



WHO SHOULD RULE INDIA ?

a score of English civilians in these Provinces who could read unaided, with fair accuracy and rapidly, even a short article in a vernacular newspaper, or a short letter written in the vernacular : and those who are in the habit of doing this, or could do it with any sense of ease or pleasure, could be counted on the fingers of one hand."

Such are the men who fill the lucrative offices of India, and who rule the land because they are so much better fitted to do so than are the educated Indians !

V

We are often told, and told with much assurance, that the interests of the Indian people are safe, because they are carefully guarded by the British Parliament, especially by the House of Commons, that splendid group of 650 men representing the best intelligence and character of the British Isles. Of course such a body of men do not, will not and cannot neglect so grave a responsibility, so important a part of the Empire, as India, or fail to see that the Indian people are ruled honorably, efficiently and justly.

This sounds assuring. But what are the facts ? Does Parliament give careful attention



INDIA, AMERICA AND WORLD BROTHERHOOD

to India, or watchfully guard her rights? Indeed do the majority of the members of Parliament know anything more about India than a schoolboy, or pay any attention at all to Indian affairs, unless there is an insurrection or some other form of serious trouble there? How can they? India is so far away, and they are so overwhelmed with matters nearer home that must be attended to! When, at the fag end of a parliamentary session, a day is announced for discussion of Indian affairs, what happens? It is the signal for everybody to be absent who can possibly find an excuse. Says Mr. Ramsay Mac Donald in his book, "The Government of India" (pp. 43 and 51): "It must be admitted that Parliament has not been a just and watchful steward of India. It holds no debates on Indian questions; its seats are empty when it has its annual saunter through the Indian Budget... Very few members of Parliament have any real knowledge of Indian affairs, and there is a deserted House of Commons when the Indian Budget is under consideration." Writes Mr. Alfred Kinnear, M. P., "I recall thirty Indian Budget nights in the House of Commons. Scarcely one of the number drew an audience of fifty members—one eleventh



WHO SHOULD RULE INDIA?

part of the membership." At a recent budget debate, when a matter of very great importance was up for discussion, there were present, by count, fourteen persons,—thirteen Liberals and one Tory. At another there were twenty present; at another, there were three on the Tory side and one on the Liberal. This shows how the great and honored (and 6,000 miles distant) British Parliament carefully guards the interests of the 320,000,000 people of India.

Let a single fact of a different nature be cited, which proves in a tragic manner how closely in touch with Indian affairs the British Parliament is. On the 19th of April, 1919, the shocking Amritsar massacre took place, in which British soldiers under command of a British General attacked a peaceful religious assembly in a public park, and shot down in cold blood (killing or wounding) more than 1,000 unarmed men, women and children. Did the British Parliament the very next day ring with hot protest and condemnation of the horrible transaction? Not exactly! It was more than seven months before the matter was even mentioned in Parliament. More amazing than that! Can it be believed? More than seven months elapsed after the horrible deed was done before Parliament *even knew*



INDIA, AMERICA AND WORLD BROTHERHOOD

what had happened! This makes entirely clear how well Parliament guards and watches over and protects India.

VI

I do not mean to convey the impression that I believe any other foreign nation would govern India better than England is doing. Possibly no other would govern it as well. But no nation in the world can rule another without awful injustice. Ruling a people without their consent is the deepest kind of injustice, and, in the nature of the case, out of it flow injustices and wrongs innumerable. Rob a nation or a man of liberty and every other safeguard is gone.

In my own extensive travels in India I found it common for Englishmen in all parts (there were of course honorable exceptions) to speak of and to treat the people of the country, no matter how intelligent or well educated or of how high character they might be, distinctly as inferiors. In travelling on the railways they were compelled to occupy inferior cars, by themselves. At the stations they must either remain out of doors or crowd into little rooms frequently hardly fit for cattle. I often heard them called "niggers". Not unfrequent-



WHO SHOULD RULE INDIA ?

ly I witnessed brutal treatment of them. In a large Bombay hotel I saw an English official belabor his servant unmercifully with his thick walking-stick, for some trivial offence—his servant, a fine looking, educated native, seemingly quite the equal of his master in intellectual ability, and infinitely his superior in all the qualities of a gentleman. I was constantly reminded of the way in which, in the days of American slavery, masters in the South (some masters) treated their slaves. Nor is all this strange; the spirit which holds a nation in subjection and that which holds individuals in bondage is the same spirit.

Says Professor Paul S. Reinsch in his work on "Colonial Government":—"The essential thought in dealing with native societies should be that they must on no account be deprived of their morale, and of their feeling of responsibility for their own destiny." Here England has failed absolutely and disastrously in her treatment of the Indian people. She has taken their destiny into her own hands. Politically she rules them wholly. Financially and industrially they feel that they are constantly at her mercy. The influence is to break their spirits. There is no incentive for ambition. Young men, no matter what their



INDIA, AMERICA AND WORLD BROTHERHOOD

talents or education, have little or nothing to look forward to. A situation more depressing it is hard to conceive. England tries to justify herself by the claim that she can rule the Indian people better than they can rule themselves. But who should be the judge? This is the claim of tyranny the world over.

I am not disposed to lay to the charge of England base motives, other than selfishness, greed of wealth, greed of power, and lack of regard for the rights of other nations. But these have led to consequences serious enough to give pause to all but the most foolhardy.

VII

The surest way to destroy the physical strength of a man is to deprive him of the possibility of physical exercise. The most brilliant minds may be reduced to dullness, and the most powerful to weakness, by being deprived of opportunities for activity. Just so, there is no other way known so effectually to weaken and degrade a people as to deprive them of liberty and the power of self-direction. It is false to say that any people can govern another civilized people better than that other can govern itself. The highest end of government is not law; it is not even order and peace.



WHO SHOULD RULE INDIA ?

These may be present under the most monstrous tyranny. The highest purpose of government is the creation of the capacity for self-government. The sufficient condemnation of all vassalage and of all government of weaker peoples by stronger is, that thus the weaker peoples are deprived of their right to plan for themselves, and thus to work out their own self-development.

This is something which the better minds of India feel very deeply. Especially is it felt by ambitious, earnest, educated young men, who want to make the most of their lives, who desire to do something for their communities and their country, and to become leaders in movements for social, industrial, educational, political and other reforms.

On every hand such young men are met by the fact that neither they nor the people are free. They are for ever under foreign masters. If they make plans for public improvements, their plans can come to nothing without the assent and co-operation of the Government, because it has all power. The very fact that the plans are initiated and carried on by Indians—by “natives,” is very likely to be regarded as a sufficient reason why the Government should ignore or oppose them.



INDIA, AMERICA AND WORLD BROTHERHOOD

The Government wants it understood that it never follows "native" lead, it never welcomes, or, if it can help it, even tolerates, native initiative. That would lower its dignity. That would destroy its "prestige." The government stands on the lofty height not only of supreme power, but of supreme wisdom, and it cannot stoop to be instructed or directed, even to have suggestions made to it, by the inferior people of the land, who of course do not know what is good for them or what the country requires.

Thus initiative on the part of the people is chilled and killed. They soon learn to say, "What is the use?" Educated young men, who, in free lands where the people have a voice, would look forward to influential public life, to careers of public usefulness and service, to doing something of value for their country, in India have little or no such possibility before them. They have no country. The English rule it, monopolize it, treat the Indians as strangers and foreigners in it. King George calls it, "My Indian Empire." And when Indians presume to interest themselves in public matters and make suggestions as to reforms and improvements which in any way touch politics, they at once find themselves in



WHO SHOULD RULE INDIA ?

danger of being arrested and sent to prison as pestilent "agitators" and "seditionists"; or if they escape that, then they are likely either to be ignored, receiving no co-operation and no encouragement from the superior powers, or else they get the virtual reply : "Mind your own business. Who are you, that you presume to teach us how to manage this country ?" Sir Henry Cotton tells us that the British policy in India has always been to discourage, and so far as possible to suppress, native ability and native initiative. He tells us of hearing Sir William Harcourt say in a speech in the House of Commons : "The Government of India have never encouraged men of ability and force of character. They have always hated and discouraged independent and original talent, and have always loved and promoted docile and unpretending mediocrity. This policy they have inherited from the Roman Tarquinius Superbus. Although they have not actually 'cut off the heads' of the 'tall poppies,' they have taken other and more merciful means of 'removing' any persons of dangerous political eminence."†

† "Indian and Home Memories". Chapter XXI.



INDIA, AMERICA AND WORLD BROTHERHOOD

VIII

I shall never forget an experience I once had in Poona. I was there attending the session of the Indian National Congress. One afternoon I went out for a stroll with a company of young men who were students in the Ferguson College. After walking an hour or so we all sat down under a great tree for a long talk. They were keen-minded, earnest fellows, all of them desirous of making something worth while of their lives, and all ambitious to serve their country. But in a land where everything was in the hands of foreign masters, how could they do either? If, ignoring their country's needs and forgetting her sorrows, they would consent to be docile servants of their alien rulers, shaping their education so as to fit themselves for employment as clerks, accountants and subordinate helpers of one kind or another in the offices of the Government or of British merchants, then places would be opened for them where they could gain at least a meagre living, with the hope of some slight advancement later, and thus their paths for the future would probably be fairly smooth.

But if, standing on their own feet as men, they determined to shape for themselves in-



WHO SHOULD RULE INDIA ?

dependent careers, and to make their lives of real service to the land they loved,—what was there for them? This was the pathetic, the tragic question, asked by all those young men, again and again and again. The government had many low positions—too low to be accepted by Englishmen—to offer them, and a very few fairly high ones. But all persons permitted to occupy these positions must give up their patriotism and their manhood, keep out of politics, be loyal to the alien Government, that is, must not criticise it or advocate any reforms, and be dumb and docile servants and satellites of their British lords. Could these earnest, patriotic, splendid young sons of India, of the holy “Mother” whom they loved and worshipped, stoop to this humiliation and this shame?

Alas! that afternoon I realized as I never had done before how bitter, bitter a thing it is for educated young men, in whose breasts burn the fires of a patriotism as true and as holy as was ever felt by Englishman or American, to know that they have no country, to realize that their country, as dear to them as their lives, has been taken by force, and is held in subjection by the sword of the foreigner!



INDIA, AMERICA AND WORLD BROTHERHOOD

IX

This Poona experience suggests that one of the great evils of British rule in India is its influence in crushing out the native genius of the Indian people,—thus robbing not only India but also mankind of something very precious. There is nothing in the world that is of higher value, and therefore that should be more sedulously guarded than genius—the peculiar genius of nations and of races; and there is nothing which when destroyed is a more serious or a more irreparable loss.

Who can estimate how great would have been the disaster to humanity, if, by foreign domination or otherwise, the genius of Greece had been cut off before it reached its splendid flowering in art and literature?

I will not compare the genius of India with that of Greece, although some eminent scholars both in Europe and America, have done so. But I will say, what no one will deny, that no nation in Asia has shown in the past so rich and splendid intellectual and spiritual genius as India has manifested in many forms and throughout many centuries. That genius should be preserved, fostered, and developed, not only for the sake of the Indian people, but



WHO SHOULD RULE INDIA?

for mankind's sake, for civilization's sake, as a precious contribution to the world's higher life.

How can this be done? What is the indispensable condition of the efflorescence, nay of the very existence of genius anywhere? It is freedom. But India is not free. This is her calamity; it is also the world's calamity. So long as she continues to be humiliated, disgraced, crippled, emasculated by being held in bondage to a foreign power, by being robbed of her proper place among the nations, by being deprived of the right to direct herself and shape her own career, it will be impossible, in the very nature of things, for her genius to rise to its best, or anything like its best, and thus for her to make that important intellectual and spiritual contribution to the world's civilization that her past history gives the world the right to expect and demand. Thus we see that India's freedom is a matter of concern not to herself alone, but to mankind. Her bondage is a world-disaster—a crime against the world's higher life.

X

One thought more before I conclude this chapter.



INDIA, AMERICA AND WORLD BROTHERHOOD

Whenever the right of the Indian people to rule themselves is urged upon Englishmen, whether in India or in England, the reply likely to be made is, Yes, what you say is probably theoretically right. But you know we must be practical. Of course India is not ready for self rule now: she may be by and by but not for a very long time. Indeed we have ultimate self-government for her in mind, and are educating her for it. That is what the New Reform Scheme (the New Government of India Act) of 1919 means. But we must "go slow," "very slow"! We must proceed safely; we must take no false steps. To allow her to attempt to govern herself before she is fully fitted for it—before we have got her fully trained—would be very disastrous.

I discuss this subject to some extent in other chapters, but I wish here to consider one aspect of it by quoting from two eminent students of history and government some brief observations which I think some Indians and perhaps some Englishmen may be glad to have called to their attention. They present reasons for believing that the only way to learn to swim is to go into the water.



WHO SHOULD RULE INDIA ?

XI

The first quotation is from the brilliant and eminent German-American statesman, Carl Schurz. Mr. Schurz was a General in the Union army during the American Civil War, a member of the Cabinet of President Cleveland (Secretary of the Interior), and for many years one of the nation's most honored and influential writers and public leaders.

In connection with his office of Secretary of the Interior he had large experience with the immigrants who at that time were coming to America in great numbers from lands of the Old World where they had been given no opportunities for self-government. How could they be made valuable citizens in a democracy—a nation where there was self rule? In his "Reminiscences" (Vol. II, pp. 77—80) he says: "One of the most interesting experiences of my life was the observation of the educational influence exercised upon men by the actual practice of self-government." Persons attempting to exercise self-government for the first time, he declares, "may do it somewhat clumsily in the beginning and make grievous mistakes, but these very mistakes, with their disagreeable consequences, will serve to sharpen



INDIA, AMERICA AND WORLD BROTHERHOOD

the wits of those who desire to learn—which every person of average intelligence who feels himself responsible for his own interests desires to do. In other words, practice upon one's own responsibility is the best if not the only school of self-government. What is sometimes called the art of self-government is not learned by masses of people theoretically, nor even by the mere presentation of other people's experiences by way of instructive example. Practice is the only really effective teacher. Other methods of instruction will rather retard, if not altogether prevent, the development of the self-governing capacity, because they will serve to weaken the sense of responsibility and self-reliance. This is why there is not any instance in history of a people having been successfully taught to govern themselves by a tutelary power acting upon the principle that its wards should not be given the power of self-government until they had shown themselves fit for it. Such teaching of self-government by a superior authority is but seldom undertaken in good faith, the teacher usually not wishing to relinquish his power. But even when it is undertaken in good faith, the teacher is usually disinclined to recognize at any time that the pupil is able



WHO SHOULD RULE INDIA ?

to stand on his own feet, and this for apparently good reasons ; for the pupil will either have no chance to demonstrate his capacity, or if he be permitted to experiment on a limited scale, he will, of course, make mistakes, and these mistakes will serve as proofs of his incapacity, while in fact the freedom to make mistakes and to suffer from their consequences is the very school from which he might receive the most effective instruction..." "It is simply impossible to overestimate the importance of self-government as an educator."

XII

The other quotation I wish to make, is from the American historian and scholar, Charles Francis Adams. Speaking before the American Historical Association in 1901, this man of candour and of large learning said : "I submit that there is not an instance in all recorded history, from the earliest times until now, where a so-called inferior race or community has been elevated in its character, or made self-sustaining or self-governing, or even put on the way to that result, through a condition of dependency or tutelage. I might, without much danger, assert that the condition of dependency, even for communities of the same



INDIA, AMERICA AND WORLD BROTHERHOOD

race and blood, always exercises an emasculating and deteriorating influence. I would undertake, if called upon, to show that this rule is invariable—that from the inherent and fundamental conditions of human nature, it has known, and can know, no exceptions. This truth I could demonstrate from almost innumerable examples.”

And Mr. Adams proceeded to make a direct application of this truth to India and declared in the most unequivocal terms that notwithstanding any or all material or other improvements made in the country by the British during the three hundred years and more since the East India Company began its exploitation and conquest of the land, British rule had been an absolute failure as a means for increasing the capacity or fitness of the Indian people for self-government,—it had not increased that capacity or that fitness in the slightest degree; but on the contrary it had actually lessened it. And he held that there was no ground for believing that it would or could ever have any other effect. It was not by subjection or tutelage to another nation—no matter what that nation might be,—but by the very opposite, by freedom, by actual practice of self-government, by experience, by



WHO SHOULD RULE INDIA ?

making mistakes and learning wisdom from the same—it was by this method and no other that all capacity for self-government has been obtained in the past and must be obtained forever. It was by this method that India learned 3,000 years ago to rule herself, and had continued one of the great self-ruling nations of the world until Great Britain robbed her of her nationhood. And what she needs now is simply “hands off” on the part of her foreign conqueror, so that her native capacity for self-rule, which Mr. Adams held has been weakened by British dominance, but by no means destroyed, may again, as in the past, come into activity and therefore into growth, normal development and permanent strength.



CHAPTER III

WHO SHOULD RULE INDIA? (*Contd.*)

II

ONE of the arguments oftenest used in justification of British rule in India, is the large number of nationalities, peoples and tribes found there, and especially the large number of languages spoken. One British writer urges the need of British rule by telling us that there are 130 different languages in India, another says 170, another 185; and by including minute variations and dialects the number has been even swelled to more than 200.

But why do these numbers (or why should numbers even ten times as great?) make it necessary for the land to be ruled by foreigners and strangers? The need would seem to be just the opposite. Are men born and reared in distant countries, who are without knowledge of these various Indian peoples, who are ignor-



WHO SHOULD RULE INDIA ?

ant of their institutions, customs and needs, and who are unable to speak one of their languages, better fitted to govern them—govern them wisely and safely—than are their own intelligent and trusted leaders, born and educated among them, having life-long knowledge of their institutions, habits and wants and able to speak their tongues? Such a claim is amazing. And yet we hear it constantly made by the British, and repeated parrot-like in America.

I

The existence of many languages in India is no more an argument against Home Rule there, and no more a proof of the need of foreign rule than is the existence of many languages in other countries than India a proof that those countries should be ruled by foreigners. Turn from India to Russia.

During all her later history Russia has had more languages, and also more races and tribes and nationalities, than India, yet nobody has contended that therefore Russia was incapable of self-government and ought to have been conquered and held in subjection by a foreign power.

As a fact the United States of America



INDIA, AMERICA AND WORLD BROTHERHOOD

has more languages and more nationalities than India. In order to get any such numbers of Indian tongues as we are told that India possesses, there have to be included the languages and dialects of all the small and unimportant hill and mountain and jungle tribes that live in remote and often almost inaccessible places,—similar to the small tribes of our American Red Indians. In the United States we have people from all the nations of South and Central America, from all the nations of Europe, from nearly or quite all those of Asia, Africa and the principal islands of the sea. Now count the languages of all these, and to them add the tongues spoken by our own Red Indian tribes, and it is easy to understand the truth of the statement that we have more languages in this country than has India. But does anybody believe it necessary, on this account, for some nation beyond the sea, say Japan or Russia or France or England, to conquer and govern us ?

Canada would hardly like to have the claim made that it is unfit to govern itself because of its many languages, nationalities and religions. Yet according to recent statistics Canada has 178 languages, 53 nationalities, and 79 religious faiths. That is to say, con-



WHO SHOULD RULE INDIA ?

sidering the number of its population, Canada has a greater diversity of languages (as well as nationalities and religions) than has India. Yet Canada rules itself and has done so for much more than half a century with great efficiency.

The great state of Bengal in India has more than 50,000,000 population, and one main language, with a fine literature. Why then should not Bengal have Home Rule? Most of the other great Indian states have a single main language, of a high order, which is the vernacular of nearly the entire population. Why should not all these great states—states equal in size and population to France and England and Italy, and possessed of a civilization hardly less high—why should not they all have self rule?

Why do not Englishmen, who urge that India is unable to govern itself and must be ruled by the British because of its diversity of tongues and peoples, apply the same principle to their own empire as a whole? The British Empire contains all the diversities of every kind that are found in India, and at least two or three times as many more. Do Englishmen think that therefore they are unfit to rule their Empire, and that it ought to be ruled by some outside power?



INDIA, AMERICA AND WORLD BROTHERHOOD

The fact is, this whole argument regarding India is hollow, is something devised in order to furnish seeming justification for Great Britain's remaining in a country where, for selfish reasons, she wants to remain, but where she has no right to be. It is strange that any sane mind can fail to see instantly that the greater the number of peoples and languages in India (or in any other country) the stronger becomes the reason why it should be ruled not by foreigners but by its *own sons*, who know most about these languages and peoples.

II

The argument is made by many Englishmen that these diversities of language, race, and so forth, in India, destroy her *unity*, make it incorrect to think or speak of India as *one*, or as a *nation* at all: and for *this* reason she cannot govern herself.

This argument, which is accepted as true by many who do not know India, has been answered many times over, and with great thoroughness, by Indian scholars, who have shown that, notwithstanding all the diversities that have been mentioned, and deep down below them all, India is one, profoundly one,—that as a fact she has a unity older and more



WHO SHOULD RULE INDIA?

fundamental than that of any other country or people or nation in the world with the possible exception of China. My space does not allow me to repeat the able and conclusive arguments and arrays of facts presented by these scholars in support of this contention. Nor perhaps is it necessary.

III

I will, however, call attention to an important matter in this connection; and that is, the very widespread *belief in India* that the *British deny Indian unity largely because they do not want India to have unity* (their denial being based on their wish). Certain it is, that nearly everywhere, particularly among the more intelligent classes, the feeling exists that there is no such other great foe to Indian unity as the British Government, that nothing else has done or is doing so much to prevent it, that throughout their whole career in India the British have fostered differences between the different races and between the different religions, particularly between Hindus and Mohammedans,—fearing the strength that comes from unity, and desiring to promote the weakness that comes from division,—on the old Roman principle of *divide et impera* (do all



INDIA, AMERICA AND WORLD BROTHERHOOD

you can to divide peoples whom you desire to rule, thus you can more easily control them). Scores of illustrations could easily be pointed out of this constant policy practised by the British rulers of the land, of fostering divisions and hindering unity so as to render their task easier of holding the people in subjection. And then they solemnly declare to the world that one of the strong reasons why they feel it their duty to remain in India is that the Indian people are so much divided: their unfortunate and regrettable lack of unity renders it absolutely necessary for them to be ruled by some foreign power, and if by any, of course by Britain.

IV

Another somewhat closely related argument much used by Englishmen, to justify their retention of India, is the *danger* to the *Indian people* which they declare would be involved in *their leaving*,—the danger of “*universal chaos, anarchy and bloodshed*.” Travelling in India one finds British officials on every hand saying to him: “If we withdrew to-morrow India would run with blood from the Himalayas to Cape Comorin.” Travelling in England one finds Englishmen saying the same.



WHO SHOULD RULE INDIA ?

But think what such statements mean. Think what a condemnation of British rule they really are. Think what a confession there is involved in them of the failure of that rule ! The British have been in India 160 years. That is, for such a period of time they have been governing a great civilized people who for 3,000 years had ruled themselves and had carried on great and well regulated empires ; and now after this period of British domination these people have become so emasculated, demoralized and degraded that if left to themselves they will at once fly at one another's throats !

If the situation in India is like that, one would think the British would hide it, cover it up, blush with shame at the thought of it, be the last persons in the world to mention it.

And yet as a fact they declare it true and blazon it to the world.

Such statements as I have mentioned are made in Parliament. The Master of Elibank is reported as declaring, without a blush, in a speech on the budget :—"For us to abandon India would be in effect to hand her over to the most frightful anarchy." Sir Charles Elliott, a high British-Indian official, has published an article in the *Imperial Review* in which he goes



INDIA, AMERICA AND WORLD BROTHERHOOD

into particulars and paints the following hair-raising picture (*horresco referens!*): "If we English abandoned India to-morrow, no organized government would be formed. There would follow, not a despotism under Surendranath Bannerjea, or any other leader of the advanced party, not a democratic government of elected representatives of Bengali Baboos or Mahratta Brahmins, but a prompt invasion from Afghanistan in the north-west and Nepal in the north, and the wild tribes on the frontier of Assam in the north-east. The Princes of the Native States, with their well-trained armies, would re-commence their old internecine quarrels and annex adjoining territory, and there would be an orgy of murder and rapine."

This kind of thing is talked so much and written so much by the British that three quarters of the world believes it. I find it on all hands accepted as true in America. Even a man as intelligent as President Roosevelt declared in a public address:—"If English control were withdrawn from India the whole peninsula would become a chaos of bloodshed and violence; all the weaker peoples, and the most industrious and law-abiding, would be plundered and forced to submit to indescribable



WHO SHOULD RULE INDIA ?

wrong and oppression, and the only beneficiaries among the natives would be the lawless, violent and bloodthirsty."

The amazing, the almost unbelievable thing is, that all this is not only declared to be true, but is put forth as a reason why England should still hold India,—instead of being seen to be, if true, a most powerful and unanswerable proof, that England should never have gone to India at all; that her rule there, if it has resulted in such conditions as these, has been nothing less than a calamity and a crime; and that the only hope for India is for the British to leave.

V

Of course if the British left *suddenly*—left "*to-morrow*," as the scare-writers like to put it—without making provision for successors, or for any government at all to take their place, the situation would undoubtedly be bad; unquestionably for a time there would be more or less chaos and anarchy; exactly as there would be in New York or London if everybody who had had experience in the government of those cities should suddenly leave without any provision having been made for any persons to take their places; or exactly as there



INDIA, AMERICA AND WORLD BROTHERHOOD

would be in any nation if everybody who had ever had experience in managing affairs, national, state, or local, should "to-morrow" drop everything and sail from the country.

Suppose England had been ruled for a century and a half by the Russians or the Germans, with every executive office and position of importance and power kept strictly in the hands of the ruling nation, and with nobody trained to succeed them : and then suppose that they suddenly left, would not there be confusion and anarchy and not a little fighting and bloodshed for a time in England ? But would that be a reason why the Germans or the Russians ought to remain permanently in control of England ; or, would it be a proof that the English people were not fit to rule themselves if given a chance ?

Why do the English make this silly scare-talk, this wholly uncalled for scare-supposition, about the danger to India if the British left "*suddenly*," left "*to-morrow*" ? Have the Indian people ever asked them to leave to-morrow or suddenly, or without careful and ample provision for the government to be carried on by competent Indians ? No ! India has never asked or desired anything of the kind. All pretence that she has is a "bugaboo," to blind



WHO SHOULD RULE INDIA ?

men's eyes to the real situation, and to make the world believe that the Indians are wild, only half civilized, dangerous fanatics, who are demanding what is utterly unreasonable as well as unjust, and who would ruin everything, themselves included, unless they were controlled by the wise British.

VI

As a fact, what India has really asked in the past and is asking to-day is something wholly sane and practicable, as well as wholly just. It is, first, that the British shall definitely and honestly promise to withdraw from India as soon as provision can be made for a competent and stable Indian government to take their place; and then, secondly, that they shall begin at once in good faith to prepare the way for such a government by giving to competent Indians experience—adequate experience—in every line of government activity and responsibility. This is reasonable, this is right, this is fair, this is the least that India can ask in justice to herself, and it is what England should have granted to her long ago.

If it is objected that competent Indians cannot be found, the answer is, they can be found if sought for. There is no lack of Indians



INDIA, AMERICA AND WORLD BROTHERHOOD

capable of filling and filling well absolutely every place of official responsibility from lowest to highest, in village, city, province and nation, if only they are allowed to receive training and experience. Given experience, India can govern herself (if the object of government in India is permitted to be the good of the Indian people, and not the enrichment and prestige of England) not only as well as, but far better than, England has ever governed her, and far better than any foreign power ever can govern her.

How long is India willing to give the British to make preparation for leaving—to train the Indian people by practical experience to carry on their own government? A few years ago she would cheerfully have said twenty years. At one time the Indian National Congress suggested ten or fifteen years. Now probably no one would consent to so long a time. To-day not a few careful and trusted Indian leaders say, two or three years are ample. Others are willing to allow five, and others even ten. If Great Britain would say to India clearly and unequivocally, "We will begin to-morrow putting more and more responsibility and power into your hands, thus in good faith training you by



WHO SHOULD RULE INDIA ?

steadily increasing your practical experience for self rule, and at the end of ten years (even so long a delay as that) we will give you self-rule in some form,—either that of absolute independence, or, that of a status similar to the dominion status of Canada and Australia within the British Empire or Commonwealth, as you yourselves at that time shall elect,”—if Great Britain would definitely and in good faith say that, does any one who knows India well and how patient and reasonable and conciliatory she has always been, doubt for a moment what her answer would be ?

While India demands for herself that freedom to manage her own affairs and to shape her own career in the world, which is the right of every nation, all her conduct in the past shows that she desires to be in every way fair and just to the British government, and also to all Englishmen—merchants and others—who are doing business in the country.

Here, there seems to be a wide-spread misunderstanding. The impression has been created that the Indian people want to drive out “bag and baggage” not only the Government but all Englishmen. This is incorrect. India has never demanded that Englishmen shall leave as individuals, but only that they



INDIA, AMERICA AND WORLD BROTHERHOOD

shall no longer remain as rulers and lords of the Indian people. Mahatma Gandhi has more than once taken pains to say that they would be welcome to stay as citizens, as business men, as traders, and even as officials in cases where the Indian Government might see fit to appoint them as such. But they must take their places by the side of the Indian people, not above them. They must not stay as self-appointed rulers, masters and privileged exploiters of the land.

Not only will India be able to govern herself, and better than any foreigners can possibly govern her, as soon as she is allowed to obtain a reasonable degree of experience and to set up a government of her own, but under a government of her own she will be fully able to protect herself from dissensions within and from foes without.

VII

It is a serious charge to make, and I do not make it, that during all her connection with India Great Britain has done all in her power to make and keep the Indian people as weak and helpless as possible, so as to enable her the more easily to hold them within her grip. But while I do not make this charge,



WHO SHOULD RULE INDIA ?

I do affirm two things. First, that this charge actually is made, seriously and earnestly, and believed to be true, by a very large proportion of the people of India ; and second, that *if* Great Britain *had* desired to make and keep India as weak and helpless as possible, it is difficult to see how she could have adopted a more effective means of securing this end than the course which she has pursued.

What has Great Britain done ? As has been pointed out elsewhere, she has drained away a large proportion of India's wealth to England, and reduced her to extreme poverty. She has so shaped the tariff, excise and other laws which she has enacted, as largely to break up India's commerce, manufactures and other industries, in the interest of those of Great Britain. Only to a limited extent has she built the railroads of India (paid for by Indian money) where India wanted them and where they would best answer the needs of the Indian people ; but mainly she has caused them to be located where they would best serve her military ends of transporting her armies quickly to strategic points, thus strengthening her military control of the country ; and also where they would best serve Britain's financial and economic ends of draining India of her



INDIA, AMERICA AND WORLD BROTHERHOOD

natural products, and making her industrially subservient to British interests as a land from which to obtain cheap raw material for British manufactures. She (Britain) has refused to give to the Indian people anything more than the most meagre amount of education. Indian leaders have begged for education and schools as for almost nothing else ; but no ! the money which ought to have been used to increase the nation's intelligence and therefore its prosperity and strength, has been wanted by the alien government for its military uses within the land and to carry on its military projects outside ; and therefore education and schools for the Indian people must be starved. A very meagre amount of higher education is provided, but even this is planned primarily in the interest of the foreign rulers of the land,—to provide them with clerks, stenographers, book-keepers and assistants of various kinds : only to a limited extent does it train young men to serve their country by building up its industries and thus making it strong.

VIII

Taken as a whole the people of India are peace-loving and law-abiding ; in this respect they are surpassed by no other people. But this



WHO SHOULD RULE INDIA ?

does not mean that they are without bravery or military qualifications. Probably quite 100 millions of the 320 millions of population of the land—the Sikhs, the Rajputs, the Mahrattas and many others—are as good fighters as there are in the world when there is need of fighting, and therefore are abundantly able to protect the country and give strength to a native Indian Government. But no! these men are disarmed. Indeed the British rulers of the land keep the entire Indian population disarmed. No Indian may possess or use a gun without a special permit from the government—a permit exceedingly difficult to obtain. Even if he lives at the edge of the jungle, he may not have any kind of arms with which to defend himself and his family from tigers.

As has been said, India sent more than a million soldiers into the Great War of 1914—1918; and no troops in that great struggle were braver or more efficient. It was they that saved the first battle of the Marne for the Allies; and who conquered Palestine and Mesopotamia for England. But they were all humiliated by being compelled to fight under British officers, so that they might not gain any experience as commanders and leaders. And when they returned to India they were



INDIA, AMERICA AND WORLD BROTHERHOOD

disarmed. An important part of the army which the British government regularly maintains in India is composed of Indian soldiers; but these are kept under British officers. A large proportion of the police of India are Indians, but they are kept strictly under the control of the British. In the executive department of the Indian Government, practically all offices of important responsibility or command or initiative or leadership are carefully kept from Indians and reserved for the British. Neither in civil nor military affairs are Indians allowed to hold positions in which they can get training or experience calculated to fit them for command or leadership. Thus seemingly everything possible is done to keep the whole nation helpless, unable to govern itself or to protect itself, absolutely dependent on the British.

And then, as I have said, the helplessness of the nation, thus brought about by the British themselves, is proclaimed to the world as proof that India is unfit for self-government, that if left to herself she could not protect herself even from little Afghanistan, or little Nepal, or the small half-civilized tribes on the borders of Assam, but would at once be overrun and filled with anarchy and bloodshed; and



WHO SHOULD RULE INDIA?

that therefore it is England's imperative and solemn duty to stay in India (so far as can be seen, forever), to protect her from ruin. If after 160 years of British tuition India is unfit to rule herself, when will she be fit? After another 160 years? No: with just as good reason then as now the British will exclaim: "We dare not go. If we leave to-morrow the whole country will run with blood from the Himalayas to Cape Comorin, therefore we must stay." And after a thousand years of such training as Britain is giving India, will it not be exactly the same?

IX

I have called attention to the claim made by the British, that one fatal reason against granting self-government to India is her internal division—the allegation that she has no unity.

On this subject a further word should be said. It is important for both India and Great Britain to understand that nothing would have so strong an influence to unite India as a government of her own, a parliamentary government which would bring representatives of all parts of the land and of all classes in the land together, to plan for the common



INDIA, AMERICA AND WORLD BROTHERHOOD

welfare and to rule the land for the common good.

This is shown by the history of the American Colonies before and after the Revolutionary War in which they gained their independence. The different colonies were, some of them, located far apart. Their inhabitants were from different countries of Europe; they had different religions, and to some extent spoke different languages. Their industrial and commercial interests were very different, and in many cases antagonistic. It was widely declared in England that these thirteen different colonies (virtually thirteen little separate nations) with so many differences and contentions, could not possibly unite in one government, or rule themselves; and that without the overlordship of Great Britain, there would be disorder, anarchy and local wars throughout the land.

As a fact it was difficult to persuade them to unite, and difficult to form a government acceptable to all. But no sooner was a common government set up, with its parliamentary or representative system, which placed all the colonies on a level and set all to the task of working together and planning for the common good, than the old differences and antagonisms



WHO SHOULD RULE INDIA ?

began to disappear. And it was not long before the new nation, the United States of America, was as united, as peaceful, and as efficient a government as probably existed in the entire world.

X

Turning to the history of Canada, we find a situation in many respects the same, and with the same lesson to teach. For a long time Canada was denied self-rule ; she was regarded as not fit to govern herself, partly because her area was so great, stretching from the Atlantic Ocean to the Pacific ; and partly because her people were so divided in race, language and religion,—her white population being about one half French, speaking the French language and professing the Roman Catholic faith, and the other half being English, speaking the English language and professing the Protestant faith, while in the land, scattered throughout all parts, were scores of tribes of aborigines, or native "Red Indians," all having separate customs and cultures, and all speaking different tongues, and still in addition to these, there were in the far north various tribes of Esquimos, with strange languages, and with customs and modes of life different from all other peoples.



INDIA, AMERICA AND WORLD BROTHERHOOD

How could a country of such vast extent, and with a population so scattered, divided and diverse, and possessing so little unity of any kind, govern itself? Surely it would be full of anarchy, wars and bloodshed, resulting in ultimate division into smaller nations forever fighting one another, if England withdrew her hand.

Was this what happened? It was the exact opposite of what happened. So long as the foreign rule of Great Britain continued there was discontent, ever increasing discontent, with insurrections and rebellions breaking out here and there, and others forever threatening. There was no feeling of general unity, no assured general peace and no general contentment until the country was given self-rule, that is, until it was given its present dominion status, with freedom and power to manage its own affairs. Then a marvellous change came. A feeling of unity such as would have been forever impossible under a foreign rule began to make its appearance; the different parts of the country began to develop a common interest, and to draw together for promotion of the common welfare, and there was such contentment and peace, and also such efficiency of government, as had never been known before.



WHO SHOULD RULE INDIA ?

XI

In these experiences,—that of the American Colonies which separated themselves from Great Britain and became an independent nation, and under independence grew united in spirit and strong; and in the experience of Canada which also found that self-rule meant unity and strength, there is a very important lesson for both India and Great Britain. It is all folly to claim that because of differences of race and language and religion India requires to be ruled by foreigners. What India needs to make her united and strong, is self-government. Nothing in the world would be so effective in causing the people of India to forget their differences of race and language and religion and to become united, and, when united, peaceful and efficient and powerful, as to set up for themselves a parliamentary government of their own, and begin the practical work of ruling themselves. That would mightily increase their self-respect, their confidence in themselves, their moral stamina, their interest in one another, their desire to promote peace in the land, and their ability to defend India in case of danger.

If the British, with all power in their hands, had set up a Parliamentary Govern-



INDIA, AMERICA AND WORLD BROTHERHOOD

ment in India when Lord Ripon (in 1880-1884) made so fine a start toward it (which India hailed with delight but which the British thwarted) we may well believe that, by this time, all the Indian peoples outside of the "Native States," and probably with some of them included, would have been working together through their representatives as harmoniously, and, so far as can be seen, well nigh or quite as efficiently, as Canada or the United States.



CHAPTER IV

THE REFORM SCHEME

I am met with the question : Is not what I have said in the preceding pages a representation of things in India as they have been in the past, but not as they are now, since the inauguration by the British Government in 1919 of what is popularly known as the New Reform Scheme? Does not this so-called Reform Plan which the British have so widely proclaimed to the world as a great boon to India, put a new face upon the whole situation? Does it not, as it claims to do, set the Indian people on the road to securing at no distant day self-government, full self-government, like that of Canada and Australia? Of course, if it does, then they will have power themselves to correct all these great evils, to right all these terrible wrongs which I have mentioned. What we need to know, therefore, is the real nature of the Reform Scheme.



INDIA, AMERICA AND WORLD BROTHERHOOD

It will help us to understand it, if we look a little at its origin.

On August 20, 1917, Mr. Montagu, the then British Secretary of State for India, announced in the House of Commons that His Majesty's Government desired "increasing association of Indians in every branch of the Government of India," and "the gradual development of self-governing institutions with a view to progressive realization of responsible government in India as an integral part of the British Empire." That looked fair and full of promise.

But Mr. Montagu went on to say further: "The British Government and the Government of India, on whom the responsibility lies for the welfare and advancement of the Indian people, must be judges of the time and measure of each advance." Ah! That seemed to put a different look upon matters.

"Increasing association of Indians in every branch of the Government of India, and gradual development of self-governing institutions" was exactly what the leaders of the Indian people had long been pleading for. And now, was it to come? If so, it would fill all India with joy.

But that *second* declaration, what did that



THE REFORM SCHEME

mean ? “The British Government (in London) and the Government of India (British) must be judges of the time and measure of each advance.” Was India, then, to have no voice in shaping the new scheme ? Had she no rights in the matter ? Were the British to have the whole say as to *what* the advance should be—much or little, important or trivial ? And the whole decision as to *when* it should be—now, or in some un-designated and absolutely indefinite future ? Then was there really a promise at all, of anything ? India waited eagerly and anxiously to see, as the plan of the British Government developed.

In sixteen months the plan was finished, and the “Government of India Act of 1919,” as it was named, was proclaimed by King George as in force from that time onward.

It has now been in operation five years—a long enough period of time, certainly, for a full understanding of its character, and a full test of its value. Did it satisfy the Indian people when it was completed and handed to them ? Has it yet given them, or does it definitely assure them in the future, any important new measure of self-government such as is the right of every nation ?

Let us glance back over some past



INDIA, AMERICA AND WORLD BROTHERHOOD

history. When the great war of 1914 broke out in Europe, England found herself in a serious plight. In order to do her part in withstanding the German attack on France, she was compelled to send for almost her entire Indian army, which was the first foreign contingent to arrive on the field of conflict, and without whose invaluable help the German advance could not have been checked and Paris would undoubtedly have fallen.

This sudden withdrawal from India of the military force maintained there to hold her in subjection, offered a very good chance to the Indian people to make use of such a time to throw off the foreign yoke which was so galling to them, and unite in a national strike for freedom and independence. And why not? Would any other nation in the world, held in bondage for more than a century and a half, have refrained from taking advantage of such an opportunity to regain the coveted liberty?

It is easy to see how great, how tremendous, might have been the temptation. Did the people say. "Now is the auspicious time; let us rise and be free?" No, on the other hand the great majority of the Indian people said: "England is in sore distress; she is fighting virtually for her life; to take advantage of her



THE REFORM SCHEME

helplessness, to strike her when she is down, would be dishonorable, cowardly. We will not do it. Although she has robbed us of our nationhood, we will not turn on her in her time of peril. Until her danger is over, we will stand by her, we will be loyal—nay, we will even help her in her struggle.” And they did. They were absolutely loyal throughout the war. Largely they laid aside for the time being the political agitation for freedom which they had been carrying on for many years. India rendered to Great Britain great and invaluable aid both in men and money. It was amazing. It was almost incredible that a subject people longing for freedom should take such a course. It was unselfish, chivalrous, noble beyond words. I am not able to recall in all history a national act, a national course of conduct so magnanimous or so noble.

The Indian people believed, and I think all the world believed, that when the war was over and England was safe, she would show appreciation of their marvellous loyalty and magnanimity, by treating them far better than she had done in the past, by righting their wrongs, and if not by granting them at once full and complete home rule like that of Canada, which was India's desire,—at least by setting



INDIA, AMERICA AND WORLD BROTHERHOOD

them well on the way toward it, and by giving them a definite promise of its complete realization in the near future.

Did England do this? No! Unbelievable as it seems, instead of meeting their magnanimity with a like magnanimity, instead of showing appreciation of their astonishing loyalty and their invaluable aid in her time of distress, instead of being even just to them, she proceeded to treat them with a degree of suspicion, oppression and cruelty beyond anything in the past, culminating in the Punjab atrocities and the infamous Rowlatt Act which virtually deprived India of even the protection of civil law.

Of course this was a terrible shock to the Indian people. It was a disappointment about as great as it is possible for any nation to experience.

But did Great Britain offer to the Indian people no return of any kind for what they had done? Yes, she offered them this so-called Reform Scheme for their Government. This was the reward, the only reward, the only semblance of reward, offered by England for India's service and devotion.

How did it impress the Indian people? I am speaking carefully when I say that



THE REFORM SCHEME

nobody was satisfied with it. Nobody felt it to be worthy of England ; nobody felt it to be at all what India deserved ; nobody felt that it in any measure righted India's wrongs. All parties, radical and conservative alike, united in protesting against its utter inadequacy.

However, there were two different views as to how it should be met—as to what India should practically do about it. One part of the Indian people—the minority—said : “ Although it is very far from what we want, and is seriously disappointing, yet perhaps it is better than nothing ; and therefore, while protesting against its limitations, let us be thankful for even a little, accept it for what it may be worth, do what we can to make it work so far as it goes, and trust to getting something better by and by. This was the position taken by what is known as the Moderate Party in India. The other and very much larger part of the Indian people said : “ No, to accept a scheme which so utterly fails to meet India's just demands would be humiliating, would be cowardice and folly, it would be to act like children—nay, like cowering slaves. When Great Britain offers us something adequate and honorable, we will accept it ; but not before.” This is the position



INDIA, AMERICA AND WORLD BROTHERHOOD

taken by the Indian National Congress, the All-India Moslem League, and by the great Nationalist Party ; it is also the position taken by Mahatma Gandhi and the powerful Non-Co-operative Movement which he inaugurated.

Let us examine the Reform Scheme a little more fully, so as to see more exactly what are the reasons for India's dissatisfaction with it.

(1) The first failure, disappointment, injustice, hardly less than insult, that India saw in the scheme, was Britain's spirit of high-handedness and arrogance, in claiming for herself all rights in the matter, and allowing India none ; in setting out from the very inception of the Scheme to make it not what the Indian people had a right to and wanted, or what would have been just and acceptable to all parties concerned ; but solely what she (Britain) wanted, and then thrusting it upon India.

The Scheme, to have been just, to have been anything that India could honorably accept, should have been mutual, something framed by India and Great Britain together, each recognizing the other's rights. But it was nothing of the kind. It was something designed to be a compact between two parties,



THE REFORM SCHEME

but framed by one party alone and imposed upon the other. There was nothing mutual about it. It was a dictation; it was a command; it was the voice of a master to slaves. Britain, standing above, handed it down to the Indian people below. They must receive it on their knees. What concerned her was not what they wanted or what rightly belonged to them, but what she, their all-powerful ruler who acknowledged no responsibility to them, thought they should have—what she was gracious enough to offer them. And of course what she condescended to offer, they were expected to receive gratefully and humbly.

Is it any wonder that a scheme framed in such a spirit and with such aims, was not welcome to the Indian people? Is it any wonder that they found it something which did not right their wrongs, or set their feet upon a path leading to self-government within any discernible future?

Let me not be misunderstood when I speak of the Scheme as formed by Great Britain alone or without the assistance which the Indian people ought to have been asked to give. I am quite aware that Mr. Montagu, the British Secretary of State for India, before formulating the Scheme went to India



INDIA, AMERICA AND WORLD BROTHERHOOD

and consulted—candidly and honestly, I have no doubt—the various interested parties there;—on the one hand, the Indian leaders and on the other the British rulers. That was fair so far as it went, but how little way did it go! What followed? What followed was that Mr. Montagu and other representatives of Great Britain proceeded to draw up a scheme for India's government, without associating with themselves in this great and serious task any representatives at all chosen by India for that task. That was unfair; that was dishonourable. Such a one-sided body of men could not possibly produce a scheme that would be just to India or that India could accept. What ought to have been done was the creation of a Joint Commission with an equal number of British and Indian members, the Indian Members being elected by the Indian people and therefore empowered really to represent them; and this Joint Commission should have been instructed to draw up, and should have drawn up, such a scheme as seemed just and wise in their united judgment. That would have been fair and just both to England and India. And to a scheme thus created, the Indian people would gladly have given their assent.



THE REFORM SCHEME

(2) The second thing to be said about this so-called Reform Scheme is that, in its very nature, it is self-contradictory.

The Scheme has been given the very unusual name of "Diarchy," which properly means the joint rule of two monarchs, as William and Mary in England. But in the present case it is supposed to signify the joint rule of the British and the Indians through an arrangement by which some matters connected with the Government are "transferred" or committed (under severe limitations) to Indian management, while others are "reserved" or kept wholly under British control. Exactly described, it is a plan which puts side by side two radically different, two absolutely antagonistic forms of government—one, self-rule; the other, arbitrary rule from the outside; one, democracy; the other, absolute autocracy or absolute monarchy (in the form of an alien bureaucracy), and expects them to work in harmony. It is an attempt to mix oil and water; or to ride two horses going in opposite directions. Abraham Lincoln said: "A nation cannot endure half free and half slave." Neither can a nation be successfully ruled by means of governmental machinery, half formed for ends of freedom and half for ends of oppression. That is exactly what



INDIA, AMERICA AND WORLD BROTHERHOOD

this scheme is. It is an attempt to take an old scheme of absolute autocracy, absolute tyranny, "tinker it up," make alterations in its form but not in its spirit, and christen it a "New Scheme of Liberty."

History shows that the whole British Governmental machine in India has been built up from the beginning (first by the old East India Company and later by the Crown) with the sole purpose not of permitting the Indian people to have freedom or to rule themselves, but to ensure for ever Great Britain ruling them, ruling them without their consent, ruling them absolutely. Now they are protesting and insisting on self-rule. What sane man had any right to expect that that old governmental machine, created to hold them down, could by any changes or manipulations be made to serve effectively as an instrument to give them freedom?

It is clear what Great Britain ought to have done in 1917—19 instead of concocting this present childish, impossible, misshapen, mongrel plan. She should have listened to India's just demands, and given her a government framed distinctly and honestly for ends of of self-rule; a government responsible, at least in all home matters, to the Indian people;



THE REFORM SCHEME

a real democracy essentially like that of Canada or South Africa, but of course adapted to the special needs and conditions of India. That would have been sane. It would have been straightforward and honest. It would have been practicable and to the infinite advantage of all concerned. On the one hand it would have made India content, and on the other it would have removed all cause for anxiety or alarm on the part of Great Britain. It would have resulted in India's becoming as loyal a part of the Empire (or Commonwealth) as South Africa or Canada or Australia. That the very opposite state of things now exists, is the result of Britain's blind and stupid refusal to give to the Indian people what they so earnestly asked for, and what was their right ; and thrusting on them, instead, this impossible, self-contradictory, vicious plan of "Diarchy".

(3) The third thing about the India Reform Scheme which vitiates it, is the fact that it contains no "Bill of Rights," no constitutional guaranty of any kind securing the Indian people against possible future injustices and tyrannies on the part of the Government. In view of the many wrongs that the people have suffered in the past, this defect is fatal—something which alone affords sufficient ground for



INDIA, AMERICA AND WORLD BROTHERHOOD

rejection of the Scheme. Without a bill of rights, or a constitutional guaranty of justice, the people have no sure protection, they are wholly at the mercy of their foreign rulers, liable at any time to have wrongs and cruelties inflicted upon them as great as any they have ever suffered. The British at home, in England, would on no consideration give up the protection which for hundreds of years they have received from their *Magna Charta*, which has shielded them by its great words: "No freeman shall be arrested or detained in prison... or in any way molested.....unless by the lawful judgment of his peers and by the law of the land."

We Americans could not possibly be induced to surrender the guaranteed protection which we possess in our Declaration of Independence, and especially in our National Constitution, which declares :

"Congress shall make no law abridging the freedom of speech or of the press, or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances.

"The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers and effects against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated.



THE REFORM SCHEME

“Excessive bail shall not be required, nor excessive fines imposed nor cruel and unusual punishments inflicted.

“No State or province within the nation shall deprive any person of life, liberty or property without due process of law, nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.”

Such charters of rights, such guarantees of protection, are regarded by Englishmen, by Americans, and by all other free peoples, as absolutely indispensable in their own cases. Why does not Great Britain grant such protection to India ?

Within the last six or seven years reports have come from the most trustworthy sources, of crimes and brutalities committed by British officials against the Indian people, which have shocked the world—houses searched without warrant; men seized and imprisoned without trial; men and women peacefully working in the field bombed from the sky; all the inhabitants in a certain street in a city forbidden to go along the street even to get water or buy food except by their crawling on their hands and knees; a great peaceful gathering assembled in a public garden on a religious festival day, fired on without warning by troops, and the



INDIA, AMERICA AND WORLD BROTHERHOOD

firing continued until the ammunition of the soldiers was exhausted, and 379 dead and 1,200 wounded men, women and children lay heaped on the bloody ground†, prisoners confined in a luggage van without ventilation, and in spite of their frantic cries for air kept there until more than 70 were dead; and many other brutalities and crimes almost as shocking.

Should not the new government scheme for India, if it was to be of any value at all, have given guarantees against such outrages in the future?

Yet it did not and does not. The fact alone that the military forces of the country and the police are both wholly under British control—neither being responsible in any degree to the Indian people—makes the recurrence of injustices and atrocities as bad as any of these possible at any future time. The new Scheme gives no guaranty whatever against any future Governor O'Dwyers

† The Hunter Committee appointed to investigate the Punjab atrocities reported the number killed in the Amritsar (Jallianwalla Bagh) massacre as 379, and the number wounded as about three times as many. These numbers, however, are very much the lowest given by any authority. The Investigation Commission appointed by the authorities of the National Indian Congress, whose researches were far more thorough, reported that they found unimpeachable evidence that the number shot to death was approximately 1,200 and the number wounded approximately 3,600.



THE REFORM SCHEME

and General Dyers and Jalianwalla Baghs, Moplah suffocations, and the rest. It protects the British rulers of the land, but nobody else. It does not guaranty to the Indian people police protection, or military protection, or civil protection; it does not insure to them freedom of speech, or of assembly or of the press, or the right of trial in open court, or the privilege of *habeas corpus*, or any other of the essential rights and privileges which are the foundations and indispensable guarantees of liberty, justice and law. Is it any wonder that India rejected the Scheme? Is it not amazing that any nation calling itself civilized and Christian, in this age of the world, can have proposed such a Scheme?

(4) A fourth indictment of a very serious character to be made against the new plan for governing India, is, that it gives to the Indian people no effective voice whatever in legislation. All real law-making power is retained absolutely in British hands. This is true of legislation in the Provinces and it is still more fully and seriously true of national legislation. On a first examination of the Scheme this is very likely to escape observation. But when we look deeper, we see that it is true.



INDIA, AMERICA AND WORLD BROTHERHOOD

In the national government, it allows Indians to hold a few more places than they formerly did. To be specific : in the Governor-General's Executive Council there are now three Indians ; but as the Council contains a majority of Englishmen besides the Governor-General himself, of course the Indians have no power. In the Legislative Assembly there is a considerable number of Indians, enough to guard India's rights, if they had any power. But they have not. They are allowed to vote on many things, but not on all ; on some they are not permitted even to speak. Matters are so arranged that in no case can they disturb the plans of the Government. Whatever legislation the British rulers desire, they enact, whether the Indians favor it or not.

In the Provinces, the situation is similar. Each Provincial Governor has one Indian (or possibly two) on his Council, but the majority (including the Governor) is English. Each Provincial Legislative Assembly contains a majority of Indians, but here again they can legislate only upon such matters as the British rulers permit ; and even regarding these they have no final power : whatever laws they enact can be overturned by the Governor in Council,



THE REFORM SCHEME

or by the Governor-General in Council, or both. The new Scheme gives each Province a new Indian Officer called a Minister (in some Provinces, more than one) whose business is to manage certain public matters, such as education, sanitation, agriculture, etc., in the interest of India. This is good so far as it goes. But here again there is little or no real freedom or power. British authority overshadows everything. The Ministers can accomplish nothing without money, and no money is allowed them except such sums as the British Rulers see fit to spare—military and other imperial expenditures always taking the precedence.

Furthermore, these Ministers are all under the control of the Governors, who can annul anything they do.

But the worst thing of all is the absolute powerlessness of the legislative bodies, especially those connected with the national government. As we have seen, some subjects of legislation they are not permitted even to discuss, and on nothing are they allowed to have the final decision. Even if they vote unanimously for a measure, the Government may disallow it.

Is it said that even in democratic America



INDIA, AMERICA AND WORLD BROTHERHOOD

the enactments of State Legislatures may be vetoed by Governors, and those of the National Congress, by Presidents? Yes, this is true. But these vetoes are not final. An American State legislature can pass anything it desires over the Governor's veto, and the American National Congress can pass anything it pleases over the veto of the President. In India, nothing of this kind is possible. There, all final legislative authority, all real legislative power, whether national or provincial, is in the hands of the executive. Notwithstanding the increased number of so-called legislators under the new plan, the British are still, just as before, the supreme, the sole, law-makers of India.

Of course the fact that in the legislative bodies the Indian members are granted considerable liberty of discussion, is not without value. It gives to the British overlords a better knowledge than they would otherwise have of the feelings and wants of the people, and thus to some extent it may influence legislation. And yet, one cannot help wondering how much. A prominent member of the British Indian Government said to an American: "Oh yes! We listen to these Indian fellows, these natives, in our legisla-



THE REFORM SCHEME

tures—to their talk, their discussions, their pleas for education, their demands for what they call their ‘rights,’ for ‘home-rule’ and the rest—we listen to them, they like it, and then—*we do as we damned please!*”

This is a cynical and almost brutal declaration; but it describes exactly the amount of power possessed by the people of India in enacting legislation on all subjects of highest importance, and in shaping all the vital affairs of their own nation.

That the ‘reformed’ Government of India is just as autocratic and absolute since the introduction of the new plan of things as it was before, and that the Indian members of the new National Legislative Assembly and the new National Council of State all combined, have no real power, is shown by one thing alone even if there were nothing else. That one thing is the imprisonment of Mahatma Gandhi and more than 25,000 of his sympathizers, among them a large number of the most honored men in India. Practically all India felt outraged by these imprisonments. But all India could do nothing. The action of the Government in doubling the cruel salt-tax in defiance of the nation’s unanimous protest, also shows how entirely helpless



INDIA, AMERICA AND WORLD BROTHERHOOD

India is. The power of "certification" given to the Governor-General makes him virtually an absolute monarch, and puts all India virtually under his feet. As to the apparent check placed upon his certifications by the provision that they must lie two months before the British Parliament before becoming operative, everybody knows that in practice this provision will always amount to nothing.

(5) The new scheme of Government is vitiated, made repellent, shown to be worthless, by the fact that its whole spirit is one of negations. Its constant aim, from first to last, is to forbid, to forbid. Its most outstanding feature is its careful, specific and multiplied specifications and descriptions of the privileges, rights, liberties and powers that the Indian people are *not permitted* to have. The word '*verboden*' was never more in evidence in any German city than are the '*forbids*' in this scheme. Prohibiting, not granting, is the whole spirit of the measure. At every point where we come upon anything of first class importance, anything that would give any real power to India, there at once we are met with "reservations," "reservations." And the reservations are always in the interest of England, never of India. Even the "trans-



THE REFORM SCHEME

ferred" subjects "have strings to them." The great thing that the scheme constantly guards against, is not the real danger that India may fail to get her rights, but the imagined danger that at some point or other England may suffer some loss of prestige, or privilege, or power. The scheme gives no evidence of being something prompted by a desire to right India's age-long and terrible wrongs; indeed, it contains no real recognition of the existence, now or in the past, of any such wrongs. Everything in it and about it shows that it is simply an effort on the part of Great Britain to retain her grip on India at a trying time. The scheme is an unintentional but clear acknowledgment to the world that a great new spirit of freedom and independence has come into the world, and that India is feeling it mightily. This alarms England. She sees that the Indian people are waking up, are rising from their knees to their feet, are becoming indignant at being held in subjection, are feeling humiliated and outraged beyond measure by the fact that they, who for so many centuries were a great nation among the nations of the world, are now not thought of as a nation at all, but are regarded as a mere appendage, a mere possession of a nation seven thousand miles away.



INDIA, AMERICA AND WORLD BROTHERHOOD

What is the new Government scheme offered to India? It is England's attempt to counteract all this, to quiet the unrest of the Indian people, to allay their humiliation, to soothe their wounded pride, to administer to them an opiate, to induce them to lay aside their dangerous ambition and be willing to continue loyal still to Great Britain, by offering them something which they are told is a great boon, something which England assures them means increasing freedom, more and more privileges, more and more participation in the Government, an advance, with more and more advances to follow, on the road leading toward self-rule.

But alas! these promises when examined, when really looked into, when probed to the bottom, when tested as now five years of trial have tested them, are seen to mean nothing of value to India. Their real purpose is not at all India's advancement, but her pacification, and England's security. They offer India no boon whatever. They merely promise her a pot of gold at the end of a rainbow.

(6) One more serious indictment remains to be made against Great Britain's new Government scheme for India. It fixes no time. It leaves everything uncertain. What-



THE REFORM SCHEME

ever promises it makes, or is supposed to make, of new rights or privileges, or of advances toward self-rule, are only to be fulfilled 'some time,' in an unknown future, and at the option of the British rulers.

This is fatal. It makes the promises absolutely worthless. It is well understood in law that if I give a man a note promising to pay him a sum of money, but without mentioning any time, my note is of no value. Nobody can collect anything on it. Or if I make my note payable at such a time in the future as I may then elect, still it is valueless. My promise to pay must state when the payment is due, in order to be of any worth. It is exactly the same with the supposed promise made in this Reform Scheme of future self-government to India. There is no date fixed. The fulfilment can be put off and put off until the end of time. It is really no promise at all.

One exception must be made to the statement that the Reform Scheme mentions no date. It does mention a date, not, however, when India is to receive full self-rule, or necessarily any new measure of self-rule, but when *all* her advance toward self-rule *may* be *stopped* by a power that she cannot control;



INDIA, AMERICA AND WORLD BROTHERHOOD

indeed, when such small degree of self rule *as she now possesses may be taken from her !* The Scheme provides that in ten years a British parliamentary Commission shall be appointed. For what? Not necessarily to grant India anything, or to advance her by a single inch on the road toward freedom, but to examine the situation and decide whether they shall then give her anything *or not*, or whether they shall *take away what she already has*. And then we must bear in mind that the Commission is to be composed not necessarily even in part of persons chosen by India or of persons favorable to India's freedom, and not of non-British men, outsiders, neutrals, who could judge without bias, but of *members of the very nation that is holding India in subjection and is interested to keep her in its power as long as possible*. When we bear this in mind, it becomes easy to understand what the decisions of that Parliamentary Commission are likely to be.

Thus we see the truth of the statement made, that the new Reform Scheme is worthless because it fixes no time when India can be sure of receiving any advancement whatever beyond her present status. The Scheme does not promise the Indian people that Great Britain, in whose hands it leaves everything, will grant them



THE REFORM SCHEME

self-government, or any advance toward self-government in ten years, or for that matter in twenty years, or a hundred. Indeed, India's deep feeling of distrust of the Reform Scheme,—the feeling which she had at the beginning and which has been strengthening ever since,—that the Scheme contains nothing of real value for India, and cannot be trusted as even having in it any permanence, has been confirmed by the highest possible authority. In the summer of 1922, Lloyd George, then Premier of the British Empire, declared in Parliament in the most unequivocal terms that the Reforms were only an experiment; that they might be changed or entirely withdrawn at any time; and that he could discern no time in the future when India could be permitted to rule herself; in other words, he could see no future time when the British could consent to the existence of any government in India that was not controlled by themselves, that did not have at its center the "steel frame" of "British bureaucracy."

The fact is not to be escaped, that Great Britain does not in her so-called Reform Scheme, pledge to the Indian people anything except that if they will cease their disagreeable (to her) agitations for reforms and freedom,



INDIA, AMERICA AND WORLD BROTHERHOOD

and be dumb and docile, and do what she tells them (like good children, or rather, like slaves) and cause her no trouble, she will be kind and motherly to them, and at such time or times in the future as, in her superior wisdom, she may see fit, she may condescend graciously to grant them such limited new liberties as she may then consider safe, and such gradual advances toward the very far-off goal of self-government as then she may deem it best for them to receive.

To put the case in a word, this Scheme which has been heralded abroad and praised as offering so much to India, and as setting her feet securely on the road to a dominion status like that of Canada, as a matter of fact *gives her no assurance of being granted such a status in a thousand years.*

In conclusion: the favorite motto of George the Third in dealing with his American colonies was, "Everything for the people, but nothing by the people." He thought the motto very wise. As a fact it was foolish in the extreme—it helped to bring on the Revolution which lost England her colonies. This fatally narrow policy is exactly the one that England at the present time seems determined to carry out in India. But it will work no better there



THE REFORM SCHEME

than in America. What all self-respecting people in the world want, is not things done for them, not charity, and doles and concessions and kindnesses graciously and condescendingly "handed down" to them by "superiors," but justice and independence—freedom to stand on their own feet and do things for themselves and be men. No material favors, however great, can take the place of freedom. Even marble palaces, and clothing of silk and velvet, and the costliest and most abundant food, can have no effect to make people who possess any manhood content with slavery or subjection to others. India desperately needs and deeply desires better material conditions—better food, better clothing, better housing, and the riddance of her awful poverty ; but more deeply still she desires to be free. And as a fact, she is profoundly convinced that it is only through freedom that she can ever hope to improve her food, her clothing and her homes, and rise out of her poverty which is so appalling. The Morley-Minto reform plans of 1908-09 were based on the idea that what would make India content was a few more "plums"—a few more concessions, a few more liberties (within strictly prescribed bounds), a few more offices for Indians, a few more honors—knighthoods, etc. The Montagu-Chelms-



INDIA, AMERICA AND WORLD BROTHERHOOD

ford Reform plan, which has been condescendingly offered to India at the present time, is based upon the same idea, with the supposed improvement that it seems to grant somewhat larger and sweeter plums, that is, ostensibly somewhat greater liberties and privileges in certain directions, somewhat more offices for Indians, with higher pay, and more numerous and enticing honors to such Indians as by their humility and obedience may win the favor of their British masters.

Can a great nation, with a proud history of three or four thousand years, be satisfied with such baubles? No! Tolstoi said of certain tyrants in Russia that they were willing to do everything for their subjects except get off their back. What India wants of Great Britain is to get off her back.

Said the great and honored American, Patrick Henry, "Give me liberty, or give me death." Said the great and honored Indian, Ram Mohun Roy, "I want to be free, or I do not want to be at all."

Why was not Great Britain wise enough and noble enough, at the close of the Great War in Europe, even if not before, to extend to India the same warm, strong hand of friendship, confidence, trust, comradeship, co-opera-



THE REFORM SCHEME

tion and real partnership in the Empire, which at the end of the Boer War she extended to South Africa? That would have saved everything in India, as it did in South Africa.

Will she do it yet? Will she do it before it is too late? Will she do it in time to prevent terrible disaster?



CHAPTER V

GANDHI AND NON-CO-OPERATION

WHAT is to be said of Mahatma Gandhi and the Indian Non-Co-operative Movement?

As is well known, for many years the leaders of the Indian people tried, by popular agitation, by appeals and by petitions, to induce Great Britain to grant their country a greater degree of freedom and self-government—not necessarily independence and entire separation from the British Empire—they would have been content with Home Rule similar to that of Canada and South Africa. But at last a large proportion of these leaders, Mahatma Gandhi conspicuous among the number, became convinced that agitation and moral appeal were of no avail; that they would never bring India self-rule or much advance in freedom beyond her present condition.

What finally created in them this conviction was Great Britain's failure to show any



GANDHI AND NON-CO-OPERATION

appreciation of India's loyalty during the great war, and her broken promises and great injustices to the Indian people after the war.

Up to that time Gandhi had been thoroughly loyal to Britain, and during the war he had rendered her valuable practical service. But when the outrageous Rowlatt Bills were enacted, putting every man and woman in India at the mercy of the police and the military without the protection of civil law, and when the shocking Punjab atrocities were committed under the authority of the Government, and were virtually defended by the Government, and when the promise made by Great Britain concerning the Khalifat was broken—then Gandhi felt that all hope for justice from Great Britain was gone and that nothing remained but to repudiate her rule, and strike for a government of the Indian people. How would he strike? The non-co-operative movement was the answer.

When the American colonists in 1776 came to the point where they felt they could endure British oppression no longer, they struck by methods of violence, appealing to arms and fighting a seven years' war to drive out the oppressor and gain their freedom. Mahatma Gandhi took higher ground. He said, "Free-



INDIA, AMERICA AND WORLD BROTHERHOOD

dom is our right ; it is dearer to us than life ; obtain it we must and will, at the cost of suffering and if need be, of life itself. But we will not obtain it by war ; that is, by the wholesale murder of innocent men. There is a higher and better way. Britain may arrest us, imprison us by the ten thousand, and kill us, if she will ; but we will not kill one of her soldiers or one of her people ; we will not even hate one of her people ; but we will compel her to do us justice and give us back our country which she has stolen. How compel her ? By refusing to co-operate with her. The British in India are a mere handful compared with our own vast population. Without our help, they cannot carry on the government for a day. More than that, without our help they cannot even obtain their daily food, they cannot live. Here, then, by simply withdrawing from them all Indian assistance so long as they continue their unjust rule, we can compel Great Britain to do us justice.”

Gandhi saw what this absolute helplessness of the English in India (when unaided)—their complete dependence upon the help of Indians not only in carrying on the Government, but even for the necessities of their existence in India, is a powerful, an absolutely



GANDHI AND NON-CO-OPERATION

irresistible weapon which the Indian people hold in their hands—if once they choose to use it—to bring their rulers to terms.

This was not wholly a new idea with Gandhi. The same thought had been expressed many years ago by a distinguished Englishman who knew India well—Mr. Meredith Townsend—who made the startling declaration that: “If ever the Indian people struck for even a single week, the British Empire there would collapse like a house of cards, and every ruling man would be a starving prisoner in his own house. He could not even feed himself or get water.”

Mahatma Gandhi and the vast body of Indian people who have accepted his leadership have simply seized this weapon of the strike, of refusal to help the British, of non-co-operation, so significantly referred to by Mr. Meredith Townsend, to gain for them their freedom. Will they succeed?

There are forms of non-co-operation as yet untried by Mr. Gandhi, or tried only to a very limited extent, which certainly seem to have in them great possibilities of effectiveness. One of these, not mentioned by Mr. Townsend, is refusal to pay taxes. Of course the Government cannot go on without



INDIA, AMERICA AND WORLD BROTHERHOOD

the revenues derived from taxation. If the Indian people with nearly or quite perfect unanimity, should refuse to pay any taxes to the Government so long as it remained in British control, that would bring a crisis; the Government would be obliged either to abdicate or radically change its form in harmony with India's demands. Gandhi and the Indian National Congress have not yet inaugurated this drastic form of non-co-operation, because to be effective it must be practically unanimous—essentially all India, or at least a large section, must be prepared to undertake it at once. If only a small part of the people should refuse to pay taxes, nothing would be accomplished. Those who refused would have their property seized by the authorities and sold, or would be sent to prison, or both,—the Government would go on, and the condition of things would be worse than before. But if practically all the people withheld their taxes, the prisons could not hold a tenth part of the delinquents, it would be useless for the authorities to seize property, for there would be nobody to buy it, all public revenues would cease, and the Government would be brought to an absolute stand-still. Gandhi and the Congress believe that such non-co-operative



GANDHI AND NON-CO-OPERATION

agencies as have been already set in operation, particularly the boycott of English-made clothes, and the introduction of the spinning wheel and the hand loom into all the homes of the land, are steadily and surely preparing the Indian people to make such a stand against foreign taxation. If they are right, and if universal refusal to pay taxes is ordered and is carried out, India will certainly win her battle.

The other form of non-co-operation which has in it tremendous possibilities of effectiveness, is that partly described by Mr. Townsend. This is already in operation in India on a limited scale. It has not been attempted beyond a limited scale, because it is felt that India is not yet completely ready. But if the time comes when Mahatma Gandhi and the Indian National Congress shall give the order, and when the Indian people with essential unanimity shall obey the order, to strike fully and completely against service of the British Government, so that virtually every man and woman in India shall refuse to co-operate with it in any way—from the highest Indian officials down to the humblest clerks in the Government offices and the women who scrub the office floors and the chauffeurs who drive the Englishmen's cars and the servants in



INDIA, AMERICA AND WORLD BROTHERHOOD

their homes who prepare their food and sweep their rooms—if such a strike as this, such complete and full non-co-operation shall take place, the inevitable result will be not only that every function of the Government as now constituted, must cease, but no foreign government official can remain in the country without resigning his official position. On this line also, therefore, as well as on the others, India can certainly win her battle, if she will.

The question is, will she do it? Will the Indian people by united action in these ways, avail themselves of the power which they possess? Will Gandhi and the Congress, in the name of all that is highest and most sacred in India's past history and her hopes for the future, call upon the Indian people to use this power to the full? And will they at any cost obey?

If India carries her unique, her wonderful, her infinitely inspiring non-violent, non-co-operative movement to success, one of the greatest steps of progress in the whole history of mankind will have been taken: for the first time in human history a nation in bondage to a foreign power will have defied and defeated its oppressors and gained its freedom without shedding one drop of human blood. Surely not



GANDHI AND NON-CO-OPERATION

only every American, but every lover of progress, of civilization, of peace, of liberty, of humanity, throughout the world, should be in profound sympathy with this great and heroic struggle of the Indian people by absolutely peaceful means to throw off their foreign yoke and attain once more their rightful place as a nation among the nations.



CHAPTER VI

INDIA AND WORLD PEACE

AGAIN and again it has been declared by the great statesmen of Europe that India was the cause—the real cause—of the World War of 1914—1918. The possession by Great Britain, for more than a century and a half, of so vast and rich an empire in Asia as India is, had been all the while kindling jealousy, envy and lust of conquest in the breasts of the other nations of Europe. All the other leading nations had looked on with envy, and said: If Great Britain holds her vast and rich Indian possessions as the result of conquest by the sword, why should not we also use the sword and conquer rich and lucrative possessions? If by her navy and her army she has won for herself such a splendid 'place in the sun,' why should not we create armies and navies and win an equal place in the sun? Says Herbert Adams



INDIA AND WORLD PEACE

Gibbons, in his book "The New Map of Asia":
"No one can understand the foreign policy of Great Britain, which has inspired military and diplomatic activities from the Napoleonic Wars to the present day, who does not interpret wars, diplomatic conflicts, treaties and alliances, territorial annexations, extensions of protectorates, all with the fact of India constantly in mind."

I

It is well known that Napoleon's greatest envy of England was her Indian Empire. His supreme ambition was to wrest that Empire from her and give it as a splendid present to his beloved France. For this he went to Egypt and fought his campaign there and in Syria, hoping thence to push on to India and secure his prize.

Most of the wars of England for more than a century have been fought directly or indirectly to make secure her grasp on India.

England's wars carried on against the tribes to the north-west of India, against Afghanistan and against Thibet, were ostensibly to give India a "scientific frontier." But that really meant, to obtain possession of the passes and strong military positions to the



INDIA, AMERICA AND WORLD BROTHERHOOD

north, north-west and west, and thus guard India against a possible or imagined invasion from Russia.

England's conquest of Egypt in 1882 was primarily to get control of the nation in whose territory lay the Suez Canal, and thus protect her passage way to India.

It has been England's hold of India that has made her regard it as necessary not only to obtain possession of the Suez Canal and lands on the route to India, such as Egypt, Cyprus and areas on the Arabian Coast and the Persian Gulf, but also to possess and powerfully fortify such strongholds as Gibraltar (conquered from Spain), Malta (which properly belongs to Italy), and Aden at the entrance to the Red Sea (wrested from Arabia).

England's great navy, the existence of which has caused so much uneasiness among all other nations and which has been a constant incitement to them to increase their navies, owes its existence largely to India—to England's felt necessity for keeping open her sea route to her distant possession and for defending that possession against any nation that might want to rob her of it.

As to England's army too, although it



INDIA AND WORLD PEACE

seldom has been as large as those of several of the other European powers, yet it has been usually kept at fully double the strength (counting both British and Indian troops) that would have been necessary except for India. Thus England's influence in stimulating the growth of modern armies has been greatly increased by her conquest and holding of India.

England's long enmity to Russia, shown in the Crimean War, in her siding with Turkey at the close of the war of 1877, and in many other ways, has been caused primarily by her fear of Russia's encroachment on India.

On the other hand, it has been Britain's great prestige, power and wealth gained through her possession of India that more than anything else has inflamed Russia with Asiatic ambitions, and caused her to push forward her own conquests with a view to obtaining a place in Asia as important as that of her British rival.

It has been largely envy of England's rich possession in India that has made all the great European powers eager to get slices of China. If England had India why should not they have China? If the big rich Asiatic cake was to be cut and divided up, and if Great Britain



INDIA, AMERICA AND WORLD BROTHERHOOD

had already secured such an enormous slice in India, why should not they bestir themselves and seize slices elsewhere ?

All these ambitions of the other leading European powers to follow Britain's example and get slices of the Asiatic cake, of course made her the more anxious to protect her slice.

Great Britain's diplomatic and military operations in Persia for some years before the war in Europe, and her co-operation with Russia in reducing Persia to the position of a dependency of Great Britain and Russia, had India in view. Great Britain wanted to get Persia under her control, and thus be able to use her as a barrier between Germany and India.

Britain's hostility to Germany, which had been growing for fifteen or twenty years, before the war of 1914, sprang largely from her fear that Germany's ambition to gain a foothold in Asia might limit her own influence there, and especially might endanger her hold on India. Particularly had she been alarmed over Germany's project of a railway from Berlin to Bagdad, because such a great high-way would bring Germany so much nearer to England's great Indian possessions.

If twenty years ago Britain had admitted



INDIA AND WORLD PEACE

India to partnership within the British Empire, with home rule, Germany would never have dreamed of her Berlin to Bagdad railway project. Germany went into the Great War believing that India was Britain's weakness, and that the Indian people would take the war as an occasion to revolt against their British overlords. This mistake would not have been made by Germany if India had been a contented partner in the British Empire. Thus there would have been no war. This means that if Britain had been wise enough to extend to India, in time, the hand of justice, friendship and brotherhood, as noble Englishmen like John Bright and Herbert Spencer and John Stuart Mill and A.O. Hume and Sir Henry Cotton and Sir William Wedderburn and others urged her to do, instead of being guided by her blind imperialists and militarists, the results would have been to-day an England leading the world in prosperity and peace, instead of a land mourning the loss of millions of its noblest young men, the widowing of millions of its wives and mothers, the unemployment of millions of its workers, the piling up a crushing debt of billions of pounds, and the crippling of its industries to a degree never known before; and, what is even more



INDIA, AMERICA AND WORLD BROTHERHOOD

important, the results on the European Continent would have been, the nations there in prosperity and peace, instead of being, as most of them now are, in conditions of simply indescribable fear, hate, misery and hopelessness. Thus England has paid dear, and Europe has paid dear, for an India conquered, exploited and held down by the sword.

II

It is not only true that India has been the main cause of England's wars for two centuries, but it is also true that India has been a constantly inciting cause, even more so than the Balkans or Turkey, (although not always realised) of Europe's political jealousies, ambitions, intrigues, rivalries, secret diplomacies and wars.

Writes a distinguished Englishman: "The great War of 1914 to 1918, which ruined and drained Europe, of which few if any confess the true aims, was a war for the possession of the routes to Asia, for the possession of Asia, particularly India. Nothing can disarm the rival ambitions of the European powers so long as the prey they covet remains for them a possible prey. Peace will come to Europe from Asia when Asia becomes free, not before.



INDIA AND WORLD PEACE

It is not solely for the uplift of Asia, but in the interest of Europe herself, that one must wish for the end of her Asiatic domination. The time has come for her to loose her deadly grip on Asia, for her own sake. The yoke of brass which she had forged for the Asiatic peoples is bruising her own neck. The sword with which she struck has turned back, dripping with blood, against herself. The hour has come for Europe to die to her old life of Asiatic conquest, greed, exploitation and domination, that she may be born again. The rebirth of Europe has for its condition the restoration, the restitution of Asia. Of Asia—yes! and first of all, India! For without India there is no real Asia. There is no Asia free without India free. For India is not simply a part of Asia; she is its living heart, the soul itself."

The conquest of India was the greatest theft in the history of the modern world. The exploitation of great India with its vast population and its enormous material resources, has been the modern world's richest loot. Is it any wonder that the other great nations have been envious of England, and have plotted and planned how they might either capture from her this richest of all her prizes, or,



INDIA, AMERICA AND WORLD BROTHERHOOD

failing that, get possession of other territories in Asia or elsewhere, and thus obtain power, and prestige and wealth in some measure commensurate with England's ?

Thus it is that ever since early in the eighteenth century the conquest and exploitation of India have stirred up perpetual rivalries, jealousies, strifes, plots, hatreds and wars among the nations of Europe. And this is only another way of saying that India held in subjection—held as a rich prize by one European nation and coveted by the rest—has been the leading influence in turning all Europe into an armed camp, thus making inevitable the terrible conflict which began in 1914.

Nor can things be permanently better so long as India remains a subject land; that is, so long as this prime cause of the plottings, jealousies and hostilities of nations continues.

All the peoples of the world want peace. But right-thinking men everywhere agree that permanent peace can be based only on justice and freedom. So long as nations are held in bondage by other nations there can be no peace that will last. On July 14th, 1917, Lloyd George, the British Premier, sent a telegram to the Prime Minister of Russia saying: "There can be no lasting peace until the responsibility



INDIA AND WORLD PEACE

of Governments to their people is clearly established from one end of Europe to the other." Why did he not add, what was quite as true and quite as important. "There can be no lasting peace until the responsibility of Governments to their people is clearly established *from one end of Asia to the other*" ?

The Allies in the late war all saw plainly and declared that there could be no permanent peace in Europe unless Belgium and Serbia and Poland were given freedom. Why did they not all see the same with regard to Asia, especially great India ? A peace settlement with India still in chains, left her, as in the past, and much more than in the past, the danger spot of the world. I say much more than in the past, for India is fast rising to a new self-consciousness, to a new sense of her wrong, to a new realization of her own power, to a new determination to be free.

III

At present India is striving to gain her freedom by peaceful means. What if that kind of effort fails ? If the liberty which she seeks, and which is dearer to her than life itself (either the liberty of Home Rule like Canada's in connection with the British



INDIA, AMERICA AND WORLD BROTHERHOOD

Empire, or if England will not willingly grant it entire independence) is refused to her until her patience is worn out—then what? Who can say that there may not be a revolt, like that of the American Colonies against Great Britain in 1776?—and a revolt caused by grievances borne and wrongs suffered far greater than those which drove the American colonists to rebellion! And England should understand that if a revolt comes in India now, after the Great War in which a million and a quarter Indians fought so bravely and effectively as any European soldiers, and after the infamous Rowlatt Act which outraged all India, and after the Amritsar massacre which shocked all India, and destroyed her faith in British justice, and after the imprisonment of Mahatma Gandhi which endeared him more than ever to all India,—if after all these experiences a revolt comes, it will not be another mutiny like that of 1857. That was terrible enough. It strained the British Empire to its utmost to quell it. But that was confined to the native army, and only a part of the army at that; for a considerable portion remained loyal to Great Britain. Indeed it was only by the help of loyal India and loyal Indian troops that the mutiny was quelled and British rule in India survived.



INDIA AND WORLD PEACE

But the next revolt, if it comes—if India is driven to it—will not be a mere local affair,—it will be the uprising of all India. In 1857 India was divided. It is not divided now. Within the last half century, and especially within the last ten years, a united India has come into existence, which is feeling its power; which remembers that it has been a great nation among the nations of the world, and is determined to be the same again,—an India in whose heart burns a mighty flame of patriotism, of love for the Motherland and of determination that she shall be free! It is this India that must be reckoned with, if a revolt comes now.

If such a revolt—such a revolution—springs up, India will be certain to have the sympathy of all Asia. Will she not have Asia's help? Will not Asia feel that India, in fighting her own battle, is also fighting the battle of all Asia? If such a struggle comes, will it not be likely to arouse all Asia with the danger of arraying that great continent against Europe in a struggle of inconceivable magnitude and horror?

Asia has a population of more than 900 millions, Europe of 450 millions.

Two-thirds of Asia is now under the do-



INDIA, AMERICA AND WORLD BROTHERHOOD

minance of Europe. Think of the crime of it! This condition of things cannot always last. Most of the Asiatic peoples are as virile as Europeans. They only need to be aroused from their long slumber by the new spirit of the modern world, when they will be certain to revolt against their oppressors and set themselves up as free and independent nations.

Already Japan has arisen and taken her place beside the foremost nations of Europe. Great China is coming forward slowly but surely into strength and influence. Great India's turn cannot be long delayed. It is incredible that a country like India, containing a population more than three-quarters as great as that of all Europe, with a civilization antedating that of Europe and with a great and proud history, should remain forever subject to a nation 6,000 miles away.

England by her present policy in India is creating for herself another Ireland, but on an immensely larger scale and involving vastly greater dangers to herself. More than that. By continuing her present Indian policy England is creating in India another Balkan situation, only far more dangerous to Europe and to the whole world than the situation in the Balkans ever was. It will require



INDIA AND WORLD PEACE

only the igniting of a match in India, as little Serbia lighted a match in the Balkans, to start a conflagration which will be liable to become quite as terrible as that which was kindled in Europe. It will mean (if I may change my figure of speech) that the second most populous nation in the world has become transformed into a live volcano, planted in the very center of the greatest continent of the world, the eruption of which will be as certain to come as the tides, and the extent and devastation of which no man can measure.

IV

In connection with this perilous condition of things for India, for Great Britain and for the world, what is to be said of Mahatma Gandhi?

I think three things are to be said of him.

First this: Gandhi is India's friend, her great and true friend, because he is endeavoring to obtain for her the greatest boon any nation on earth can possess,—the boon of freedom:—and what is best and most splendid of all, he is endeavoring to obtain it by peaceful means, by rational and moral means, and not by blood and slaughter.



INDIA, AMERICA AND WORLD BROTHERHOOD

The second thing to be said of Gandhi is that he is England's friend as truly as he is India's.

He has always been England's friend. He rendered England conspicuous service in South Africa. He rendered her great and important service in India during the European War. Is there any other man on earth who is now trying to render her so vast and vital a service as he, in endeavoring to prevent her from committing the unspeakable crime of deluging all India in blood to prevent the Indian people from obtaining the freedom that justly belongs to them?

I have spoken of India in bondage as a smoldering volcano with a terrible eruption impending if the repression is continued. Gandhi would prevent the eruption by putting out the fires.

I have spoken of India held in subjection by the sword as another and more dangerous Ireland. All the horrors that have been witnessed in Ireland in all the years and generations past, might have been averted if England had dealt with Ireland justly. Gandhi pleads with England to deal with India justly and thus save her from horrors such as Ireland has suffered, and worse; and also to save



INDIA AND WORLD PEACE

herself—England—from committing crimes against India such as she so long committed against Ireland, and worse.

If England refuses to take the hand of Gandhi, held out to her for justice and peace, the future of India is dark; and the future of England is dark. Every lover of England in the world should pray that British statesmen may be wise enough to take this great peace-lover's hand for justice and friendship and peace.

If Gandhi desires to save India, scarcely less earnestly does he desire to save Britain—to save her from her worst enemies, her militarists and her imperialists. These men he believes are her foes because they are endeavoring to keep the British Empire part slave and part free, a condition which, in the very nature of things, is a mistake and cannot endure. He would save the British nation by making it all free—by transforming it into a great federation of free peoples,—a condition which in the nature of things is the most stable and secure that the world has ever discovered. Such a federation, bound together by ideals and aims of world liberty, world justice and world brotherhood, would have no truer friend on earth than Mohandas Karamchand Gandhi.



INDIA, AMERICA AND WORLD BROTHERHOOD

Third, and finally, Gandhi is not only the friend of India and Britain, but he is no less the friend of Europe, Asia and the whole world—a friend of all these, than whom none greater or truer is living or is likely to arise. He is the friend of Europe and Asia because he is showing to those two great continents how they may free themselves from that antagonism which many centuries of greed and conquest and cruel exploitation on the part of Europe has created, and which at no distant day must burst into a flame to devastate both continents, unless prevented by the rise of such a spirit of justice and human brotherhood as Gandhi is preaching with such power in India. And he is the friend of the whole world because he is showing to the whole world the way to avoid that greatest peril that threatens the future of mankind—the array of the white race, on the one hand, and the colored races, on the other, in permanent social, economic and political hostility the one to the other. Such hostility can lead nowhere but to death. Gandhi is pointing out, as did Buddha and Jesus in the ancient days, the way of life.



CHAPTER VII

WHAT GREAT BRITAIN SHOULD DO

IN this closing chapter of the section of my book (*Part Second*) which deals directly with India, I wish to make one thing absolutely clear, if it has not been made clear already. It is (as was said in the beginning) that this is not a book "against England". Not one word of it has been written in a spirit of hostility to Great Britain. Although I am a citizen of America and have lived most of my life here, I was born in England, where I have many relatives and dear friends, and where I have spent much time. Next to my adopted country I love England best of any land on earth. I am also much attached to Canada, where I have lived seven years. I wish all Englishmen well. I wish good and only good to Great Britain. It is because I love England and Englishmen, as well as India and the Indian people, that this book has been written.



INDIA, AMERICA AND WORLD BROTHERHOOD

What I have endeavored to do in these pages has been to point out and deprecate those features of British rule in India, those lines of conduct of the British government toward the Indian people, that I believe to be unjust and therefore harmful to Great Britain herself as well as to India and to the world.

Those men are not enemies of any nation who point out its mistakes and its sins with a view to their correction and future avoidance. Burke and Fox and Pitt were not enemies of their country when they thundered against the conduct of their government toward the American Colonies and warned the King and his ministers that unless they changed their policy they would lose these valuable possessions. The enemies of their country at that time were the short-sighted and evil-minded men who encouraged the British government to persist in treating its American Colonies tyrannically and unjustly.

Burke was not an enemy of his country when he arraigned Warren Hastings for his unjust and tyrannical treatment of India. John Bright, John Stuart Mill, Professor Fawcett, Charles Bradlaugh and such eminent men of the Indian Civil Service as A. O. Hume, Sir Henry Cotton, Sir William Wedderburn



WHAT GREAT BRITAIN SHOULD DO

and a host of others, have not been enemies of their country when they have pointed out with unsparing hand and condemned with unsparing voice, the evils and the wrongs of the British-Indian Government, and pleaded for justice and freedom for the Indian people. These men have been wise enough to understand that injustice is weakness in any nation, and that only the just nation can be permanently strong.

What I want for India is justice : this means freedom to direct her own life and shape her own future. What I want of Britain is to give her this freedom, which is the right of every nation. Why does not Britain, for her own sake as well as India's, hasten to perform this high act of justice ? By doing it she would win the respect and honor of the world. Every year all justice-loving and liberty-loving people are seeing more and more clearly that for her to hold a great civilized nation in subjection is against humanity. After having made the declarations which she has before the whole world, that she believes in freedom for all peoples, and having fought a great war in ostensible support of the same, it will be an eternal disgrace, a stain upon her honor that cannot be removed, if she refuses freedom to



INDIA, AMERICA AND WORLD BROTHERHOOD

the second largest civilized nation on the entire earth.

Of course it is not for me to say whether the future of India should be that of an absolutely independent nation, separate from Great Britain, or that of a free nation linked by willing and fraternal bonds with other free nations in a great world-encircling British-Indian Federation or Commonwealth. The decision as to this should be left of course to India and Great Britain, in full, fraternal conference, the Indian people having absolute freedom in the matter and absolute equality in all deliberations and decisions.

Why does not Great Britain, without delay, invite India to hold with her such a conference? The time is ripe. Everything is propitious. Such a conference must be held sooner or later. It is unthinkable that a final adjustment can ever be made between the two nations in any other way. India has risen to her feet. She will never sink to her knees again. She can never again be dictated to or coerced. If the Gandhi non-co-operation movement wins, there must be such a conference at its end to settle matters. If the Gandhi movement fails and India is driven to revolt, and years of blood and terror, there can



WHAT GREAT BRITAIN SHOULD DO

be but one possible end to it : India will win ; and then must come a conference to arrange terms of peace. All wars have to end in conferences at last. How much better to hold them at first and prevent the wars ! After a bloody revolution in India, Britain will occupy a far less advantageous position in a conference than now. If she has any wisdom she will call a conference without waiting for a revolution.

And of course the initiative must come from her. If the conference is absolutely sincere, open, honorable and fair on Britain's part, it will succeed, and reach an adjustment of relations between the two nations of the highest value to both parties. It will hardly be possible for India to enter the conference without feeling more or less of suspicion and distrust,—she has been deceived so often, so many promises have been made to her that have not been kept, so many hopes have been held up before her that have proved only mirages ! She herself will be fair and honorable. Will Britain come into a conference in the same spirit ? If so, all will be well. But as already suggested, she must not come with any thought of dictating, or manifesting any spirit of condescension. For the first time in



INDIA, AMERICA AND WORLD BROTHERHOOD

her history she must take her stand before the Indian people on a level with them.

Of course the conference cannot be with all the Indian people, but only with their representatives; but they must be real representatives, chosen by India herself, and not by Britain. There has been too much pretense on the part of Britain in the past that she was granting India representation in this and that important imperial gathering (as her War Councils, etc.), when she brought into those gatherings Indians chosen by herself and not by India. That was not representation of India: it was representation of Britain; it was Britain increasing her own representation, by choosing certain Indians as *her* representatives. Perhaps it ought to be counted an honor by those Indians that they were admitted to Britain's councils; but the lie should not have been given out to the world that they represented the Indian people, who had not authorized them in any way to speak or act for India. India can be represented only by representatives chosen by herself: as no nation can be represented by persons other than those whom it chooses and duly authorizes to act in its behalf.

I speak on this point thus fully because



WHAT GREAT BRITAIN SHOULD DO

there is danger here. If such a conference as I am suggesting shall be called, it will be natural for Britain to desire to do what she has always done and designate the persons who are to represent India. But that, if allowed, will destroy everything. Of course India will not allow it. Nor ought Britain to wish it. She should learn wisdom from the past and come in with a wholly different spirit.

If a conference is held which is absolutely honest, sincere, open, just and fair on Britain's part, it will succeed and I am sure all the indications are that India will accept its decisions and carry them out faithfully and honorably. Thus bitterness and antagonisms will cease, bloody revolution and war will be averted, and an adjustment of relations between the two nations will be reached which will be in the highest degree advantageous to both.

Will Great Britain be wise enough to invite India to hold such a conference, to consist of say twenty of India's wisest and most trusted leaders, to be chosen through her National Congress and All-India Muslim League, or these two in connection with other national organizations, or in such other manner as the Indian people may desire, these twenty duly carefully chosen and duly accredited



INDIA, AMERICA AND WORLD BROTHERHOOD

representatives of India to meet with a corresponding number of wise and trusted representatives of Great Britain, the whole body to study together the many-sided, complicated, difficult Indian situation, with patience, with ample time at their disposal, with all the intelligence they can command, with candor, with respect for one another, with a sincere desire to do justice to India as a nation and to every individual Indian who may be affected by a change of government, and an equally sincere desire to do justice to Great Britain as a nation and to every individual Englishman who may have just interests in India—I say, will Great Britain be wise enough to call such a conference, and thus settle rationally, justly (at least with as great a degree of justice to all parties and interests as can be attained), and peacefully, the most difficult and the most menacing problem that confronts her, and at the same time free herself from a continuation of the greatest wrong that has blackened her name in the recent past? Let us hope.



CSL

PART THIRD
WORLD-WIDE BROTHERHOOD



WORLD-WIDE BROTHERHOOD

OUR world has many needs, many that are great and urgent. But among them all has it any other that is so vital as the need of brotherhood? And the brotherhood must not be limited. It must be universal, it must be world-wide, it must take in the entire human race.

I

Perhaps the one thing that has done more than anything else in human history to make this possible—to prepare the way for human brotherhood on the scale of an entire humanity, has been the recent unifying of the physical world, that is, the bringing of the scattered parts of the earth's surface for the first time, into actual relations with one another, so as to form a whole. Strange as it may seem, only within our own time has the earth been really one. Previously, there were fragments of a



INDIA, AMERICA AND WORLD BROTHERHOOD

world, parts of a world, some near to one another and some remote, some known to one another and some unknown ; but not an entire and unbroken world. There was no unity among the parts : therefore there was no basis for a unity of mankind. Although the spiritual world transcends the physical, yet in a very real sense it rests upon it. Therefore, not until the physical world became a unity was it possible for humanity to become a unity.

How isolated and unconnected have been the different parts of the world is easily seen. The world as we know it to-day contains five main land-areas which we call continents. But until very recent times only three of these—Asia, Europe, and Africa—even knew of the existence of the others: and in these three only relatively small parts which were contiguous, ever had much intercourse. The vastly larger outlying portions were almost as much strangers as if they had been in different universes. Until four centuries ago, so great and important a country as China was a mysterious land, practically unknown beyond limited parts of Asia. Even India, with her conspicuous place in Asiatic civilization, was hardly more than a name to a large part of mankind. Her silks and tapestries and other



WORLD-WIDE BROTHERHOOD

rich products of her looms, and the exquisite work of her jewellers and lapidaries, had made their way to the chief cities of Western Asia and the countries around the Mediterranean Sea, and her Buddhist monks seem to have carried their gospel of brotherhood nearly as far; yet it was not until a sea-route was discovered connecting Europe with the Orient, that India began to be at all adequately known to the Western world.

Until sixty or seventy years ago, Japan—now so conspicuous among the nations—was merely a group of obscure, far-away islands, of which the majority of mankind had never heard. Until four hundred years ago the great continents of North and South America were hidden away beyond the broad and stormy Atlantic, undreamed of by any nation of the Eastern world. Until later still, Australia—larger in area than all of Europe outside of Russia—was undiscovered by the rest of mankind. The immense interior of Africa was a *terra incognita* until almost our own generation. The same was true of vast regions in the extreme north and the extreme south, in the vicinity of the north and south poles. Not until the modern age of exploration and discovery, consequent upon man's mastery of the



INDIA, AMERICA AND WORLD BROTHERHOOD

sea, were the thousands of islands—some of them large and populous—scattered among the oceans of the world, known to Europe or Asia, or even to one another.

But at last a very great change has come, a change beginning in the fifteenth century with such great voyagers and explorers as Columbus and Vasco de Gama, but not completed until our own generation. Now all important parts are discovered ; the fragments are brought into touch ; the scattered pieces, no matter how far apart, are joined ; for the first time the world is really one.

And it is one not only in the sense that all parts are known to one another, but also in the deeper sense that relationships undreamed of before have been established between them, and common interests of a hundred kinds have been discovered or created, which are certain to be permanent. Trade and commerce by land and sea, railways, steamships, telegraphs, cables under oceans and wireless and radio over both oceans and continents, postal systems extending to all countries, travel to remotest regions, world-wide finance, newspapers and literature circulating everywhere—these things, the creations of our modern science and modern knowledge—are shuttles which have woven



WORLD-WIDE BROTHERHOOD

all parts of the earth together and made them a unity,—one world in the fullest and deepest sense, no portion of which can separate its fortunes from the fortunes of all the rest—no part of which can prosper without all other parts being advanced, or injured without all other parts of suffering. The isolation and self-sufficiency of peoples and of nations is gone, never to return.

St. Paul says of the human body: "The eye cannot say to the hand, I have no need of thee, or the head to the feet, I have no need of you. If one member suffers, all the members suffer with it; and if one member is honored, all the members are honored." We are beginning to see that exactly the same is true of the world, now that it has become one. Asia cannot say to Europe, "I have no need of you; nor Europe to Asia, "I have no need of you." No nation, without folly, and loss, can be indifferent to the welfare of any other nation. No people can harm another people without, sooner or later, finding a lash falling upon their own back.

The consequences flowing from the unification of the world are necessarily very great and far-reaching. Since we have now one world and one human family, with interests



INDIA, AMERICA AND WORLD BROTHERHOOD

that cannot be separated, we must have harmony, we must have brotherhood. Everything possible must be done to prevent ill-feelings, misunderstandings, contentions, injustices, suspicions, fears, hates, whatever tends to produce antagonisms and wars. The family, the whole family of humanity, must learn to live together in peace and goodwill. This is absolutely vital. This means that the most imperative, the most pressing question now before the entire world is how to promote human brotherhood, how to enable the great newly-created world-family of individuals, nations and races, to live together without destroying one another.

It is said by doubting, fearing, faithless men, that thoughts of human brotherhood are pleasant, exhilarating, delightful, but are not practical, and are mere dreams. The answer, clear as the sun, is that nothing else but brotherhood is practical; everything to the contrary is insanity, anarchy, ruin.

“Dreams are they—our dreams of human brotherhood ?

Yes, they are dreams, but dreams
from God.

Shall we despise and scorn them—
That men shall love one another,



WORLD-WIDE BROTHERHOOD

That all, whate'er their station, color,
Rank or name, shall call each other
brother,
That hate 'twixt land and land shall
cease,
That war, red-handed, shall give place
to peace,
That greed shall grow less in the
market-place,
That lust shall yield to love for the
race,
That men shall meet God face to
face?
Dreams are they all? Yes, *God's*
dreams, and
Because they are God's dreams,
As God lives *they shall come true.*"

Human brotherhood is important in whatever form it appears : it is particularly necessary, however, that it be promoted in four different directions, namely, between *Nations*, between *Races*; between *Individuals* and *Classes* (Social and Industrial Brotherhood) and between *Religions*.

II

First, brotherhood between *Races*. One of the greatest obstacles in the way of inter-racial



INDIA, AMERICA AND WORLD BROTHERHOOD

brotherhood has been the lack of acquaintance, with, and of knowledge of, one another.

“Herein lies the tragedy of the world:

Not that men are poor—

All men know something of poverty.

Not that men are wicked—

Who is good?

Not that men are ignorant of a thousand things—

Truth is infinite.

Nay, but that men and peoples *know so little of one another.*”

For the most part, the different races of the world have had habitats widely separated; and men are likely to be prejudiced against those at a distance whom they do not know. People who are strange to us are apt to repel us. Charles Lamb in talking with a friend referred to a certain man as one whom he hated. “But why do you hate him?” inquired the friend, “do you know him?” “Oh no,” replied Lamb, “that is why I hate him; if I knew him, I couldn’t hate him.” The fact that races have usually been so widely separated, and therefore strangers to one another, has been an important cause in the rise of race antipathies. Happily *this* cause of race hatred and antagonism is tending to pass away under modern



WORLD-WIDE BROTHERHOOD

conditions, since the physical world has become one and people of all races are being brought into closer contact.

Another cause of antagonism between races is difference of color, hair, and physical characteristics, difference of language, of dress and of customs. But why should difference create alienation, or hatred, or repulsion? Would mankind be more attractive if all men were exactly alike? Would we regard a flower-garden as more beautiful, if it contained only one kind of flower? Would a forest made up of a single species of trees be thought superior to one containing many species? In the world of physical nature variety is considered an element of attraction, beauty, wealth. Why should it not be so in the world of humanity? Rightly looked at, the fact that there are different races of men, with different appearances, customs, characteristics, means advantage; means a more interesting and wonderful world. The world would be far poorer and far less desirable as a place to live in if there were in it only one race and one civilization, even if that race and civilization were our own. Intimate acquaintance with different races shows that they all possess qualities which in their different ways are interesting



INDIA, AMERICA AND WORLD BROTHERHOOD

and admirable, and which form a solid basis for mutual regard and fraternal relations. Friendships should not be confined to persons of one's own class, one's own station in life, or one's own race. Some of the warmest and truest friendships ever known have been between men of widely different races. Lives are widened and enriched by international and inter-racial contacts and sympathies. To know another civilization with sympathy and appreciation, is a valuable education. We should learn to care for human beings as human beings, without reference to the accidents that differentiate them from one another or from us. Brotherhood should be as wide as humanity.

Perhaps nothing in the past has done so much to create antagonism between races, perhaps nothing is doing so much to create and foster such antagonism at the present time, as the disposition on the part of the stronger and more advanced races to tyrannize over, oppress and wrong the weaker—to subjugate them and exploit their lands, and in many cases virtually to make slaves of them. Under such conditions, of course, brotherhood is impossible. Brotherhood can be based only on kindness and justice.



WORLD-WIDE BROTHERHOOD

Whenever races more advanced in civilization come into contact with those less advanced, their aim should not be to subjugate and exploit, but to befriend and lift up. We are ashamed to take advantage of the weakness and ignorance of children to abuse and oppress them—because we are wiser and stronger than they we recognize it to be our duty to protect them. It should be the same with advanced races in their dealings with races of inferior culture. The attitude of the superior should always be that of friend, guardian, teacher; never that of despoiler. Thus it is that the promotion of brotherhood between races must always rest mainly with the higher.

What have we in America done to promote or to hinder the spirit of brotherhood between races? Let us see.

I recall with shame that some years ago we, as a nation, forgot for the time being, our own past history and the very foundation principle of our democracy—that “all just government derives its power from the consent of the governed”—and following the evil example of the nations of Europe, we obtained a colony, or rather a dependency, in the Far East. Finding the people of the Philippine Islands



INDIA, AMERICA AND WORLD BROTHERHOOD

struggling to free themselves from a tyrannical foreign power, instead of aiding them, we committed the crime of seizing their country, carrying on a cruel war to subdue them, and have held them ever since as our subjects, undoubtedly feeling ourselves more at liberty to do this because they were of a race different from our own.

True, we have probably treated these Filipino subjects of ours better than any other nation has ever treated a subject people. We have done much to establish and maintain schools and education among them everywhere, and to promote sanitation in all parts of the Islands. We have allowed a majority of the offices of the country—the higher as well as the lower—to be filled by Filipinos. We have left municipal and local government almost wholly in the hands of the people. We have even gone so far as to grant to the Filipinos themselves nearly full power in national legislation and in control of their national finances. In other words, our “benevolent despotism” has been extraordinarily benevolent,—benevolent to a degree hitherto unknown. Yet what of all this? Nonetheless our rule has been a despotism, unpardonable and unendurable, because it has robbed nine or



WORLD-WIDE BROTHERHOOD

ten millions of people of something for the loss of which nothing can compensate, something dearer to them than life itself—their freedom, their independence; it has kept them in subjection to a foreign power whose only right to rule them was the right of the sword; it has humiliated and degraded them by depriving them of a place among the nations of the world.

Will we persist in our national sin? I am happy to answer that I do not think so. We have promised the Filipinos their independence, and I believe we shall keep our promise. Our militarists, imperialists and capitalists, to whom human freedom means little (as it means little to those classes the world over) want to retain these rich Islands permanently for purposes of exploitation, and are doing and will do all in their power to render our promise of no effect by causing interminable delays in its fulfilment. Their power is great but they will not succeed. The American people as a whole are honorable and just. To them the nation's promises are not camouflage, and not scraps of paper to be trampled under foot at will. They are sacred things. We shall defeat our capitalists and militarists, and at no distant day we shall grant to the Filipinos the freedom we have too long withheld from them.



INDIA, AMERICA AND WORLD BROTHERHOOD

We, Americans have a very serious race problem here at home. It has to do with our negro population. How can ninety or a hundred millions of white people and ten or twelve millions of another race and color live together in the same nation? Unfortunately we have tried the way of antagonism, as seen in our shameful lynchings. But antagonism only creates further antagonism, and our difficulties deepen. Slowly but surely, as I believe, our better minds are beginning to see that because we, the white people, have always been free while the negroes have been slaves, because we have enjoyed advantages of education and self-development of which the negroes have been deprived, and because our civilization has been higher than theirs, therefore the chief responsibility for mending things rests upon us. *Noblesse oblige*. Our business is not to sneer or criticize or blame, but to help. To these people who are with us, not because they wanted to come, but because we brought them for our own advantage, we must now give the advantages that are their right—facilities for education that will lift them out of their ignorance and dependence, and make them intelligent, self-supporting, self-respecting members of civilized communities. In other



WORLD-WIDE BROTHERHOOD

words, we are beginning to discover that the key to our American negro problem is brotherhood and that there is no other, as there is no other to any of the race problems of the world.

There is serious antagonism, largely racial, between the peoples of Asia and those of Europe. Because European nations belong to the so-called 'White' race, they have long been disposed to look down upon Asiatic peoples, and to regard themselves as at liberty to domineer over them, to exploit them and rob them of their territory. Today, Europe holds political control over three quarters of Asia. This injustice, of course, is felt deeply by the Asiatic peoples. They love freedom and independence as much as do the people of Europe. They like no better to be robbed of their soil and be ruled by aliens. If antagonism between Asiatic and European nations is to be removed, Europe must treat the older continent with more of justice than too often she has done in the past or is doing today.

Great Britain's past treatment of China in twice waging war against her for the purpose of forcing the opium trade upon her people, thus to gain revenue by their degradation and ruin, forms one of the darkest records of modern history. Indeed the treatment which



INDIA, AMERICA AND WORLD BROTHERHOOD

nearly all the leading powers of Europe have accorded to China has been overbearing and unjust in the extreme. How long is this to continue ?

Great Britain's treatment of India, her persistence in holding in subjection a highly intellectual people, with a civilization far older than her own, exploiting and impoverishing their country for her own enrichment, and granting them no effective voice whatever in their own government, is a great and long-continued wrong which the whole civilized world should condemn. Is this to continue ?

It is especially unfortunate that there should be injustice and antagonism between the races of Europe and Asia, because of the fact that they are so closely related. Europeans call themselves 'white' and the peoples of Asia 'brown' and 'yellow'. But how very little do these colors really signify ! Some Asiatics are whiter than some Europeans. When light-skinned Europeans migrate to tropical lands they grow darker in color, and when dark-skinned Asiatics move to colder climates, they grow lighter.

If anywhere in either continent any race is disposed to lift itself up in pride above others as a purer race and therefore as superior, it



WORLD-WIDE BROTHERHOOD

may well be reminded that neither continent contains any such thing as a pure race. All the races of Asia and Europe are mixed : this is particularly true of Europe. It seems to be the verdict of the highest scientific authorities that there is probably not a single so-called 'European' person living who does not have Asiatic blood in his veins, while large numbers of the inhabitants of Southern Europe possess more or less African blood. Considering these facts, how little ground is there among the peoples of either continent for race pride or race antagonisms and how much for race brotherhood !

Europe is disposed to be proud and domineering over Asia because she (Europe) claims to be at the front in the world's civilization. Her claim is open to dispute—the decision depending upon what we are to regard as highest in civilization, things material or things spiritual. And it may be well for Europe to remember that even if she is at the front to-day, she was not always so, and the time may come again when she will not be. At one time Egypt, in despised Africa, led the civilization of the world. At another, Babylon in Asia was the leader ; at another, India ; at another, China.



INDIA, AMERICA AND WORLD BROTHERHOOD

If Europe has produced great nations, so has Asia. If Europe has given birth to great men, Asia has given birth to men quite as great. Indeed, has Europe any sons who may justly be ranked as the equal of Asia's Confucius, Buddha, Moses, Mahomet, and Jesus? Europe should not forget that she did not originate her own civilization, but received it from Asia. More than that, she did not originate her moral laws, or her religion. Both of these inestimable treasures are Asia's gifts to her.

During the past half century, Europe has been conferring upon Asia the valuable boon of her science. For this Asia may well be grateful. But there is little cause for boasting on Europe's part, of surely it is time for her to be making some return to the older continent for the priceless boons of her own civilization and especially for the most valuable parts of her civilization, her moral laws, and her religious faith.

What is needed is for Europe and Asia to lay aside their antagonisms, to join hands in carrying forward civilization—civilization on both its sides, material and spiritual, and to co-operate in every way possible in the work of practically uplifting the world.



WORLD-WIDE BROTHERHOOD

III

I pass now from races to *Nations*. If inter-racial brotherhood is important, no less is international. As already pointed out, no nation can prosper by seclusion and certainly not by antagonism. It used to be thought otherwise, and there was some ground for the thought when the countries of the world were isolated and unrelated fragments. But now since they have become united into one world, the situation is wholly different. Now isolation is weakness, it is poverty, it is absence from participation in the world's life and the world's prosperity. And as for fighting others, that is simply suicide. From this time on that nation will be the most prosperous, the most influential and the most safe which has the fewest antagonisms, and the closest and most friendly relations of every kind with the other nations of the world.

It is most unfortunate that our modern idea of nationality is so narrow. There ought to be nothing in nationality antagonistic to other nations. I love my home. But that is no reason why I should hate or seek to injure other people's homes. So, the fact that I love my own nation is no reason why I should hate



INDIA, AMERICA AND WORLD BROTHERHOOD

or distrust or encroach upon other nations.
“Larger than any nation is humanity.”

Why is it that two men who are friends, who respect each other and have perfect confidence in each other when living together as neighbors on the same side of an imaginary line called a national boundary, should grow distrustful of one another or become enemies as soon as they come to have homes on opposite sides of that line? What is there in nationality or national boundary lines that should destroy human brotherhood? If kindly feeling is desirable and possible between man and man and between community and community in the same nation, why is it not equally so between different nations? Is it not just as important that two neighboring nations should be friendly, as that two parts of the same nation should be?

We see men making strange uses of the word ‘patriotism.’ He who takes part in a war that his country carries on, is likely to be called a ‘patriot’ regardless of the character of the conflict, however unjust or inhuman, its method or purpose. He who devotes his whole life to his country in ways of peace, rendering her service of the highest possible importance—for an example, as a wise educator of the



WORLD-WIDE BROTHERHOOD

young, or a great and unselfish scientist, or an honorable and upright business man and developer of the country's industrial resources, or as a just and incorruptible judge—such a man is seldom pointed to as a patriot. And yet which is the truer patriot ?

In the long history of the relations between France and Germany, involving so many bloody struggles, those Frenchmen have always claimed to be most patriotic who have been the bitterest foes of Germany and have done the most to keep alive hostility toward Germany. And those Germans have always claimed to be most patriotic who have been the bitterest foes of France and have most fanned the flame of hatred toward the nation beyond the Rhine. But it was false patriotism. Such patriots, so-called, were really enemies of their countries. The real friends of France and Germany, the men in both nations who have been real patriots, have been those who have labored to allay enmity, and to create between the two nations sentiments of goodwill, mutual respect and fraternity. So everywhere.

During the last half century there have been no such enemies of England as those men who have stirred up in the public mind of Britain constant distrust of the nations of the



INDIA, AMERICA AND WORLD BROTHERHOOD

Continent, and thus have pushed on the Government to the building of more and ever more warships, with the money so deeply needed for feeding and clothing and housing and educating the British people. And in America there are no such enemies of the United States as those who try to kindle among our people distrust of England, or distrust of Germany, or distrust of Japan or distrust of Russia as an excuse for creating a great navy to menace other nations and to get us into entanglements with other powers.

Among the nations today, we have world-wide finance. Financial cheques or drafts drawn by men in England or America or China or Australia, are cashed by banks in every part of the globe. Why is this possible? It is possible only because we have world-wide financial confidence. The same degree of political confidence among the nations would give us world-wide arbitration, and that would mean world-wide peace, with such resultant prosperity as the nations have never known. Why should we not have the same degree of political as of financial confidence among the nations? The great majority of the people who make up every civilized nation are trustworthy, honest, peace-loving. They do not want war. They



WORLD-WIDE BROTHERHOOD

do not want to wrong other peoples. They would like to live in as friendly relations with their neighboring nations as with their neighboring communities or neighboring families. Why should they not be permitted to do so?

The late awful war in Europe grew wholly out of mental conditions—out of fear and suspicion. The European nations did not want to injure one another—I mean, the people of those nations did not. But they had all been taught to distrust and suspect one another, and so they kept themselves armed to the teeth against one another. The result was inevitable. Sooner or later the armies and navies were certain to be put to use, and such an Armageddon as we saw was sure to come. What was needed? International trust instead of international distrust.

Unquestionably the most prolific begetters of international distrust within the last fifty years have been great armies and navies. The greater these have become, the greater has been the mistrust, and the greater the distrust, the greater has been the danger. Instead of great armies and navies preventing war, as we have foolishly dreamed, they foster it; they foster it because they create a spirit of suspicion and fear and therefore of hostility. Vast



INDIA, AMERICA AND WORLD BROTHERHOOD

armaments, instead of being called—as militarists everywhere insist on calling them as “insurance against war”, ought to be labelled “assurances of war.” This the terrible European conflict has made forever clear.

All the leading nations in the great European war seem to have believed that they were forced into it. But if they were, it was their own preparations for war that forced him.

Let us make two suppositions. First, let us suppose that at the time the late German Kaiser came to the throne, in 1887, he and the German nation had been wise enough to issue to the world the following proclamation:—“Germany sincerely wants peace. Germany believes in peace. Germany invites all nations to set out, with her, upon honest, determined, permanent careers of peace. In the interest of peace we, the German Government and people, solemnly declare and promise to all nations that from this time on we will maintain no army except one simply sufficient to perform necessary police service at home, or—in connection with other nations—in unprotected regions abroad. We will maintain no navy except what may be necessary for strictly police ends, on waters for which we are respon-



WORLD-WIDE BROTHERHOOD

sible. Our policy hereafter will be peace. We will commit no aggressions. We will try to treat all nations justly and fairly and we shall confidently trust and believe that other nations will treat us with corresponding fairness and justice. We shall cultivate among our people a spirit of respect for other peoples. We shall do what in us lies to promote goodwill and brotherhood among all nations. If ever trouble or misunderstanding arises between us and any other Government, which we cannot peacefully settle between that government and ourselves, we will submit the case for settlement to a competent and trustworthy Court or Tribunal of Arbitration which shall be agreed upon by the two governments, and abide by the decision of that tribunal."

What would have been the result of such a stand for peace taken before the world by Germany? Would her safety have been imperilled? Rather would not her security have been greatly increased? Would any nation have dared to attack her? Would any have wished to attack her? And being thus relieved from the staggering burden of modern army and navy support, how she would have forged ahead in industries, in the sciences, in the fine arts, in literature, in education, in



INDIA, AMERICA AND WORLD BROTHERHOOD

wealth, in the comfort and prosperity of her people! She would have become the admired and the envied land of the whole world.

My second supposition is that had Great Britain twenty-five years ago issued a similar proclamation of peace, goodwill, and justice to all nations, with a determination to submit all questions of international misunderstanding to arbitration, what would have been the result in her case?

She would have been as safe as Germany, She and Germany would have been the two most secure, honored and prosperous nations in existence; and long before the present time every other nation would have been compelled to follow them—nay, would have been glad to follow them. This would have been the condition of things in the world during recent years, and this would have been the condition to-day, instead of a war which raged four years slaughtered ten millions of men, pauperized far more than ten millions of women and children, and left behind it a ruined Europe.

Nothing on earth is more certain than that wars can never be prevented by the madness of filling the world with armies and navies. If nations would have peace, they must prepare for peace, not for war; they must



WORLD-WIDE BROTHERHOOD

do those things which create between them—not suspicion, hate and fear—but trust, goodwill and the spirit of brotherhood.

As there is no course so safe for an individual man, as to do right and trust his fellows, so there is no course so safe for a nation as to be just and trust other nations. And as there is no course so dangerous for a man, as to distrust everybody and go about, arrogant and defiant and armed to the teeth, so no course is so dangerous for a nation as to distrust and antagonize other nations and depend for safety on armies and navies. The time has fully come when armies and navies should not be tolerated for any other purposes except strictly those of national and international police.

IV

I come now to a consideration of Brotherhood between *Classes* and *Individual Persons*.

Social brotherhood in our day appears in many interesting and excellent forms. The chief trouble is its limitation. We have social sets restricted to chosen circles, social clubs for the few. We have social and benevolent fraternities of many names, some of them with very large memberships, all of them excellent so far as they go. But the great need is for



INDIA, AMERICA AND WORLD BROTHERHOOD

brotherhood not limited by social restrictions, brotherhood based on simple manhood and womanhood, brotherhood wide as humanity.

In times past in England, in Russia before the late revolution, and in many other lands, we have seen brotherhood prevented, or very seriously limited by the existence of kings, lords, hereditary aristocracies, privileged classes, who on account of birth and ancestry have arrogated to themselves positions above the people, and have claimed for themselves special rights and immunities (often divine rights) for which they have made no adequate return. Against all this the people everywhere are more and more revolting, and justly so. The spirit of democracy is rising in all lands, and democracy means not special privileges for certain classes, but equality of privileges for all.

In all ages militarism has been a great destroyer of human brotherhood. In the nature of the case, armies are autocracies. The officers command, the soldiers obey. The business of the soldier is not to think for himself, but to subordinate his thought wholly to that of his commander. An army to be efficient, must be a machine, every part moved by the will which is at its head. An army is



WORLD-WIDE BROTHERHOOD

a caste system. The higher officers look down upon the lower, and the lower upon the private soldiers. There must not be democracy, there must not be the spirit of brotherhood; these destroy authority and weaken discipline. The most perfect army is one where there is least democracy. This is why militarism is so great an evil. Men everywhere who love liberty must learn to distrust and to fear armies and navies. If democracy, true democracy, democracy that means human brotherhood, is to prevail in the modern world, armies and navies must be reduced to the very lowest possible limits.

In India, we see brotherhood broken up in a serious way by caste. Her forty millions or more of "untouchables" are at once her disgrace and her peril. How can she expect national unity; how can she hope to become a democracy or a government in any sense "of the people and by the people" so long as these millions are robbed of their manhood and of the most elementary and fundamental rights of life? Their existence in her midst alienates from her the sympathy and regard of justice-loving men in all lands. The rights of these unfortunates must be restored to them if India is to be free or worthy of freedom.



INDIA, AMERICA AND WORLD BROTHERHOOD

Happily the Indian people themselves are realising this and are beginning to act in accordance with the realization. It is one of the signs of the wisdom, the nobleness and the justice of Mahatma Gandhi and the great movement for national freedom which he has so powerfully led, that from the first he raised the banner of equal rights for all, declaring that India must have no untouchables; that all Indians must understand that they are brothers.

Perhaps the most wide-spread, the most rapidly increasing and the most serious danger to brotherhood in the modern world is wealth. This danger is greatest in the West; but it is not absent from the East. Wherever wealth appears, it tends to create a caste; it tends to separate its possessors into an artificial and anything but a noble aristocracy, the existence of which destroys brotherhood very effectually.

How can this peril to modern society be counteracted? For one thing, all that is possible should everywhere be done to create a public sentiment which will make it a disgrace for rich men to use their wealth for merely selfish ends, for mere personal pleasure and self-aggrandisement. We must help them to



WORLD-WIDE BROTHERHOOD

understand that the public has a just partnership in all their possessions. They did not create any part of their wealth out of nothing. They were able to obtain it only because the community helped them to obtain it in a thousand ways. Compelled to spend their lives in a desert, or on an island of the sea, separated from their fellowmen, they would have been able to accumulate as little wealth as the beggar who asks alms of them. They have been able to become rich only because they have been widely ministered to and richly aided. Therefore their wealth is theirs only in part. The law of the land gives them the privilege of directing its use; but there is a law higher than any act of congress or legislature or Parliament or decree of monarch, which declares that they are only trustees. The community has claims upon the possessions they hold, and upon them. They themselves are not their own. They belong to God. They belong to their country. They belong to their fellow men.

Society in its real interests is a solidarity, and is coming to be more and more so as it grows more complex. This all men need to understand. No man can injure another without injuring himself; no man can benefit another



INDIA, AMERICA AND WORLD BROTHERHOOD

without benefiting himself. Each needs all. We are all "our brothers' keepers." Every man's wealth, as also every man's talent is a trust.

In ancient Athens it was regarded as a disgrace for a rich man to live in personal luxury, or to lavish wealth upon his family. Public sentiment required him to employ it for the public good. There should be such a public sentiment in every country to-day.

But it is not enough to prevent unbrotherly *uses* of wealth; we must guard against unjust and therefore unbrotherly *accumulations*. Whatever we can do in every land to protect the rights of the people as a whole in public lands, mines, forests, water-power, water-ways, highways, all natural monopolies, valuable franchises, unearned increments, is just so much done to prevent the accumulation in the hands of the few, of that wealth which of right, belongs to the many, and therefore just so much to check-mate those forces which tend to destroy human brotherhood.

The whole world is reaching out after political democracy. Much of its effort is crude, half-blind, unintelligent, blundering. But the impulse is true, and sooner or later it will succeed. In like manner the world is beginning to reach out after social and indus-



WORLD-WIDE BROTHERHOOD

trial democracy. Here, too, there is much blindness and blundering; but the aim is just and there can be no permanent retreat. Old feudalism has long since passed away. Our new capitalistic feudalism must follow. Manhood, character, must be re-valued, must come to be the true purpose of all material development; and the mere massing of material possessions—now called 'wealth', must be rated at its true level, as childish, an atavistic instinct carried over from a very primitive and unintelligent stage of human evolution. Money as a king must be dethroned. Unjust special privilege must be destroyed. Rich idleness must be branded as a disgrace. Labor must everywhere be honored.

It is unfortunate to have labor men and capitalists organised separately for rival and antagonistic purposes. Capital and labor need each other as much as do eye and ear, hand and feet. Neither should seek to dominate the other, but each to supplement the other. Not the capitalist above the laborer, dictating terms to him as in the past, but the capitalist hand in hand with the laborer, the two planning together for the common advantage—this is what the better future will require. Co-operation, industrial partnership, sharing



INDIA, AMERICA AND WORLD BROTHERHOOD

of responsibility, sharing of management and sharing of ownership by capital and labor conjointly—in other words, brotherhood among all concerned—is the imperative need of the industrial world, and there can be no cessation of conflicts until brotherhood is achieved. Here lies the only possible road to permanent industrial peace. Brotherhood, industrial as well as individual and social, is God's law, written in the very nature of man and of human society, and any group of men who try to thwart its development, imperil their own existence as well as the well-being of society as a whole.

V

I come now in conclusion to brotherhood between *Religions*. It would seem natural to suppose that religious brotherhood would arise earliest of all, would set the example for the rest of the world. But as a fact it has been one of the last to make its appearance, and even yet the world has little experience of it.

Religion began in the world low down. Early people believed in very imperfect gods, and generally in large numbers of them. They attributed to their gods their own charac-



WORLD-WIDE BROTHERHOOD

teristics and passions. If two nations or peoples were hostile toward each other, their gods were regarded as hostile. Under such conditions there could be no brotherhood between religions. And even after men had come to believe in better gods, or in one supreme God, there were many obstacles to overcome. Men have always been prone to believe that they were special favorites of their deities; that their god or gods had given a true religion to them but not to any other people; that supernatural and infallible inspiration had been vouchsafed to their prophets and religious teachers, but not to the prophets and religious teachers of any other land; that their own sacred books were true and divine revelations, but that the sacred books of all other peoples were false; that the 'way of salvation' which their teachers showed was the only true and safe way, and that nations or peoples who trusted to any other would be lost.

This kind of thinking has always been divisive; it has always prevented religious brotherhood, and always will, so long as it continues. Happily, little by little, the larger view is dawning on men's minds, that, notwithstanding the many names, the Power and



INDIA, AMERICA AND WORLD BROTHERHOOD

Wisdom that is over all is One; that God does not have special favorites; that all men in some true deep sense are his children; that his providence embraces all lands and peoples; that his inspiration is not confined to any age or race, but is universal; that his revelation is larger than any single book or set of books and embraces all truth; that he has raised up prophets and saints and teachers of righteousness in all lands; that no religion has a right to claim that it alone is true and all others false. As soon as men begin to think in this large way, then religious brotherhood begins to appear, and grow, and bear its beautiful fruit of love and peace among men.

Are all the leading religions of the world today effective in producing religious brotherhood? Certainly they ought to be. But are they? I will not attempt to express any judgment concerning the influence in this respect of any of them other than my own. But regarding Christianity I will say that, as it manifests itself in non-Christian countries at the present time, I very much fear it does not always tend to create brotherhood between itself and the faiths with which it comes into contact.

If Christianity comes to a non-Christian



WORLD-WIDE BROTHERHOOD

land, like India, for example, and recognizes the historic and venerable faiths there as sister religions; if it takes pains to make itself intelligent concerning them, keeps eyes open to discover their truths and excellences; is ready to overlook their imperfections (remembering its own); and seeks to co-operate with them in all good works and all efforts to uplift the spiritual and moral life of the people—then the presence of Christianity unquestionably tends to create religious brotherhood. But if Christianity, coming to a non-Christian land, seeks to conquer its historic faiths and endeavors to put itself “on top” instead of by their side, how can this produce brotherhood? Is this any better than if Britain or France or Russia or Japan seek to conquer other countries? Is it any more brotherly to seek to destroy Buddhism, or Hinduism, or Mohammedanism, or Confucianism, than to seek to destroy a neighbor nation?

There is no religion that is free from imperfections. But it is also true that no religion which for centuries has nourished the spiritual faith of millions of human beings, can be declared to be devoid of good.

“Children of men! The Unseen Power
whose eye



INDIA, AMERICA AND WORLD BROTHERHOOD

Forever doth accompany mankind,
Hath looked on no religion scornfully
That man did ever find.

Which hath not taught weak wills
how much they can ?

Which hath not fallen on the dry
heart like rain ?

Which hath not cried to sunk, self-
weary man :

‘Thou must be born again’ ?”

These are things which all religions must bear in mind if they would create among themselves and in the world, the spirit of brotherhood. The world needs religions that appreciate one another's excellences, that are quick to find grounds of unity; that are eager to co-operate. Religions that are blind to one another's merits, that fight and antagonize, by that very fact condemn themselves. The universal need is for religions of good-will; religions that propagate themselves not by the sword, by antagonism or controversy, but by the beauty and self-evidencing quality of their truth, by the elevation and purity of their ethics, by the breadth and kindness of their spirit, and by the excellence of their good works. As such faiths spread and take possession of men's hearts, wars will become impossi-



WORLD-WIDE BROTHERHOOD

ble, hatreds and bigotries will pass away, antagonisms will cease, men will learn to walk together hand in hand as brothers, and peace will come to this distracted earth.

The world needs nothing else so much as it needs brotherhood—not of one kind only, but of all kinds, racial brotherhood, national brotherhood, social brotherhood, industrial brotherhood, religious brotherhood, brotherhood between all classes and peoples—the spirit of brotherhood to pervade all human life.

The finest dream that ever rose on the prophetic vision of humanity is the dream of human brotherhood. Human brotherhood means the "Commonwealth of Man." Human brotherhood means the "Kingdom of Heaven" coming to practical realization on the earth.

I have asked: Is world-wide human brotherhood only a dream? I reply again: It is more than a dream, it is a vision from God, showing to men what ought to be realized, what will be realized, because the ideals of men are the promises of God. As surely then, as that God is God—in other words, as surely as that truth is stronger than error; as surely as that right is stronger than wrong; as surely as that love is stronger than hate; as surely as that good is stronger than evil;—so surely



INDIA, AMERICA AND WORLD BROTHERHOOD

must brotherhood, wide as humanity, come. To doubt this is both cowardice and atheism. But because God works through human agencies therefore it is also both cowardice and atheism if any of us to whom the divine vision has been revealed, fails to do his part, fails to join hands with God and his fellowmen to help make the dream of Human Brotherhood come true.

“ Alas, how much sweet life is lost,
How much is black and bitter with the
frost,

That might be sweet with the sweet
sun,

If men could only know that they are
one.

But it will rise—Love's Hero-World
—at last.

I see the arches of the Pit depart,
The Creeds, the Fears, the Hates,
The carnal, wild-haired Fates
That sunder, bruise and mar.

The crest and crowning of all good,
Life's final star, is Brotherhood.

Come, clear the way, then ; clear the
way ;

Blind creeds and kings have had their
day.

Our hope is in heroic man,



CSL

WORLD-WIDE BROTHERHOOD

Star-led, to build the world again.
To this event the ages ran ;
Make way for Brotherhood ; make
way for Man."



INDEX

A

- Adams, Charles Francis, 161.
Adams, John, 39.
Aden, 230.
Afghanistan, 229.
American colonies, 108.
American colonies—history, 184.
American Peace Society 78, 80.
American Revolution, 216.
Amritsar massacre, 147.
Andrews, C. F. on Famines, 120.
Antislavery and Garrison, 30.
Antislavery and Mrs. Howe, 30.
Antislavery party, 11. [74.
Arabian coast, 230.
Armies and Navies, 277.
Arnold, Matthew, 61.
Asia and India, 239,
Asoka, 139.
Athens, 286.

B

- Babylon, 271.
Baltimore jail, Garrison in, 33.
Battle Hymn of the Republic 72.
Bellary famine, 116.
Bengal, 167.
Bible, favorite of Lincoln, 4.
Bill of Rights, 201.
Boer War, 219.
Bombay, 112.

- Boston commonwealth, 74.
Bowring, Sir John, 80.
Bradlaugh, Charles, 246.
Breshkovsky, Catherine. 75.
Brice, Judge, 34.
Bridgeman, Laura, 68.
Bright, Jacob, 80.
Bright, John, 233, 246.
Britain and China, 269.
Britain and Persia, 232.
Britain should confer with India, 249.
Britain, What Great, should do, 245.
Britain's colonies and dependencies—difference, 107.
Britain's grip on India, 211.
Britain's hostility to Germany 232.
Britain's rule of India. 2.
British Rule in India, 103.
British rule, withdrawal of, from India, 171.
British Rule in India a failure 162.
Brooks, Philips, 75.
Brotherhood, World-wide 255.
Buddha, 36, 139.
Bunker's Hill, 40.
Burke, 108, 246.
Burke's Impeachment of Warren Hastings, 104.
Burns, 4.
Buxton, 50.
Byron, Lord, 66.



C

- Calcutta, 113.
Campbell Bannerman, Sir
Henry, on Indian army,
127.
Canada, Government of, 106.
Canada, languages of, 166.
Canada and self rule, 185,
Capitol, The, 96.
Carlyle, Thomas, 60, 69.
Carpenter, Mary, 80.
Caste in India, 283.
Certification by Governor
General, 210.
Channing, William Henry 79.
Charter of rights to India, 203.
China and Britain, 269.
China and India, 231.
Circle Italiano, 77.
Civil Service, 125.
Civilians, Young, 142.
Civilisation, 271.
Civilisation of India, 104.
Clarke, Dr. James Freeman,
70.
Classes and individual per-
sons, 281.
Cleveland, 159.
Clough, Miss, 80.
Cobbe, Frances Power, 80.
"Colonial Government" 149.
Colonisation in Africa, 50.
Colonisation scheme, 49.
Columbus, 258.
Commerce of Bombay and
Calcutta, 113.
Commission for Indian affairs
after ten years, 214.
Congress, Indian National,
and non-co-operation, 224.

Congress of Women in
London, 79.

- Cooper, J. Fennimore, 67.
Cotton, Sir Henry, 233, 246.
Cotton, Sir Henry, on British
policy in India, 153.
Council of State, 209.
Crimean War, 231.
Cromwell, 108.
Crosby, Ernest, 41.
Curzon, Lord, on India, 110.
Cyprus, 230.

D

- Declaration of Independence,
202.
Democracy in the United
States 57.
Diarchy, 199.
Diarchy, Lincoln on, 199.
Dickens, Charles, 69.
Divide et impera, 169.
Douglass, Stephen A. 9.
Drain of India's wealth, 179.
Dreams, 260.
Dutt, R. C. on Drain from
India, 129.

E

- Economic History of India,
129.
Edgeworth, Maria, 69.
Education of girls and women
in America, 64.
Edward's, King, Coronation
110.
Egypt conquered, 230.
Elliott, Sir Charles, 120, 171.
Elliott, Mrs. Maud Howe,
87, 96.



INDEX

iii

- Emancipation, Garrison's view of, 54.
Emancipation Proclamation, vii, 13.
Emerson, 70.
England in India, 109.
England's army, 230.
England's Enmity to Russia, 231.
England's navy, 230.
England's wars and India, 229.
English language and Lincoln, 26.
English Peace Society, 79.
- F
- Famines in India, 115.
Famines in India, causes, 118.
Fawcett, Prof, 246.
Field, David Dudley, 79.
Fields, James, T., 73.
Filipino, 266.
Finance, World-wide, 276.
'Forbids' in Reform scheme, 210.
Foreign rule, Results of, 105.
Fox, 108, 246.
France and Germany, 275.
Franklin, 39.
Freedom for bondsmen, 57.
Freemason's Tavern, Mrs. Howe at, 80.
Froude, 109.
Fuller, Sir Bamfylde, 143.
- G
- Gandhi, Mahatma, 47, 77, 196, 241.
Gandhi, on Famines, 120.
Gandhi and non-co-operation, 220.
Gandhi on Englishmen in India, 178.
Gandhi's imprisonment, 209.
Garibaldi, 76.
Garrison, William Lloyd, vii 29.
Garrison, contributor, 31, and later editor.
Garrison and the church, 44.
Garrison and war, 47.
Garrison fined and sentenced to imprisonment, 32.
Garrison's character, 58.
Garrison's death, 59.
Garrison's domestic life, 59.
Garrison's early life, 30.
Garrison's funeral, 59.
Garrison's *Liberator*, 40.
Garrison's life—its lessons, 60.
Garrison's parents, 30.
Garrison's Religion, 36.
Garrison's triumph, 53.
Garrison's visit to England 50.
Genius of India and Greece, 156.
Genius of universal Emancipation, 32.
George, Lloyd, 215, 236.
George III and American colonies, 216.
Germany and India, 233.
Germany and France, 275.
Germany, Britain's hostility to 232.
Gibbons, Herbert Adams, 229.
Gibraltar, 230.
Gokhale, G. K., 120.
Government, Just, 1.
"Government of India", 146.



Government of India Act,
158, 191.
Government of the people,
for the people and by the
people, 2.
Governor General's Exe-
cutive Council, 206.
Governors of Provinces, 206.
Governor's veto, 208.
Greeks and Mrs. Howe, 75.

H

Hale, Edward Everett, 70.
Hallam, Henry, 69.
Hamilton, Alexander, 39.
Harcourt, Sir William, 153.
Hastings, Warren, 105, 246.
Henry, Patrick, 39, 218.
Higginson, 70.
Hoar, Senator, 82.
Holmes, Oliver Wendell, 70.
Home Rule for Bengal, 167.
Howe, Dr. Samuel, 66.
Howe, Dr., in Greece, 67.
Howe, Dr., Work for the
blind, 68.
Howe, Mrs. Julia Ward, viii,
62.
Howe, Mrs., and Anti-
slavery, 74.
Howe Mrs., and Italy, 76.
Howe, Mrs., a mother, 86.
Howe, Mrs., a musician, 91.
Howe, Mrs., a writer, 71.
Howe, Mrs., Her life in-
terests, 71.
Howe, Mrs., honorary de-
grees, conferred on, 95.
Howe, Mrs., Keynote of her
life, 63.

Howe Mrs., and Peace, 78.
Howe Mrs., and religion, 92.
Howe Mrs., and the Greeks,
75.
Howe Mrs., and woman
suffrage, 82.
Howe's Mrs., Centennial, 99.
Howe's, Mrs., funeral, 97.
Howe's Mrs., love of books,
65.
Howe's Mrs., religion, 70.
Howe's Mrs., work for
women, 81.
Humor, of Lincoln, 25.
Human body, 259.
Human brotherhood, 293.
Hume, A.O., 233, 246.

I

Illinois, Lincoln's youth
spent in, 3.
Imperial, Review, 171.
India, a Nation, 168.
India, British Rule in, 103.
India, Cause of England's
Wars, 234.
India, Is, a free nation, 110.
India, Is, fit for self-rule, 139.
India, living heart of Asia,
235.
India, who should rule 136.
India and England's wars,
229.
"India and its Problems",
115.
India and World Peace, 288.
Indian troops in Great War,
181, 192.
Indians in Governor-
General's Executive Coun-
cil, 206.



INDEX

- India's civilisation, 104.
India's freedom, 157.
India's government, cost of, 125.
India's languages, 165.
India's liberty, 130.
India's loyalty, 193.
India's manufactures, 123.
India's military expenditure, 126.
India's people, 180.
India's Poverty, 121.
India's Problem, 106.
India's Struggle for Swaraj, 103.
India's taxation, 121.
India's Tribute, 128.
India's unity, 168.
India's Young men, 154.
Ireland, 242.
Italy and Howe, 76.
- J
- Japan, 240, 257.
Jesus, 4.
Jefferson, Thomas, 39.
Justice for India, 247.
- K
- Kentucky, Lincoln born in, 3.
Knapp, Isaac, 41.
- L
- Labor and capital, 287.
Lajpat Rai, xi
Lamb, Charles, 262.
Landseer, 69.
Languages of Canada, 166.
Languages of India, 165.
Laurier, Sir Wilfred, 110.
Lawyers, Lincoln's advice to, 8.
Legislation-No voice in, for Indian people, 205.
Legislative Assembly, 206.
Legislative Councils, 206.
Liberator, The, 40.
Liberty, 2.
Liberty in India, 130.
Lilly's India and its Problems, 115.
Lincoln, Abraham, vii, 1.
Lincoln, Abraham, on governing other people, 141.
Lincoln, Belief in, 5.
Lincoln, clerk in a store, 5.
Lincoln, representative in Illinois State Legislature, 5.
Lincoln and temperance, 22.
Lincoln as a lawyer, 6.
Lincoln as teller of stories, 25.
Lincoln Memorial, 20.
Lincoln elected President in 1860, 10.
Lincoln's hatred of war, 12.
Lincoln on Diarchy, 199.
Lincoln's character and service to the world, 22.
Lincoln's death, 14.
Lincoln's humor, 25.
Lincoln's parents, 4.
Lincoln's life, an inspiration to India, 3.
Lincoln's mastery of English, 26.
Lincoln's political speaking, 8.
Lincoln's religion, 23.
Lincoln's second Election to Presidency, 13.
Longfellow, 60, 70.
Lowell, 70.



Loyalty of India, 193.
Lundy, Benjamin, 31.
Luther, 4.

M

Macaulay, 50.
MacDonald, Ramsay, on
Parliament and India, 146.
Maclise, 69.
Magna Charta, 108.
Malta, 230.
Mann, Horace, 69.
Manufactures of India, 123.
Markham, Edwin, 26.
Master of Elibank, 171.
Massachussetts, Garrison
born in, 29.
Mazzini, 76.
McCabe, Chaplain, 73.
Memorial Meeting for Mrs.
Howe, 98.
Militarism, 283.
Military Expenditure of
India, 126.
Mill, John Stuart, 134, 233,
246.
Milnes, Monckton, 69.
Minister, 207.
Moderate Party in India,
195.
Montagu, Edurin Samuel,
190.
Montagu-Chelmsford plan,
218.
Montagu's visit to India, 197.
Moral laws, 272.
Morley-Minto Reforms, 217.
Morse, S. F. B., 67.
Mother's Day, 80.
Moton, Robert P., 20.

N

Napoleon's envy of England,
229.
National House of represen-
tatives, Washington, 6.
National Peace Congress, 81.
Nations, 273.
Nationalist party, 196.
Nationality, 273.
Native genius of Indian
people, 156.
Negro Slavery, introduction
to America, 38.
Negros, industry etc. 21.
Negros, sorrow of, at Lin-
coln's death, 17.
New England Woman Suf-
frage Association, 82.
New England Anti Slavery
Society, 49, 51.
"New map of Asia", 229.
Nightingale, Florence, 69.
"Niggers", 148.
Nivedita, Sister, 91.
Non-co-operation--Case, 221.
Non-co-operation--Explained
222.
Non-co-operation--Forms of,
223.
Non-co-operative movement,
196.

O

Otis, Harrison Gray, 41.

P

Parker, Theodore, 24, 70.
Parliamentary control of
India, 145.
Patriotism, 274.
Peace, 278.



INDEX

CSL
vii

Peace, World, India and, 229.
People of India, 180.
Perkins Institution for the
blind, 68.
Persia and Britain, 232.
Persian gulf, 230.
Phillippine Islands, 265.
Phillips, Wendell, 44, 70, 75.
Pitt, 108, 246.
Poles, revolt of, 68.
Political Democracy, 286.
Political speaking of Lincoln,
8.
Pouren, Jan, 76.
Poverty of India, 121.
Problem of India, 106.
Proclamation of Emancipa-
tion, 13.
Punjab atrocities, 194.

Q

Quakers, 48.

R

Races, brotherhood of, 261.
Radical, 55.
Reform Scheme, 123, 131,
189.
Reform Scheme, Defects in,
204.
Reform Scheme, No date,
fixed, 213.
Reform Scheme, reasons for
dissatisfaction, 196.
Reform Scheme, what is it?
212.
Reform Scheme worthless,
214.
Reformed government auto-
cratic, 209.
Reinsch, Prof. Pauls, on
native societies, 149.

Religion, 272.
Religion, Garrison and, 36.
Religion, Lincoln and, 23.
Religious brotherhood, 288.
Remedy for India's suffer-
ings, 131.
"Reminiscences" of Clevel-
land, 159.
Reminiscences of Mrs. Howe,
78.
Reserved subjects, 199.
Richards, Mrs. Laura E, 66.
Richards, Mrs. Laura Howe,
87.
Ripon, Lord, 188.
Roman Empire, 110.
Roosevelt, Theodore, 172.
Roosevelt, on Mrs. Howe, 98.
Rowlatt Act, 194.
Russian languages, 165.
Ryots of India, 114.

S

Salt Tax, 122.
Sanboon, F. B., 70.
Schurz, Carl, 159.
Science, 272.
Self-rule, India's demand for,
133.
Sewell, Samuel E., 51.
Shakespeare-favorite of Lin-
coln, 4.
Slavery, Abolition of, Bene-
fits, 18.
Slavery, history, 35.
Slavery, Lincoln's debate on,
9.
Slavery, Prohibition of, 10.
Slavery Bill introduced by
Lincoln, 6.
Smith, Gerritt, 53.
Smith, Sydney, 57.



Social Brotherhood, 281.
Societa Dante Alighieri of Rome, 77.
Society of American Friends of Russian Freedom, 75.
Spencer, Herbert, 122, 233.
Stories and Lincoln, 25.
Strikes, a form of non-cooperation, 226.
Struggle for Swaraj, India's 103.
"Studies of Indian Life and Sentiment", 143.
Suez canal, 230.
Sufferings of India, 131.
Superior nation, 2.
Swaraj, Struggle for, India's, 103.

T

Tagore, Dr. Rabindranath, 77, 139.
Tappan, Arthur, 33.
Tarquinius Superbus, 153.
Taxation of India, 121.
Taxes, Refusal to pay, 223.
Temperance, Lincoln and, 22.
Thibet, 229.
Tolstoi, 218.
Townsend, Meredith, 223.
Transferred subjects, 199, 210.
Turkey, 231.
Teskegee Institute, 19.
Tyranny, 2.

U

Unification of the world, 259.
Unitarian Association of London, 79.
Unity of India, 168.
Untouchables, 283.

V

Vasco de Gama, 258.
Vassar College, first American College for women, 64.
'Verboten' in Germany, 210.
Vernacular, Ignorance of, in officers, 144.

W

War and Garrison, 47.
War and Lincoln, 12.
Wars, 280.
Washington, Booker, 19.
Washington, George and Slavery, 39.
Watson, Cathcart, 122.
Wealth, 284.
Webster, Daniel, 50.
Wedderburn, Sir William, 233, 246.
Wells, H. G., 139.
When I was your age, 87.
Whitman, Walt, 14.
Whittier, 70, 75.
Who should rule India, 136.
Wilberforce, 50.
Williams, Roger, 66.
Woman suffrage, Mrs. Howe advocates, 82.
Women's Peace Crusade, 78.
Women's Apostolate of Peace, 79.
Women's Congress, 83.
Women's ministerial conference, 93.
Woolley, President Mary E. 98.
World Peace, India and, 228.
Worldwide Brotherhood, ix, 255.

