time was not very long ago when every village was self-sufficient in regard to the two primary human wants, food and clothing.

Unfortunately for us, the East India Company, by means which I would prefer not to describe, destroyed that supplementary village industry as well as the livelihood of millions of spinners who had become famous through the cunning of their deft fingers for drawing the finest thread, such as has never yet been drawn by any modern machinery. These village spinners found themselves one fine morning with their noble occupation gone. And from that day forward India has become progressively poor.

No matter what may be said to the contrary, it is a historical fact that before the advent of the East India Company, these villagers were not idle, and he who wants may see today that these villagers are idle. It, therefore, requires no great effort or learning to know that these villagers must starve if they cannot work for six months in the year.

May I not, then, on behalf of these semi-starved millions, appeal to the conscience of the world to come to the rescue of a people dying to regain its liberty?

(Haridas T. Muzumdar, Gandhi versus The Empire /New York, 1932/, pp. 166-170.)

APPENDIX C

A letter from Mr. Henry Eaton (California) to Mahatma Gandhi, and the latter's reply

Mr. Henry Eaton writes from California:

"I am not a British sympathizer. My ancestors fought to liberate themselves from the British in 1776. But as far as I can see from what I read in the papers it would be more harmful than beneficial if Britain got out of India. I do not mean to infer that India could not govern herself, although I cannot but see that such an attempt would be very arduous at the present time. But if Britain gets out of India, who is going to keep the Russians or any other nation out? Certainly India, from all I can learn of her, has no adequate army to protect herself.

But perhaps you would prefer Russian masters to English. Russia is waiting there at the Khyber pass. Russia understands the East. Her people are a mingling of the occidental and the oriental. But Russia has Western culture. Any relation India could have with her would have to be subordinate. Personally I am not antagonistic to Russia. Her war against Capitalism is the great hope of Western civilization. Here in America, our greatest capitalist, Henry Ford, realizes the inevitability of an equitable distribution of wealth. But Russia as master of India does not particularly appeal to me. With Russia as master India would lose her identity as a culture. With England India has always retained that identity.

Perhaps you do not fear the Russian menace as much as we of the Western world. In America many of us are sure that once Britain is out of India, Russia will step in. We cannot visualize the India of the present, the India with her caste system and her primitive methods of manufacture and agriculture, defending herself against Western invasion. You have no national organization for protection. There is no unity in India. Unity has been essential to the rise of Western culture and civilization. There also seems to be no progress, as we look on progress in the West, in India. You yourself advocate the return to the old methods of weaving. Have you, with your great intelligence, no realization of the inevitability of change, of moving forward?

You cannot go back from old age to childhood. How then can you go back from enlightened methods of weaving to unenlightened methods and hope to gain anything? While you work in the old way that is hard, you realize that there is a new way that is easy, and you cannot be satis-

fied with the old hard way. You see how Japan has risen to power by adopting the new way and even China is awakening. India alone seems not to realize the importance of the new ways of the world. How is it that you, her great leader, do not preach progress to your people?

These are two questions that puzzle me greatly: Why does India not realize the Russian menace if she becomes free of England? And why does Mahatma Gandhi not make his people realize that their freedom lies first of all in adopting the new system of labour with the help of machinery? I would very much like to have you, who alone must know the answers, tell them to me.

By birth and heritage I am a citizen of the United States of America, but I take such a personal interest in the affairs of the world that I like to think of myself in my little way as a citizen of the world. At the University I attend here in California, the question of India often arises. The general sympathies are with you against the British. However, as I myself can understand the present situation in India, it seems that of the two evils British control in India is the lesser. The other evil, as I have already tried to explain, is Russian domination. But what we all want to know is how you feel about the matter."

This letter betrays two superstitions. One of them is that India is unfit to govern herself because she cannot defend herself and is torn with internal dissensions. The writer gratuitously assumes that, if Britain withdraws, Russia is ready to pounce upon India. This is an insult to Russia. Is Russia's one business to rule over those peoples who are not ruled by Britain? And if Russia has such nefarious designs upon India, does not the writer see that the same power that will oust the British from domination is bound to prevent any other domination? If the control is handed to India's representatives by agreement, there must be some condition whereby Britain will guarantee protection from foreign aggression as a penance for her conscious or unconscious neglect during all these past years to fit India for defending herself.

Personally, even under agreement, I should rely more upon the capacity of the nation to offer civil resistance to any aggressor as it did last year with partial success in the case of the British occupier. Complete success awaits complete assimilation of non-violence in thought, word and deed by the nation. An ocular demonstration of the success of nation-wide satyagraha must be a prelude to its world-wide acceptance and hence as a natural corollary to the admission of the futility of armament. The only antidote to armament, which is the visible symbol of violence is Satyagraha, the visible symbol of non-violence. But the writer is oppressed also by the fear of our dis-

sensions. In the first place, they are grossly exaggerated in transmission to the West. In the second place, they are hardened during foreign control. Imperial rule means divide et impera. They must, therefore, melt with the withdrawal of the frigid foreign rule and the introduction of the warmth-giving sunshine of real freedom.....

Lastly, I do not subscribe to the belief that everything old is bad. Truth is old and difficult. Untruth has many attractions. But I would gladly go back to the very old Golden Age of Truth. Good old brown bread is any day superior to the pasty white bread which has lost much of its nutritive value in going through the various processes of refinement. The list of old and yet good things can be endlessly multiplied. The spinning wheel is one such thing, at any rate for India.

When India becomes self-supporting, self-reliant, and proof against temptations and exploitation, she will cease to be the object of greedy attraction for any power in the West or the East, and will then feel secure without having to carry the burden of expensive armament. Her internal economy will be India's strongest bulwark against aggression.

(Young India, [Ahmedabad, India], July 2, 1931. As quoted by M. K. Gandhi in his book Non-Violence In Peace And War, pp. 117-120.)

GLOSSARY

Ahimsa, non-violence.

Ashram, a hermitage; a place for study and discipline.

Bhangi, a scavenger.

Charkha, a spinning wheel.

Darshan, sight of a venerated person or deity.

Dharma, duty; religion.

Dhoti, a long piece of cloth used as a lower garment worn by men in India.

Durbar, ruler's court.

Fakir, a Muslim ascetic.

Harijan, a man of God; untouchable.

Hartal, a strike.

Ji, an affix added to names denoting respect, e.g., Gandhiji.

Khaddar, Khadi, hand-woven cloth from hand-spun yarn.

Kisan, peasant.

Lathi, a staff.

Maharaja, king, ruler.

Mahatma, a great soul.

Mahatma-ki-jai, victory to Mahatma.

Maulana, a Muslim divine.

Pandit, pundit, a learned Hindu teacher; a prefix to certain Brahmin family names, e.g., Pandit Nehru.

Raja, king, ruler.

Satyagraha, "a force which is born of truth and love or non-violence"; tenacious clinging to truth; civil or non-violent resistance.

Satyagrahi, one practising satyagraha.

Shastras, religious law books of the Hindus.

Swadeshi, manufacture of one's own country.

Swami, a monk.

Swaraj, self-government; self-rule.

Zamindar, landlord.

Zindabad, long live.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

NEWSPAPERS

Birmingham News (Alabama), 1931 - 1932.

Chicago Daily Tribune, 1929 - 1932.

Mimes-Picayune (New Orleans), 1931 - 1932.

Nashville Tennessean, 1929 - 1932.

New York Herald Tribune, 1930 - 1932.

New York Times, 1929 - 1932.

San Francisco Chronicle, 1929 - 1932.

The Times (London), 1914, 1930.

Washington Post, 1930 - 1932.

PERIODICALS

Annal of American Academy of Political Science.

Asiatic Review.

Blackwood's Magazine.

Business Week.

Catholic World.

Christian Century.

Contemporary Review.

Current History.

Foreign Affairs.

Fortnightly Review.

Literary Digest.

Living Age.

Outlook And Independent.

Quarterly Review.

Review of Reviews.

Saturday Evening Post.

Social Forces.

Sociology and Social Research.

Virginia Quarterly Review.

ARTICLES FROM PERIODICALS

Andrews, C. F. "After Mother India" in New Republic, January 8, 1930, pp. 199-200.

_____. "Gandhi And Indian Reforms" in Yale Review, March 1930, pp. 491-507.

_____. "Gandhi's Mystic Aims In His Mystic March" in New York Times, April 6, 1930, sec. 6, p. 1.

_____. "Heart-Beats In India--Gandhi Again Comes to the Fore In India's Struggle For Freedom" in Asia, March 1930, pp. 196-216.

_____. "President Hoover And The Orient" in New Republic, December 4, 1929, p. 33.

_____. "What Hope For India?" in New Republic, October 22, 1930, pp. 255-257.

_____. "What Next In India?" in Nation, January 1, 1930, pp. 25-27.

Austin, F. Britten. "Will India Blow Up?" in Saturday Evening Post, June 7, 1930.

Barmby, Beatrice. "Again All India Awaits Gandhi's Words" in New York Times, February 8, 1931, sec. 5, p. 6.

Blackett, Sir Basil. "The Economics of Indian Unrest" in Foreign Affairs, October 1929, pp. 44-50.

Bliven, Bruce. "Mr. Gandhi On The Future" in New Republic, January 13, 1932, pp. 206-207.

Blyth, E. M. E. "Mahatma Gandhi: A Study In Destructiveness" in Quarterly Review, April 1931, pp. 388-401.

Brailsford, H. N. "A Journalist vs. A Nation" in New Republic, June 10, 1931, p. 103.

_____. "Gandhi And The Future of India" in New Republic, October 21, 1931, pp. 250-251.

_____. "India Under The Lathi" in New Republic, December 10, 1930, pp. 89-90.

_____. "Justice For India?" in New Republic, November 27, 1929, pp. 8-10.

_____. "The Indian Peasant Strikes Back" in New Republic, December 13, 1930, pp. 183-185.

_____. "The Truce In India" in New Republic, March 25, 1931, pp. 152-154.

_____. "What Next For India?" in New Republic, January 6, 1932, pp. 204-205.

Buck, Philo M. "Is This The Passing of Gandhi?" in Virginia Quarterly Review, July 1926, pp. 390-404.

Campbell, Sir John. "Misrepresented India" in Atlantic Monthly, November 1930, pp. 569-580.

Chatterjee, Ramananda. "The Situation In India" in New Republic, August 20, 1930, pp. 18-19.

_____. "Civil Disobedience In India" in Asia, August 1930, pp. 548-554.

Close, Upton. "Gandhi" in Living Age, June 1929, pp. 278-281.

_____. "Gandhi: The Prophet Who Sways India" in New York Times, January 9, 1930, sec. 5, p. 3.

_____. "What Next For India?" in World's Work, July 1930, pp. 110-112.

Gandhi, Mohandas Karamchand. "Backward And Untouchable Classes" in Annals of The American Academy of Political And Social Science, September 1929, pp. 181-182.

Garrett, G. T. "Deadlock In India" in Asia, July 1930, pp. 471-481.

Garrett, G. T. "Indian India" in Asia, November 1930, pp. 783-787.

Gregg, Richard B. "Has Gandhi Sold Out?" in Nation, July 15, 1931, pp. 75-76.

_____. "The Indian Struggle" in Nation, February 25, 1931, pp. 215-216.

_____. "Will Gandhi Win?" in Nation, June 4, 1930, pp. 661-662.

H. I. R. S. "The Indian Situation" in Blackwood's Magazine, July 1931, pp. 282-288.

Hayden, Ralston. "India In Turmoil" in Current History, June 1930, p. 549.

_____. "The British Empire" in Current History, July 1930, pp. 774-782.

Hossain, Syud. "India And The Labor Government" in New Republic, July 16, 1930, pp. 235-236.

_____. "Mahatma Gandhi" in a series of three articles in Washington Post in 1931, September 15, pp. 1, 5; September 16, pp. 1, 7; and September 17, pp. 1, 4.

_____. "Sources of American News In India" in New Republic, October 22, 1930, p. 260.

Johnston, Charles. "The Destiny of India" in Atlantic Monthly, December 1930, pp. 801-808.

Jones, E. Stanley. "Christianity And Self-Government In India" in Christian Century, September 3, 1930, p. 1060.

Kendall, Patricia. "Gandhi--Mountebank Or Martyr?" in Outlook And The Independent, January 20, 1932, pp. 77-95.

Kirk, William. "Will India Follow Gandhi?" in Sociology And Social Research, March 1930, pp. 342-357.

Lovett, Robert Morss. "Peshawar And Amritsar" in Nation, August 6, 1930, pp. 338-340.

Maynard, Theodore. "The Problem of India" in Catholic World, January 1931, pp. 385-395.

Mayo, Katherine. "Gandhi's March Past" in Atlantic Monthly, September 1930, pp. 327-333.

McConnell, Bishop J. "What Has India To Give The World?" in Christian Century, May 27, 1931, p. 739.

Miller, Herbert Adolphus. "Gandhi's Campaign Begins" in Nation, April 23, 1930, pp. 501-502.

Motvani, K. L. "Propaganda In Mahatma Gandhi's Movement," in Social Forces, June 1930, pp. 574-581.

Muzumdar, Haridas T. "An Indian Replies To Bishop McConnell" in New Republic, August 19, 1931, pp. 1041-1043.

Mussey, Raymond. "Gandhi the Non-Resistant" in Nation, May 21, 1930, pp. 608-610.

Parulekar, N. B. "India: A Nation on Strike" in New Republic, May 28, 1930, pp. 39-40.

Peffer, Nathaniel. "The Twilight of Empire" in Harper's Monthly Magazine, July 1930, pp. 225-231.

Pratt, Frederick G. "The Indian Round Table Conference" in Pacific Affairs, Vol. V, pp. 151-167, 1932.

Ramsden, Lord Olivier of. "The Economic Factor In International Relations--Capitalist Exploitation, Which Creates Resentment In Africa And Asia" in Asia, February 1930, pp. 98-146.

Ratcliffe, S. K. "India And The United States" in Asiatic Review, Vol. XXVI, pp. 65-81, 1930.

Rayfield, Stanley. "A Voice For England" in New Republic, August 20, 1930, pp. 21-22.

Roberts, W. H. "Mahatma Gandhi: His Character and Career" in Current History, June 1930, pp. 495-511.

Sastri, V. S. Srinivasa. "The Report Of The Simon Commission" in Asiatic Review, Vol. XXVI, pp. 648-676. 1930.

Sikes, E. W. "Gandhi Converts A Missionary" in Christian Century, June 11, 1930, pp. 747-748.

Slocombe, George. "The Weapons of Non-Violence" in New York Times, October 22, 1930, pp. 454-456.

Steenkiste, J. "Gandhi And The Catholic Church" in Commonweal, November 25, 1931, pp. 95-96.

Stokes, Newton Phelps. "Marching With Gandhi" in Review of Reviews, June 1930, p. 36.

Strickland, C. F. "The Indian Village And Indian Unrest" in Foreign Affairs, October 1931, pp. 70-80.

_____. "What India Really Needs" in Asiatic Review, Vol. XXVI, pp. 299-323. 1930.

Sundram, Lanka. "India And The Imperial Conference" in a series of two articles, Asiatic Review, April 1930, pp. 369-373; July 1930, pp. iv-viii.

Tendulkar, Ayi. "Farewell To India" in Living Age, February 1932, pp. 489-492.

Thompson, Edward. "America And India" in a series of three articles in The Times (London) in 1930, July 21, pp. 13-14; July 22, pp. 15-16; and July 23, pp. 15-16.

_____. "India--A British Point of View" in New Republic, August 20, 1930, pp. 102-103.

Watson, Blanche. "MacDonald And Gandhi" in New Republic, July 23, 1930, p. 292.

Welby, T. Earle. "Can We Content India" in Fortnightly Review, May 1, 1930, pp. 616-622.

Westerberg, Carl F. "Revolt In The Tropics" in North American Review, March 1931, pp. 257-262.

Wilcockson, Rosamond. "The Lighter Side of Gandhi-ism" in Blackwood's Magazine, December 1930, p. 770.

Williams, L. F. Rushbrook, "India Between The Conferences" in Foreign Affairs, pp. 624-637.

_____. "Indian Unrest And American Opinion" in Asiatic Review, Vol. XXVI, pp. 479-508. 1930.

Zetland, Marquess of. "Self-Government For India" in Foreign Affairs, October 1930, pp. 1-12.

Zetland, Marquess of. "The Report Of The Simon Commission" in Asiatic Review, Vol. XXVI, pp. 629-647. 1930.

_____. "After The Conference" in Foreign Affairs, April 1932, pp. 377-381.

Zimand, Savel. "India Rejects The Simon Report" in New Republic, July 9, 1930, pp. 199-201.

EDITORIALS AND COMMENTARIES

"American Opinion And India" in New Republic, August 20, 1930, p. 5.

"Apostles of Passive Resistance" in Nation, June 25, 1930, p. 723.

"Arrest of Gandhi" in Nashville Tennessean, May 6, 1930, p. 4.

"Britain's Great Test" in New York Times, May 5, 1930, p. 22.

"Deadlock In India" in New York Times, September 8, 1930, p. 20.

"Doubts And Difficulties In India" in Round Table, Vol. XXI, pp. 821-835.

"Fires of India Stirred By Commission Report" in New York Times, June 29, 1930, sec. 3, p. 3.

"Gandhi Before Pilate" in Christian Century, April 16, 1930, pp. 488-490.

"Gandhi In Jail" in Christian Century, May 2, 1930, p. 647.

"Gandhi's Place In The Sun" in New York Times, August 4, 1931, p. 20.

"Great Britain All Set For India" in Chicago Daily Tribune, May 3, 1930, p. 10.

"Gandhi The Problem" in San Francisco Chronicle, January 4, 1932, p. 10.

"India And Britain Meet" in Nation, November 19, 1930, pp. 543-544.

"India: Conference or Intransigence" in Round Table, Vol. XXI, pp. 59-69.

"India: Constitution or Chaos" in Round Table, Vol. XXI, pp. 239-273.

"India In American Eyes" in The Times (London), July 21, 1930, p. 13.

"India: Ordinances And Reforms" in Round Table, Vol. XXII, pp. 574-593.

"India: The Struggle With Congress" in Round Table, Vol. XXII, pp. 322-342.

"Indians Agree To Disagree" in San Francisco Chronicle, October 9, 1931, p. 10.

"Indian Salt And Indian Taxes" in New York Times, April 16, 1930, p. 28.

"Indian Troubles" in Review of Reviews, July 1930, pp. 66-67.

"Ku Kluxism At Ohio State" in New Republic, June 10, 1931, p. 113.

"Let India Go" in Nation, May 14, 1930, p. 561.

"MacDonald's First Year" in New Republic, June 18, 1930, p. 112.

"Mr. Churchill Runs Amuck" in Nation, September 3, 1930, p. 234.

"Mr. MacDonald And India" in New York Times, p. 22.

"Mr. MacDonald's Sea of Troubles" in New York Times, May 13, 1930, p. 28.

"New HopeFFor India" in New Republic, March 18, 1931, p. 113.

"Present In Spirit" in New York Times, September 13, 1930, p. 14.

"Progress In India" in Nation, March 18, 1931, pp. 289-290.

"Prospects For India" in New York Times, November 22, 1930, p. 16.

"Ramsay MacDonald And India" in Nation, June 11, 1930, p. 669.

"Question of Gandhi's Visit To United States" in New Republic, October 21, 1931, p. 244.

"Realities In India" in Nation, July 30, 1930, pp. 114-115.

"Realities In India" in New York Times, May 11, 1930, sec. 3, p. 4.

"Round-Table Manoeuvers" in New York Times, November 11, 1931, p. 22.

"Salt And Insurrection" in Chicago Daily Tribune, May 18, 1930, Part I, p. 14.

"Six Men Who Will Play Vital Roles In The Affairs of 1932" in New York Times, January 3, 1932, sec. 9, p. 1.

"Temporizing With India" in New Republic, July 2, 1930, pp. 165-166.

"The Alternatives In India" in Nation, May 7, 1930, pp. 312-313.

"The Army In India" in New York Times, May 19, 1930, p. 22.

"The British In India" in Chicago Daily Tribune, May 6, 1930, p. 14.

"The Chance In India" in New Republic, November 19, 1930, pp. 6-7.

"The Future of India" in Round Table, Vol. XXII, pp. 705-720.

"The Heart of Indian Problem" in New Republic, September 3, 1930, pp. 58-59.

"The Indian Crisis" in Nashville Tennessean, May 14, 1930, p. 4.

"The Indian Conference" in Nation, January 28, 1931, pp. 89-90.

"The Man In A Cloth" in Commonweal, September 30, 1931, pp. 511-512.

"The Results of The Round Table Conference" in Round Table, Vol. XXII, pp. 282-293. 1932.

"The Second Gandhi Campaign" in New York Times, May 10, 1930, p. 20.

"The Temper of India" in Nation, January 8, 1930, p. 29.

"What India Wants?" in New Republic, January 8, 1930, pp. 184-185.

BOOKS

A British-India Merchant. India On The Brink. P. S. King and Son, Ltd. London, 1931.

Andrews, Charles Freer. India And The Simon Report. The Macmillan Company. New York, 1930.

Andrews, Charles Freer (ed.). Mahatma Gandhi His Own Story. The Macmillan Company. New York, 1930.

Andrews, Charles Freer. Mahatma Gandhi's Ideas. The Macmillan Company. New York, 1930.

Bernays, Robert. Naked Faquir. Henry Holt and Company New York, 1932.

Brailsford, H. N. Rebel India. New Republic, Inc. New York, 1931.

Brinton, Clarence Crane. The United States And Britain. Harvard University Press. Cambridge, 1945.

Buck, Oscar MacMillan. India Looks To Her Future. New York Friendship Press. New York, 1930.

Churchill, Winston S. India. Thornton Butterworth, Ltd. London, 1931.

Clark, Alden H. India on The March. Missionary Education Movement. New York, 1922.

Close, Upton. The Revolt of Asia. G. P. Putnam's Sons. New York, 1928.

Coatman, John. India: The Road To Self-Government. George Allen And Unwin Ltd. London, 1941.

Cumming, Sir John (ed.). Political India 1832-1932. Oxford University Press. London, 1932.

Das, Taraknath. India In World Politics. B. W. Huebsch, Inc. New York, 1923.

Das, Frieda Mathilda. Gandhi: A Portrait From Life. The Vanguard Press. New York, 1931.

Durant, William James. The Case For India. Simon and Schuster. New York, 1930.

Ericson, Eston Everett. India In Revolution. University of North Carolina. Chapel Hill, 1937.

Fisher, Frederick B. That Strange Little Brown Man Gandhi Ray Long and Richard R. Smith, Inc. New York, 1932.

Gandhi, Mohandas Karamchand. Non-Violence In Peace And War. Navajivan Publishing House. 2 vols. Ahmedabad, 1949.

Gandhi, Mohandas Karamchand. Sermon On The Sea. Edited by Haridas T. Muzumdar. Universal Publishing Company. Chicago, 1924.

Gandhi, Mohandas Karamchand. Young India (1924-1926). The Viking Press. New York, XCMXXVII.

Gregg, Richard B. Gandhism Versus Socialism. The John Day Company. New York, 1932.

Hogg, Dorothy. The Moral Challenge of Gandhi. Kitah Mahal. Allababad, 1946.

Holmes, John Haynes. My Gandhi. Harper and Brothers Publishers. New York, 1953.

Hoyland, John S. They Saw Gandhi. Fellowship Publications. New York, 1947.

Hull, William I. India's Political Crisis. The John Hopkins Press. New York, 1930.

Jones, E. Stanley. Mahatma Gandhi. Abingdon-Cokesbury Press. New York,1949.

Jones, Marc Edmund. Gandhi Lives. David McKay Company. Philadelphia, 1948.

Manshardt, Clifford. The Terrible Week. Hirsdale, 1948.

Jack, Homer A. (ed.). The Wit And Wisdom of Gandhi. The Beacon Press. Boston, 1951.

Maurer, Herrymon. Great Soul. Doubleday And Company. Garden City, 1948.

Meston, Lord. Nationhood For India. The Institute of Politics. New Haven, 1931.

Minney, R. J. The Future of India. E. P. Dutton And Company. New York, 1929.

Muzumdar, Haridas T. Gandhi Versus The Empire. Universal Publishing Company. New York, 1932.

Muzumdar, Haridas T. Gandhi The Apostle. Universal Publishing Company. Chicago. 1923.

Osburn, Arthur Carr. Must England Lose India? Alfred A. Knopf. New York, 1930.

Oxnam, Garfield Bromley. Personalities In Social Reform. Abingdon Cokesbury Press. New York, 1950.

Rolland, Romain. Mahatma Gandhi. The Century Company. New York, 1924.

Sheean, Vincent. Lead Kindly Light. Random House. New York, 1949.

_____. Mahatma Gandhi. Alfred A. Knopf. New York, 1955.

Sunderland, Jabez B. India In Bondage. Lewis Copeland Company. New York, 1929.

Tendulkar, D. G. Mahatma. Published by Vithalbhai K. Jhaveri and D. G. Tendulkar. Vol. 3 (1930-1934). Bombay, 1952.

Wallbank, T. Walter. India: a survey of the heritage and growth of Indian nationalism. Henry Holt and Company. New York, 1948.

Woolcott, J. E. India on Trial. Macmillan and Co., Lmt. London, 1929.

PAMPHLETS

India. Foreign Policy Association. New York, 1930.

India. Foreign Policy Association. New York, 1931.

Singh, Anup. India--facts in brief. National Committee For India's Freedom. Washington, D. C., n.d.

Some American Opinions On The Indian Empire. T. Fisher Unwin Ltd. London, n.d.

UNITED STATES CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

Volume 58, Part 7, 66th Congress, 1st Session, Senate, October 8, 1919, pp. 6607-6610.

Volume 59, Part 4, 66th Congress, 2nd Session, February 27, 1920, pp. 3569-3570.

Volume 72, Part 2, 71st Congress, 2nd Session, January 6, 1930, p. 1096.

DOCUMENTS

Senator Blaine Papers, Documents Section, Wisconsin State Historical Society.

Approved

F. H. Harrington