

THE MISSIONARY REVIEW *of the* WORLD

VOL.
XLV.

APRIL, 1922

NUMBER
FOUR

OUR INDIA NUMBER

INDIA is one of the largest, most varied, most important, most difficult and most promising mission fields in the world. It is at present attracting universal attention because of the complicated political situation, the possible serious results of the unrest, and because of the efforts of Great Britain to give the people self-government so far as they are able to exercise it without irremediable damage to themselves and to other nations. This political situation is inseparably connected with the maintenance of peace, religious toleration, educational problems, economic progress, moral advancement, the administration of justice and the great spiritual work of Christian missions.

It is fitting therefore that India should be the topic for mission study in all denominations during the coming year. The adult text book "Building with India" has been prepared by Dr. D. J. Fleming, formerly a missionary in India and recently secretary to the Christian Educational Commission sent to India by the British and American Mission Boards. Other study books for various grades include "Lighted to Lighten" by Alice Van Doren; "India on the March", by Alden H. Clark; "The Wonderland of India", by Helen M. Rockey and Harold B. Hunting; "A Child Garden in India", by Amelia Josephine Burr; "Picture Sheets on India", and "India Primary Picture Stories" collected by Ruth Isabel Seabury. Probably at least two hundred thousand people will be studying these books in our churches and will therefore become better informed on the subject and able to cooperate more intelligently in the support of a constructive Christian program of education and evangelism for India's millions. During the summer India will be the subject of study in a hundred or more conferences and summer schools where thousands of leaders will prepare to teach the mission study classes in local churches.

It is fitting therefore that this number of the REVIEW should be devoted especially to the various phases of "India as a Mission

Politics and Missions in India To-day

BY ROBERT E. SPEER, NEW YORK

A Letter from the President of the Missionary Review Publishing Co.

AMONG the chief external factors in determining the problems of the Church and the success of missionary effort are the prevailing conditions of political thought and organization, the measure of freedom allowed by the laws or by the sentiments controlling social and religious movements, and the conceptions which are dominant in the nation and which neither individuals nor organizations can ignore or escape. This was true in the Roman Empire. We know its truth from our own experience both at home and in all the fields where we have sought to carry on missionary work. It is assuredly true in India today. The tides of national feeling and political activity which have arisen can no more fail to influence the Church in India now than corresponding tides failed to influence the Church in America at the time of the Revolution and the churches of Europe and Great Britain at the Reformation period, with its awakening of peoples to the sense of national personality.

Every such time is marked by follies and excesses. With each such new awakening one hopes that, learning wisdom from the past, men will act with full tolerance and patience and judgment, as well as with boldness and courage. One hopes, and I suppose will always hope, in vain for any such perfect movement of human forces. But whatever the imperfections one can only rejoice, as the wisest politicians and the wisest missionaries are rejoicing, over the present growth of national consciousness in India. This is what the best British administrators in India hoped for and looked forward to from the time when the conscience of Great Britain first awoke to the responsibilities in which she had become involved through the occupation of India through the East India Company. Men like John Lawrence, Herbert Edwardes, and Donald MacLeod, the group known as the Panjab School, who saved India from the anarchy and disorganization of the Mutiny, the Queen in her proclamation taking India over under the Crown from the East India Company when the Mutiny had been quelled, and the voices of many Englishmen, high and low, who have given their lives for the service of India across the century, can be quoted in evidence of the hope which has been cherished of the development in India of a true freedom and national life. And certainly though the rise of a nationalistic spirit brings with it many painful and perplexing problems for Missions, these are greatly to be preferred to any situation in which the Churches resulting from mission work are satisfied with the relation of subjection and dependence, and are not alive to the necessity or

the possibility of standing on their own feet and determining their own policies and relationships, and finding their right place among the guiding forces of the nation. It ought to be easier to develop a self-dependent Church in a self-dependent nation.

But while one rejoices in the growth of national consciousness in India, the present situation is beset for the student of Missions by two difficulties. The first is the difficulty of really understanding it, of estimating the true character and strength and direction of the various tendencies. There is a great deal of literature on the subject which is available, but it does not resolve this difficulty. Books like Lovett's "A History of the Indian Nationalist Movement," Rushbrook Williams's three volumes, "India in 1917 and 1918," "India in 1919," and "India in 1920," the Reports of the Indian National Congress, the "Resurrection of the Congress" by D. N. Bannerjee, Mr. Athalaye's "Life of Lokamanya Tilak," and the books and speeches of Sir Rabindrinath Tagore and most of all of Mr. Gandhi and Lajpat Rai are only a fraction of the great volume of literature which is already available.

All this literature, so far from answering our questions as to the character and strength and direction of the present tendencies, only makes the difficulties greater. And the difficulty is further increased by a careful study of the situation on the field. During the past three months we have traveled over India from Ceylon to the Himalayas and from Calcutta to Goa and Bombay, and I suppose there is no one who has seen more of India in this time or who has talked with more people of every class and type than we have done, but the mass of evidence which we have gathered, instead of uniting in support of any one view, is so divided that it could be cited in support of almost any estimate of the present forces and any forecast of the future.

THE RAPID CHANGE OF VIEWS

The second difficulty to which I have referred arises from the incessant and rapid change that is going on in movements and in the attitudes of individuals. It is easy to attribute some of this change in individuals to inconsistency or even insincerity. There are few who would charge Mr. Gandhi with insincerity, but both his opinions and those of Lajpat Rai appear to undergo most remarkable changes. Here is Lajpat Rai, for example, who during the war could say nothing too bitter against Great Britain and was deported, taking up his residence in New York City. Then he returns to India in an apparently different frame of mind, repudiating the idea of Indian political and social reactionism and advocating the unity of India with the British Empire. In his book on "*The Problem of National Education in India*" though he is an Arya Samajist, he wrote:

.

“The process of self-praise and the glorification of our past has its dangerous side also. It has the tendency of making us look to the past rather than to the future, thus sometimes blinding us to the progress which the world has made since Aryan times. If modern truths (truth is truth and is neither ancient nor modern) are to be tested by the sanctions of the ancient times and to be promulgated only if they accord with the teachings of our Rishis, then woe to India.....No progress is conceivable unless we have an open mind and do away with the superstition that all truth was revealed to us in the beginning of the world, and that all that was worth knowing was known to our ancestors, and that they had said the last word in all questions, be they religion or sociology or politics or economics or art or even science. It is essential that we should realize that we are living in a new world.....It is sheer and unjustifiable waste of time to insist on the dissemination of theories that have been superseded by and discarded in favor of others proved to be better and truer than the former.....For example it would be sheer folly to replace the modern treatises on arithmetic, geometry, algebra, trigonometry, and kindred subjects by Lilawati or other books on these subjects in the Sanskrit language.....Truth is neither local nor national nor even international. It is simply truth.”

The aim of India, he held, should be “to remain a part of the British Commonwealth on terms of equality with other parts of the British Empire.” And now this same Lajpat Rai, though his son is studying in America, is unqualifiedly denouncing Western education, preaching Indian social reactionism, entire withdrawal from the empire, and just before we reached Lahore was arrested and imprisoned for sedition. In all great human movements of this kind, however, one must be prepared for a great deal of inconsistency, and still more for a great deal that looks like inconsistency but which is really only the readjustment of men’s minds to the pressure of the social forces which in part they make and by which in part they are made.

The shifts in Indian viewpoint often explain and justify themselves by the changes in British official sentiment and action. Only nine years ago, for example, Lord Crewe, Secretary of State, expressly disclaimed in Parliament any idea that Great Britain was prepared to contemplate Indian self-government on colonial lines. Speaking on June 24th, 1912, he said:

“There is a certain section in India which looks forward to a measure of self-government approaching that which has been granted in the Dominions. I see no future for India on these lines. The experiment of extending a measure of self-government practically free from parliamentary control to a race which is not our own, even though that race enjoys the services of the best men belonging to our race, is one which cannot be tried. It is my duty as Secretary of State to repudiate the idea that the despatch implies anything of the kind as the hope or goal of the policy of Government. At the same time I think it is the duty of the nation, and of the Government for the time being of the nation, to encourage in every possible way the desire of the inhabitants of India to take a further share in the management of their country.”

Again, he said, on June 29, 1912:

There is nothing whatever in the teachings of history, so far as I know them, or in the present condition of the world which makes such a dream (as complete self-government within the British Empire) even remotely probable. . . . Is it conceivable that at any time an Indian Empire could exist, on the lines, say, of Australia and New Zealand, with no British officials, and no tie of creed and blood which takes the place of these material bonds? To me that is a world as imaginary as any Atlantis or any that was ever thought of by the ingenious brain of any imaginative writer. . . . I venture to think that it is only those who think less of service and more of distinction who would lose heart if they braced themselves to set aside this vision altogether and to settle down to closer cooperation with the Western race, to which they can teach much, and from which they can learn much, in cooperation for the moral and material bettering of the country to which they are so deeply attached and of which we are so proud to be governors.

Now whatever else may be said of these views, it is certain that they were not the views of many earlier British statesmen, and they are distinctly repudiated in the legislation embodied in the Montagu-Chelmsford reforms under which India is now being governed. The principles of these reforms is clearly stated in the instructions issued under them to Governors which declare that by these reforms, "provision has been made for the gradual development of self-governing institutions in India, with a view to the progressive realization of responsible government in that country as an integral part of Our Empire." And Governors are instructed to execute their office, "to the end that the institutions and methods of government shall be laid on the best and surest foundations, that the people shall acquire such habits of political action and respect such conventions as will best and soonest fit them for self-government."

There are many Indians who believe that these shifts of British attitude are due wholly to the extent of pressure exerted by India, that such an attitude as Lord Crewe's was due to Indian supineness and servility. And dissatisfied with the extent to which the present reforms have gone, they believe that by the pressure of moral if not physical forces Great Britain can be coerced into granting complete and immediate independence. A few years ago, it is said, India would have been satisfied with what is now offered, but it was not offered then and would not have been offered now except in response to pressure. Such offers are always tardy and reluctant, and such pressure once successful will not be satisfied so long as there is anything further to be pressed for. The struggle, so it is said, between the reluctance of Great Britain to let India go and India's demand to be let go is inevitable and will continue until complete independence is secured.

We have met with Englishmen in India who say candidly "Why not let India go? Great Britain has no desire to rule a reluctant people. India is not essential to the Empire. We should be in favor of saying to India, 'Certainly, if you do not want us here, we

do not want to stay. On the 31st of December, 1924, you will find us completely gone'."

There are very few, however, who say this, fewer probably than those who take the directly opposite view, expressed by the anonymous writer in *Blackwood's Magazine* of February 21, 1921, in an article entitled "India on the Threshold," who speaks contemptuously of the present political reforms and holds to the doctrine of the divine right of Great Britain to rule anybody whom she deems unfit for self-rule:

"No longer are Indians to be treated as the children they are—to be kept in order by straight talking and punished with the rod when they are naughty. We have done a great work in the material development of the country but we have failed in the education both moral and intellectual of the people." [presumably the people's fault] "When Christ said, 'Render unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's' he did not condemn but approved one race ruling another race which is unfit to rule itself." *Ball!*

It is the amount of talk of this kind and of the spirit which it embodies both at home in Great Britain and in India which has intensified the nationalistic movement and been responsible for a good deal of its bitterness and indignation.—It has made vastly more difficult also the task of the great body of the British in India who are here in the way of duty and human service, who do not believe that India is ready for absolute independence or that the great mass of the people desire it or that Great Britain could, in honor and fidelity before either God or man, summarily throw overboard her responsibility in India. It would be the easiest course to fling India free, but what would be the judgment of history and humanity? "No," say Englishmen of this type, "such a course would be easy, but it would be cowardly. History is a continuous process. To run a knife across it is to cut living fibres. Difficult as the situation is we owe it to India to secure to her the best conditions of an independent national life, and we must stay and see the thing through."

The Moderate party in India takes this same view and desires to cooperate with Great Britain in carrying forward and enlarging the present reforms. They were adopted for a period of ten years looking toward revision and enlargement at that time. Both the Moderate party and the Government of India believe that if wisely and harmoniously carried forward the time of complete self-government in India may be greatly hastened. Against all this, however, the Extremist party which has control of the All India Muslim League and of the Indian National Congress stands opposed, denouncing the present government as "Satanic" and demanding immediate and complete independence.

"MAHATMA" GANDHI

The outstanding personality embodying the whole movement and recognized by every one as its head is Mr. Gandhi. One meets a

few who disbelieve in his sincerity, many more who wholly distrust his judgment, but the great mass of the Indian people believe in him absolutely, and even most of those who disagree with him respect deeply his character and his devotion. The literature about Mr. Gandhi is full of references to his Christ-like qualities. Some of the characterizations are very bold:

"Those Christian doctors of Europe and America who liken the Mahatma to Christ, are not mistaken. I have been closely observing the Mahatma's movements, his preachings and practices, his words and deeds, their causes and effects, and I am satisfied,—thoroughly satisfied, of the similarity of these two great personages. In spite of the opponents' (I was an opponent) declaration that nothing that the Mahatma has prophesied has come to pass, we see that everything that he has prophesied has been fulfilled.....It is not in the least exaggerating if I say that the life of Christ is being re-enacted by the Mahatma, the opponents of the Mahatma enacting the part of the opponents of Jesus Christ, seeking how they may arrest him without rousing the people, his followers.....I am, therefore, absolutely certain that when the Mahatma is arrested and tried, the Judge will once more wash his hands and repeat the same verdict that Pontius Pilate had pronounced upon Jesus Christ: 'I am innocent of the blood of this just person.' (Letter of T. Ruthnam, *Bombay Chronicle*, December 24, 1921.)

"One does not feel it blasphemous to compare him with Christ and Christ, too, one suspects, gave infinite trouble to reasonable and respectable followers. For Gandhi is a philosophic anarchist—a new edition of Tolstoy without Tolstoy's past and a Tolstoy who has long since subdued Nature and shrunk into simplicity." (Colonel Wedgewood, *The Indian Review*, March, 1921.)

"From the first it must be realized that consciously his teaching has been influenced by that of Christ, for whom his admiration has long been the almost dominating feature of his spiritual life, and probably the external character of his daily activity has been modelled also upon Him. He made a curious observation during our conversation, which throws some light upon his interpretation of the Galilean Teacher. In answer to a remark of mine that Christ strictly abstained from interfering in politics, Mr. Gandhi answered, 'I do not think so; but, if you are right, the less Christ in that was He.'" (Percival Landon, *The Indian Review*, March 1921.)

"The key to Gandhi and Gandhism is wrapped in his self-revealing sentence: 'Most religious men I have met are politicians in disguise: I however, who wear the guise of a politician, am at heart a religious man'." (D. P., *Indian Review*, March 1921.)

"In Mahatma Gandhi we have a volcanic personality, a moral genius of the first order, who has revealed to us all the hidden power of a living freedom from within, who has taught us to depend not on any external resources but on ourselves. My whole heart goes out to his appeal and I have a great hope that, along this path, independence will be reached at last.....Such personalities as that of Mahatma Gandhi which can inspire a whole nation are rare indeed in human history." Mr. C. F. Andrews in *The Indian Review* of March 1921.

We asked a great many Indians what they regarded as the secret of Mr. Gandhi's influence, and they invariably replied, "his asceticism." And this is the element in his character to which Dr. Wil-

liams attributes his power, in his report to Parliament entitled "India in 1921."

"It has often been remarked that every Indian, no matter how Westernized, will ever retain in his heart of hearts a reverence for asceticism. Even educated Indian gentlemen who play a prominent part in public life cherish before them the ideal of worldly renunciation and retirement to the practice of individual austerities. Furthermore, the insistence of Mr. Gandhi upon the supremacy of soul force in opposition to material might; his advocacy of national fasting as a means of influencing Government; his conviction of the irresistible power of passive resistance, have all three their logical basis in the ancient Hindu doctrine of Dharma, that is, the application of moral pressure to another through physical austerities deliberately endured by oneself. Hence it is that to Indians of all classes Mr. Gandhi, of lowly birth though he be, who stands forth, not only as the perfect ascetic but also as the perfect exponent of Hindu tradition, makes an appeal of well-nigh irresistible force. Even those who are most profoundly convinced that his political opinions are unsound, unpractical and even disastrous, can rarely be found openly to criticize, far less to oppose, him. During the whole of the year 1920, the tendency of the time has been to place a premium upon Mr. Gandhi's opinions. India is now suffering from reaction against the more materialistic manifestations of Western civilization. In addition to this, the events of the Panjab disturbances of 1919, which only became fully known during the period under review, gave rise amongst educated Indians to feelings of intense and bitter humiliation. Against the all-dominant tide of Western materialism, Western might and Western achievement, Mr. Gandhi, with his explicit scorn for that which we call modern civilization stands before the injured national pride of many of his countrymen like a rock of salvation. He embodies an other-worldliness essentially Indian, a spirit the West does not possess, a plane of detachment to which it cannot hope to aspire. Hence it is that his behests have the influence of semi-divine commands; and even those whose intellects are too keen to be dominated by his sway can rarely be found to resist the appeal which he makes to their innermost heart."

Just as we were leaving India this amazing influence which Mr. Gandhi has acquired reached its highest possible expression in his appointment as dictator by the National Congress at its meeting in Ahmedabad, giving him the full powers of the Congress. This had been foreshadowed by many articles in the Indian press from both Hindus and Mohammedans, appealing for the unquestioning acceptance of Mr. Gandhi's absolute leadership. There were some, of course, who foresaw the criticism which such action would meet from those who would be unable to reconcile it with democratic principles and who would find themselves unable to respect the nationalist movement if it could no longer respect or trust itself, but should abdicate the representative and responsible popular direction of the movement and surrender it to a dictatorship. Both these misgivings and the repression of them find expression in the editorial on "The Dictator" which appeared in *The Bombay Chronicle*, the leading nationalist newspaper on December 27th:

"Much capital will be sought to be made by the opponents of India's cause of the election to virtual dictatorship of Mahatma Gandhi, of the vest-

ing in him of all Congress' authority. Sudden solicitude for the principles of democracy will animate the reactionary Press which will almost tearfully tell the nation that they have betrayed themselves and the liberties of individuals. But no Nationalist will question for a moment the supreme wisdom of the step.

"Mahatma Gandhi is no ordinary man. He is the greatest man in the world today. He is to India and the world a prophet—the Prophet of Freedom. Those, who in the past put implicit trust in messengers of the Truth, did not act undemocratically or unwisely—for if they had acted otherwise, there would be today no religious system and no moral code existing in the world. If anything were wanting to secure India's confidence in ultimate triumph of her cause, the Congress decision to delegate all authority to Mahatma Gandhi has supplied the deficiency. Even the Mahatma's bitterest enemies proclaim him to be a great and good man. The worst they can say of him is that he is an idealist. The Mahatma and India will admit the charge. For the Mahatma and India have resolved to prove to a sceptic world, (and that very shortly) that idealism need not necessarily be divorced from administration. If India is to establish an ideal government of the country, who but an idealist should lead her?"

This is a very dangerous position both for Mr. Gandhi and for the movement in India toward the development of a true national consciousness. India is seeking for self-government and here on the very threshold surrenders the principles of self-government to the expedient of an autocrat. And Mr. Gandhi has committed himself to opinions which he must retract or with which he must deal insincerely, because they are untrue or impossible. I shall refer to his religious position in another chapter. I have in mind here the economic and social views which he has expressed. Let any one read Mr. Gandhi's book "Indian Home Rule," and he will see what a sure end Mr. Gandhi has prepared for his own leadership. These are some of the views expressed there:

"Parliaments are really emblems of slavery."

"If money and time wasted by the Parliament were intrusted to a few good men the English nation would be occupying today a much higher platform."

"It behooves every lover of India to cling to the old Indian civilization even as a child clings to its mother's breast."

"In order to restore India to its pristine condition, we have to return to it."

"Machinery is the chief symbol of modern civilization. It represents a great sin."

"We should only do what we can with our hands and feet."

He appeals for the retention of "the same kind of plow which existed thousands of years ago," "the same kind of cottages that we had in former times." "Railways accentuate the evil nature of man." They should be given up together with tram cars and electric lights. "Hand made earthen saucers" should be used as lamps. "Where this cursed modern civilization has not reached, India remains as it was before. The English do not rule over them..... I would certainly advise you to go into the interior that has not yet

been polluted by the railways and to live there for six months. You might then be patriotic and speak of home rule. Now you see what I consider to be real civilization." He opposes modern education. "Tilak and Ram Mohun Roy," he has recently said, "would have been far greater men if they had not had the contagion of English learning." And in his paper *Young India*, January 26th, 1921, he wrote, forsooth, in English:

"My conviction is deeper today than ever. I feel that if India would discard modern civilization she can only gain by doing so."

Now it is open to any man to hold prejudices and theories like these and to lament the materialistic temper that is part of but by no means the whole of Western civilization, but Mr. Gandhi's economics and sociology are simple reaction and futility. He would perpetuate the impossible conditions of old India.

"The primitive condition of sanitation in rural India amounts to the virtual negation of any sanitation at all.....It has been calculated that every year no fewer than two million Indian babies die while many others survive only to grow up weak and feeble from unhygienic surroundings during infancy."

Yet Mr. Gandhi would not have doctors and hospitals for "hospitals are institutions for propagating sins."

Mr. Gandhi himself has begun to hedge in this folly in the interest of practical politics. In *Young India*, January 26th, 1921, he wrote referring to his book on Home Rule:

"I would warn the reader against thinking that I am today aiming at the *Swaraj* described therein. I know that India is not ripe for it. It may seem an impertinence to say so. But such is my conviction. I am individually working for the self-rule pictured therein. But today my corporate activity is undoubtedly devoted to the attainment of Parliamentary *Swaraj* in accordance with the wishes of the people of India. I am not aiming at destroying railways or hospitals, though I would certainly welcome their natural destruction. Neither railways nor hospitals are a test of high and pure civilization. At best they are a necessary evil. Neither adds one inch to the moral stature of a nation. Nor am I aiming at a permanent destruction of law courts, much as I regard it as a 'consummation devoutly to be wished for.' Still less am I trying to destroy all machinery and mills. It requires a higher simplicity and renunciation than the people are today prepared for.

"I offer these comments because I observe that much is being quoted from the booklet to discredit the present movement. I have even seen writing suggesting that I am playing a deep game, that I am using the present turmoil to foist my fads on India, and am making religious experiments at India's expense. I can only answer that Satyagraha is made of sterner stuff. There is nothing reserved and nothing secret in it. A portion of the whole theory of life described in 'Hindu Swaraj' is undoubtedly being carried into practice. There is no danger attendant upon the whole of it being practiced. But it is not right to scare away people by reproducing from my writings passages that are irrelevant to the issue before the country."

One studies the phenomenon of Mr. Gandhi's influence and leadership with the deepest interest. There is no possibility, however, that India will follow in the pathway either political or economic which he has marked out. It is clear, as Mr. S. N. Agnihotri, the President of the Dev Samaj, declares, that Mr. Gandhi "considers parliamentary government, that is government by elected representatives of the people for the people a sign of 'slavery' and waste of money and time and instead of this he advocates the government by a few men. In short the democratic ideal of government, of government by the people and for the people, is rejected by Mr. Gandhi, and it appears that in place of the English bureaucracy he wants an autocracy of few Indians."

But even if this is not a justified charge, it is none the less clear from Mr. Gandhi's writings that he would be satisfied with forms of government with which the great body of educated Indians who have breathed the spirit of English freedom will never be satisfied. Likewise India will not follow on Mr. Gandhi's economic pathway. Perhaps the achievement of independence at present might mean, as Mr. Gandhi argues is desirable, the disintegration of railway and telegraph service and the deterioration of roads, industries, irrigation canals, and the innumerable contributions of civilization which Great Britain has introduced. But India will never consent to this return to "its pristine condition," to economic infancy. One can only conclude that great forces either personal or impersonal which will never follow Mr. Gandhi politically or economically are still deliberately or unconsciously making use of him and of the tremendous influence which he wields, for the sake of securing ends which, once secured, will make Mr. Gandhi's disappearance from the place of control both possible and inevitable. All this, as I have said, may be unconscious and it may be impersonal, but it is the explanation which would suggest itself to any one who is studying the present movement dispassionately and who has to account for a situation which is full either of intellectual contradiction or of moral insincerity. This second alternative one desires to reject. In so far as he is able to do so the intellectual paradox is intensified.

(To be Concluded in our May Number)

A PROPHECY ABOUT INDIA

Sir Herbert Edwardes, who was chiefly instrumental in saving the Panjab during the Mutiny, said, in a speech delivered at Manchester, England:

"Till India is leavened with Christianity she will be unfit for freedom. When India is leavened with Christianity she will be unfit for any form of slavery however mild... England may then leave her freely, frankly, gladly, proudly; leave the stately daughter she has reared, to walk the future with a free imperial step...."

THE MISSIONARY REVIEW *of the* WORLD

VOL.
XLV.

MAY, 1922

NUMBER
FIVE

CLOUD AND SUNSHINE ON THE TURKISH HORIZON

IT IS increasingly difficult to discover the bright spots in the Near East situation. The expected "helpful results of the war" have about vanished into thin air. Instead of a defeated Turk and a country partitioned for the good of humanity, we see a growing Turkish Nationalist power and a weakness on the part of the European Governments that seem inclined to yield to Turkish demands for the return of territories and dominion of which they had been shorn. Moreover while the Turks are more awake to modern ideas and have a new desire for education, they are no more inclined to harbor unshackled and unsubdued the Christians in their midst or to tolerate any attempts to lead followers of Mohammed into the fold of Christ.

The demands for the return of Eastern Thrace and complete control of Constantinople and the Straits may not be fully acceded to by the Allies but it seems probable that Asia Minor, including Cilicia, and Anatolia (with Smyrna) will be returned. The territory formerly assigned by the Allies to the Armenians has never been relinquished by the Turks. Such is the trend of events when fear, jealousy and intrigue gain the upper hand. The hands on the clock of progress are apparently to be turned back but the hand on God's clock will not move backward. His hour has not yet come.

As a gentleman in Constantinople, not a missionary, writes:

"The politicians of Europe made a great mistake in letting this country remain unoccupied after the armistice. The Christian Church ought not to make that mistake. To say that we must wait till things are settled in this country is a grave blunder. The fact that conditions are not settled certainly cannot be a valid excuse for not doing what we can do now. This is a great center and strategic in the social and religious life of the whole Near East; the scope for Christian work here is immense and the fate of millions of people depends on the conditions in this city. Who knows if the key to the whole Moslem problem may not be found here? Therefore it is for us to make a good survey of our field, to feel our way with common sense, to organize our forces and to go ahead with sure faith."

Politics and Missions in India Today—II

BY ROBERT E. SPEER

Dr. Speer has passed through Mesopotamia and Persia and is expected to reach America about the middle of May

THE problem is no simpler nor the difficulty less when one turns from personalities to policies. The program under which the nationalistic movement has been proceeding the past year was adopted at a special meeting of the Indian National Congress held in Calcutta in September, 1920. The Moderate party held entirely aloof from the Congress. They share fully in the present national spirit in India and in the desire for independence, but they want this independence within the Empire, and they were opposed to Mr. Gandhi's program. Many of Mr. Gandhi's own party were opposed to his recommendations, but nevertheless they prevailed. They called for the surrender of titles and government offices, the refusal to attend government functions, for the withdrawal of students from schools and colleges controlled or aided by the government, for the boycott of the courts by lawyers and litigants, for the refusal of military service in Mesopotamia, for abstention from candidacy or voting in connection with the political reforms, and they contemplated as further measures, not yet adopted, civil disobedience, the refusal to pay taxes, and the cessation of enlistment in the army and police. At the regular meeting of the Congress at Nagpur at the end of December 1920, in spite of many secessions and protests Mr. Gandhi's creed was reaffirmed, and Article 1 of the Constitution of the Congress as adopted in 1908 was amended. It had read:

"The objects of the Indian National Congress are the attainment by the people of India of a system of Government similar to that enjoyed by the self-governing members of the British Empire and a participation by them in the rights and responsibilities of the Empire on equal terms with those members. These objects are to be achieved by constitutional means by bringing about a steady reform of the existing system of administration and by promoting national unity, fostering public spirit and developing and organizing the intellectual, moral, economic, and industrial resources of the country."

This article was eliminated and new Article 1. is as follows:

"The object of the Indian National Congress is the attainment of *Swaraj* by the people of India by all legitimate and peaceful means."

Mr. Gandhi was clear in his teaching that the means used must be peaceful, that the policy to be followed, as he repeatedly insisted, was to be one of "non-violent non-cooperation," that India must win its freedom not by physical force but by "soul force." He held that the real trouble with India was its "slave mentality," the harlotry of its spirit with Western civilization and modern educa-

tion, that salvation was to be found in intellectual and economic self-sufficiency, that non-cooperation, though a negative term, covered a deeply positive policy, "a policy of self-reliance, self-purification, self-discipline, and self-realization." (Vaswani, "India in Chains.")

It was pointed out by the Moderates and others who sympathized with a reasonable principle of *swadeshi*, or development of home industries, and who believed in Indian self-government and who approved of its achievement by the legitimate and peaceful means of constitutional agitation and parliamentary reform, that the methods which Mr. Gandhi was advocating, the definitions and the indefinitions which he was putting forward, the spirit that he was engendering, and the forces which he was releasing were certain to play havoc with his principle of non-violence and to rob "soul force" of its spiritual power. The events of the year have proved that these forecasts were justified. In any other land than India the consequences might have been far more grave and disastrous; how grave and disastrous they have been even in India perhaps does not yet appear. It would seem, however, that the bonfires which have burned up foreign cloth in the name of *swadeshi* have burned up some other things as well. It has become clear, as Mr. Gandhi has sorrowfully acknowledged, that his name and the cause that he represents, in spite of the principle of non-violence, may be made to cover gross violence and wrong. Posters used in Lahore at the time of the outbreak in April, 1919, "called upon the brave people of the Panjab to enlist in the Danda Fauj and kill the English who were described as pigs, monkeys, and kafirs," and the same month posters were put up in Lyallpur in which "Indians were called upon in the blessed name of Mahatma Gandhi to fight to the death against English cheats and to dishonor English women."

No one lamented such outrageous proceedings more than Mr. Gandhi. He denounced the "mobocracy" of his followers. On November 17th, when we were in Bombay on the day of the arrival of the Prince of Wales, riots were begun by men who call themselves Mr. Gandhi's followers and who wore the Gandhi caps and home spun cloth, and scores of lives were lost. No one mourned this outbreak more deeply than Mr. Gandhi. But he has been warned again and again by his own countrymen and by those who have been among his closest followers that both the words he has been speaking and the principles he has been advocating were bound to result in bloodshed and violence. In a pamphlet entitled "Mr. Gandhi in the Light of Truth," Mr. Agnihotri wrote last November:

"Alas he is unable to see that the abominable and very horrible fire of *race hatred* which he is kindling into flame, will surely bring *great havoc* in India of which the riots that have hitherto occurred are but only fore-runners. It appears however that he himself is not altogether unaware of this, and he is *not* at all anxious to *avoid violence in future*. For the fol-

lowing significant lines appeared lately in his own journal called *Young India* over his familiar initials M. K. G.:

"We must be scrupulously truthful to our pledge. We can succeed beyond all expectation only if we remain *non-violent* in thought, word, and deed. It need not be our final creed, but it must be our present creed for the attainment of our goal." (*Tribune*, 17th July, 1921.)

"Again Mr. Gandhi said in his *Young India*:

"I can clearly see the time coming to me when I must refuse obedience to *every* single state-made law, *even though there may be a certainty of bloodshed.*" (Vide *Indian Mirror*, August, 1921.)

"Do not Mr. Gandhi's words that have been italicised by me, give sufficient ground to strongly suspect that the creed of non-violence of which so much fuss is being made by non-cooperators, is only a temporary political ruse, as long as they are weak in physical force, but as soon as they get the required physical force, they will become ready to wade through blood to attain their goal of worldly *Raj* and power, and it can not long remain Non-violent non-cooperation."

Mrs. Annie Besant, who for years had been almost as conspicuous a figure in the National Congress as Mr. Gandhi has become wrote when at last the Government felt that it was forced to take action to check the disorderly forces released by Mr. Gandhi's policy:

"Many have been blaming the Government of India for a policy of drastic repression which has not only been unduly severe but leads nowhere. Such censure ignores the fact that the policy of Mr. Gandhi has been deliberately and intentionally provocative, and that defiance of the law for the mere sake of defiance encourages a spirit of lawlessness among the ignorant and criminal classes which strikes at the very foundations of society. If the present Government permitted this to continue unchecked they would bequeath to their Indian successors the painful task of reducing to order the chaos they had permitted, instead of handing over to them a well-ordered and law-abiding people. . . . The whole responsibility, therefore, now rests on Mr. Gandhi and the non-coöperators, for the Government cannot remain quiescent in the presence of intimidation and the paralyzing of the peaceful life of the community. . . . He might have restored peace to the country and ensured constitutional progress. He has chosen the path of law-breaking and revolution, which can only lead to bloodshed and anarchy."

There are those who think that Mr. Gandhi's eyes are wide open in this matter and who believe that the creed of non-violence is not a creed of conviction and principle. The leading Indian in Western India told me that Mr. Gandhi had said to him, "If I had arms, I would use them." But I believe that the true Gandhi does not want violence and could count it a great triumph to lead India along peaceful ways to *swaraj*. But one difficulty is that *swaraj* is still undefined or was so at the time we left India. And another is that the forces which appear to be united under his leadership are not united on the principle of non-violence. The last newspaper which we saw before leaving India, *The Bombay Chronicle* of December 27, 1921, contained significant statements on both these points in its report of the India National Congress just beginning its sessions in Mr. Gandhi's home city of Ahmedabad:

“At five this evening, the All-India Congress Committee adjourned till Tuesday morning without making any appreciable progress in connection with the main resolution which alone was discussed today.....Almost from the beginning, Maulana Hasrat Mohani, President-elect of the All-India Moslem League led the opposition demanding deletion from the resolution of those phrases which excluded the possibility of resort to violence, or even the thought of it, so long as the pledge of non-violence was in force. Mr. Hasrat Mohani emphasized that as Islam allowed him to take to violence he did not want the door closed against him by insertion of the phrase which said that non-violence alone could help them to achieve their end. On its being pointed out that his contention indirectly involved a change in the Congress creed the Maulana observed that he already intended to move in the open Congress for such a change.....Moulana Hasrat Mohim is a recognized leader of the minority which counts among its ranks not only some staunch Mussulmans but several equally staunch Hindus.....Another resolution defines the meaning of *Swaraj*, and declares that in the event of the British people making common cause with the people of India, in securing the redress of the Khilafat and Panjab wrongs, the Congress has no desire to declare complete independence, but in the event of the British people and Government remaining hostile to the Khilafat and not making full reparation for the Panjab wrongs, the Congress will strive to sever all connection with England and declare complete independence. The Congress declares its irrevocable decision not to enter into any compromise or settlement with Government about *Swaraj* without the settlement of the Khilafat question. Another resolution congratulates Ghazi Mustafa Kemal and the Turks on their success and assures the Turkish nation of India's sympathy and support in its struggle to retain its status and independence.”

Often in talking with educated Indians we told them that the two things that it was most difficult for Americans to understand in the present-day thought of India were the Hindu idea of the sacredness of the cow and the Khilafat movement, with its anxiety for the restoration and preservation of Turkey. Regarding the sacredness of the cow I shall speak later in a letter on “Present Religious Conditions in India.” With regard to the Khilafat agitation it is exceedingly difficult to determine how much of it is genuine and how much of it is nothing but a political agitation used to embarrass the Government and to furnish nourishment for the program of Hindu-Moslem unity. The undeniable history and nature of Turkish government, the oppression and massacre of its Christian subjects, the fictitious character of its religious pretensions—these are so indisputable and so notorious that it is hard to see how intelligent Indians can maintain the agitation without a blush or at least without a smile. When I asked for an explanation from one exceedingly able Hindu lawyer, he replied that he felt about the matter just as we did, and that if things were settled in this world on a basis of righteousness, the Turkish government would not be endured, but they are not settled on this basis but on a basis of expediency.

India saw this with perfect clearness and intended to use the leverage that the Turkish situation gave it to put pressure upon the British Government in India. And they have done so with great

success, as witness the actions of the Government of India in response to the Khilafat demands, the answers of the Government of Great Britain both to these demands and to the Government of India in connection with them, and such statements as Sir Theodore Morrison's letter in the London *Times* and the editorial which accompanied its re-publication in the *Times of India* of December 23rd. And without one word regarding the history and character of Turkish rule or her deliberate murder of her Christian people, the Indian Nationalist organ in Bombay calmly demands the immediate and unconditional restoration of Constantinople and the full and undiscussable recognition of Khilafat claims. And the Indian National Congress will have no freedom for India that is not preceded by the freedom of Turkey. It is not to be wondered at that there are many Christians in India who look with misgiving upon such a *swaraj*, nor is it surprising that many Hindus look with amazement upon such an alliance.

If this unity of Hindus and Mohammedans were real it would have tremendous significance for the history of religion and for the missionary enterprise and the Christian Church in India. It is certainly not real. Not one of all the men with whom we talked who could be thought of as taking a detached view of Indian conditions believed in the reality of it. One of the ablest Hindus said quite bluntly:

"I don't believe in this idea of Mohammedan democracy or brotherhood at all. There is no democracy whatever in Islam outside of the mosque."

"Hindu-Moslem unity," said one of the ablest Mohammedan Christians in India, "will not last one day after the attainment of *swaraj*."

These were no doubt both over-emphatic statements. All over India there were religious clashes between the Hindus and the Mohammedans in 1919, and while there have been many honest and laudable efforts to draw the two communities together and while they must learn to live together in a free India, they are bound together now by a negative hostility alone and by none of the positive unifying influences without which the attainment of Mr. Gandhi's *swaraj* will bring disaster to both of them.

There are many other elements in the political situation in India which have their bearing upon the problem of the Church and the missions, but this discussion has already reached undue limits and has perhaps gone beyond the ordinary bounds of such a report as this. We shall certainly be asked, however, several questions which missionaries and Indian Christians are asking themselves in India.

1. *What is the British Government intending to do?*

The Secretary of State for India said very clearly in Parliament that the Government intends to go forward with the present reform

scheme in the orderly development of self-government for India within the Empire, and although one hears British officials in India speak as though something more radical than this is to be expected and although people wondered in India what could be the meaning of the Prince of Wales' visit if he were not coming to offer India something more than had been promised or to offer it more expeditiously, nevertheless the official utterance both at home and in India has been clear. Whatever course others may take it is within the bounds of that utterance that the Church and the Missions should do their thinking and plan their work. If the British Government of India were an oppressive tyranny or if it were resisting the legitimate aspirations of the people, the problem of the Indian Church would be different, but while the Government may have been paternalistic and dilatory in its past recognition and development of Indian autonomy, it is seeking now with the highest conscience and with a changed attitude of mind which is as wonderful as it must have been psychologically difficult, to abandon once for all, as Lord Chelmsford said, the old principle of autocracy and to replace British rule by Indian rule.

It would be a great day for India if the forces which Mr. Gandhi leads should cordially give themselves to the speedy working out of this problem and abandon the agitation of hatred and separatism, and forego the substitution of exceptional grievances or mistakes or fabricated agitations like Hindu-Moslem unity in the Khilafat movement for the steady processes of justice and freedom which are under way. Americans are estopped by the facts of their own national history from denying the right of revolution, but they have learned from their own national history also how much wiser are the constructive processes of justice and brotherhood than the upheaval and ruin of civil war.

2. Is India ready for self-government?

The conviction of India and the policy of the British Government agree that she is ready for a larger measure of self-government than she has had. The National Congress claims that she is ready for complete self-government at once. The student class take the same view. In one sense their position is the right one. It is a bad thing for a nation to be told or to tell itself that it is not capable of self-government. With all the excesses of thought and language which ever accompany in history such nationalistic movements as this one that is now going on in India, one nevertheless rejoices in the upheaval, and he is sorry to hear Indians speak of their "slave mentality," their "race servility," their "political impotence." These certainly are not self-respecting terms.

What one wants to see is just what is going on inside the Christian Church in India. Here, with far less to be regretted than is to

be found in politics, men are setting themselves to the building in Indian life of those qualities of character and those conceptions of human relationships on which alone a true and free state can be built. Here they are seeking to achieve the unity which has never existed in India and without which there can not be a united national life in India. I know that there are those who in the interests of this national life are glorifying India's past and discovering there a unity which they think will suffice for India's present need. They are mistaken. There never was such a unity in India, and there is not now a unity that can stand the strain of a modern solidified nationality. The great body of Indian people deride the idea, but it is a fact nevertheless which they might learn from a book which many of them are fond of quoting, Sir John Seely's "The Expansion of England," that India is not united and that neither Hinduism nor Mohammedanism will ever unite her and that Christianity can.

3. *Will the future unfold in peace or will there be revolution and war?*

One hears this question answered in both ways. It will be enough to give the reasons which we heard in India for the hopeful view.

(a) The responsible men in India are preparing not for anarchy but for order and progress. The number of people who would profit temporarily by a re-distribution of wealth in India is enormous, but those who possess wealth are not in fear of any such upheaval. In spite of Mr. Gandhi's denunciation of machinery and industry, Indians are buying up all the capital stock they can in British mills and are founding constantly new enterprises of their own. In city after city they are buying land and building new homes of the most modern type. Government loans are oversubscribed at once. Land owners whose titles run from the British Government in India instead of getting rid of such property because of its insecurity are eager to acquire more. The National Congress in September, 1920, called for the surrender of all titles and government offices. Out of an approximate total of 5,000 title holders, up to February, 1921, titles had been surrendered by twenty-one. In one large city we were accidentally caught in the midst of a great mass of people in the main street of the city on the great day of the Ramalila festival. We were able barely to make our way through the crowd to the police station. On either side of our car gangs of young men wearing Gandhi caps and carrying lathies were shouting, "Mahatma Gandhi ki ji" (Victory to Saint Gandhi), while others answered back, "Angrezon ki chhai" (Destruction to the English). I asked the Deputy Superintendent of Police, as we watched the Ramalila procession go by with its floats on which there were cauldrons burning foreign cloth and representations of General Dyer with bloody victims lying before him at Amritsar, and of the Ali brothers in an

iron cage, and of Mr. Gandhi proclaiming *swaraj*, whether trouble would not come from all this. "No," he said, "this is an escape valve. The responsible men are not doing this. We see the mail, and we know that the really responsible people of India who have property investment in the country at stake are not financing disorder." Perhaps he was over-optimistic, but it is certainly true that the economic forces of India are expecting not anarchy but peace.

(b) "No," we were told again and again, "India is not a land of violence. The Indian people are a mild and peace loving people." Perhaps such views forget too much, including Nana Sahib and the Rani of Jhansi, but they are certainly true of the Indian people as a whole. The report of the Government of India on the disturbances in the Panjab in the spring of 1919 states that "it must not be forgotten that the loyalty of India as a whole remained unshaken, and that even in the Panjab the bulk of the population maintained its reputation and did not fall a victim to the infection which so disastrously affected a portion of it. . . . the vast rural tract in the five districts concerned having remained tranquil and loyal." Even the shouting crowds seemed to be acting more in sport than in anger although no doubt a fanatic might throw a match into such powder with disaster, as happened in the riots among "the hooligans of Bombay," as Mr. Gandhi called them. But certainly the great mass of simple village people in India, making up eighty-five per cent of the population, are not people of violence, and they know of no quarrel which they have with the Government. No doubt they have been deeply affected by Mr. Gandhi's campaign.

(c) "There will undoubtedly be disturbances," said the British Resident in one of the Native States, "but it will be sporadic and the Government will be able to suppress it in one section before it emerges in another, and in the end the transition will be peacefully made." This has been true of the situation thus far. It seems likely to continue to be true, if the army and the police remain loyal. Some say that they will not, especially the police. Others declare that they will. And it is always to be remembered that one-third of India is made up of Native States and that one-fourth of the population of India lives in these States, and that for various reasons these States are dead set against the Nationalistic movement. Mr. Gandhi would not be allowed to set foot in some of them, and even the white home-spun caps which bear his name are forbidden.

(d) Ideals of justice and right are abroad in India. It is in their name that, justly or unjustly, the new movements in India are proceeding. Surely they will prevail in India, and the new day dawn in peace. And yet this whole view may be proved false before this letter reaches America.