The Indian Century

General Editors RAMACHANDRA GUHA AND SUNIL KHILNANI

David Hardiman
Gandhi in His Time and Ours

Christophe Jaffrelot
Dr Ambedkar and Untouchability

Harish Damodaran
India's New Capitalists

Vasanthi Srinivasan
Gandhi's Conscience Keeper

Rajendra Vora
The World's First Anti-Dam Movement

Srinath Raghavan
War and Peace in Modern India

Irfan Ahmad
Islamism and Democracy in India

Mukul Sharma
Green and Saffron

Nico Slate
Colored Cosmopolitanism

COLORED COSMOPOLITANISM

The Shared Struggle for Freedom

in the United States and India

NICO SLATE
World Stirs," the veteran Black socialist and labor leader Frank R. Crosswaith praised struggles in India, China, and Japan. Despite the depth of Black solidarity with "the darker world," Crosswaith argued, "all that we have equipped ourselves to contribute in their struggle for independence are prayers and spirituals, and these weapons (if you call them such) in a world of struggle make as much impression upon a foe as feathers falling on a snow covered field." Crosswaith's editorial appeared in January 1930, only months before Gandhi's dramatic Salt March would once again make India front-page news. India's seemingly rapid progress toward independence offered the hope that even if Black Americans could provide little more than "prayers and spirituals" to the Indian cause, Indians might use their newfound influence to aid Blacks and other members of the darker world.

It was in the 1930s, as his renown once again peaked worldwide, that Mahatma Gandhi intensified his interactions with African Americans. Gandhi met with several Black Americans in India and corresponded with others. His engagement with African Americans and with American racism helped inspire his evolving views not only of race but also of caste. By the Second World War, Gandhi would emerge as an outspoken opponent of white domination worldwide, as well as an increasingly radical critic of caste in India. If the influence of Black Americans on British imperialism approximated "feathers falling on a snow covered field," the impact of Blacks on the shape of the emerging Indian nation proved far more significant.

Soul Force

The African must remember the colored Christ. Preachers did not understand Christ until taught by my Master, Mahatma Gandhi. Jesus, remember, was not a white man, but an Asiatic like me.

—Sarojini Naidu

IN MAY 1924 Marcus Garvey's newspaper, The Negro World, reported a speech given by the Indian poet Sarojini Naidu at a meeting of the Universal Negro Improvement Association (UNIA) in Capetown, South Africa. As the meeting opened, an auditorium full of Black and Indian South Africans sang Christian hymns, including "The Lord Is King" and one of Gandhi's personal favorites, "Lead, Kindly Light." The hymns befitted Naidu's speech. Linking Gandhi, Garvey, and Christ as prophets of pride in dark skin, Naidu offered her audience a conception of colored unity grounded in an emancipatory reading of Christian and Gandhian teachings. "The message I bring to my people is the same message I give to the Negroes," Naidu proclaimed, "that message that Mahatman Gandhi brought out of Africa; that message that Marcus Garvey is giving the British Dominions to the Negroes of the world; the same message that Jesus preached nearly two thousand years ago. Africans, be not ashamed of your black skin." To her audience and the many African American readers of The Negro World, Naidu presented Gandhi as a Christian apostle of colored pride and solidarity.

On January 26, 1930, the Indian National Congress endorsed the goal of purna swaraj, or complete independence. To Gandhi fell the task of deciding how to use civil disobedience to make that goal a reality. He chose to challenge the government monopoly on the collection and production

of salt, a staple whose price particularly affected the poor. Along with a carefully chosen group of followers, Gandhi walked 240 miles from his ashram near the banks of the Sabarmati River to the coastal town of Dandi. The march captured the attention of the world. On April 6 Gandhi reached the sea and gathered a handful of salty sand from the shore. Throughout India, nonviolent protesters began to produce and distribute salt in open defiance of the law.

In the wake of the Salt March, African American interest in Gandhi boomed, revealing both the depth and diversity of Black engagement with the Mahatma. To properly understand the range of African American responses to Gandhi requires careful attention to shifting constructions of race, nation, empire, and, perhaps most crucially, religion. For many Black Americans, Gandhi was a religious teacher who offered spiritual as well as political instruction. The African American encounter with Gandhi was part of a larger American engagement with Indian religion, ranging from American transcendentalism to theosophy. While they contributed to widespread efforts to reconcile Gandhi and Christianity, many African Americans presented the Mahatma as a colored leader opposed to white oppression.

By focusing primarily on Gandhi's impact on African Americans, existing scholarship has largely neglected the ways in which African Americans influenced Gandhi. As a young man, Gandhi used the Aryan idea to distinguish "civilized" Indians from uncivilized Africans. Over the course of his years in South Africa, Gandhi developed a different understanding of civilization, influenced by Booker T. Washington, in which poor and working-class people of all races became exemplars of the civilizing capacity of labor. In the 1920s and 1930s Gandhi's interaction with a variety of African Americans contributed to his growing colored cosmopolitanism and his increasingly outspoken criticism of American racial inequality. While emancipatory conceptions of Christianity strongly influenced many Black perceptions of Gandhi, Gandhi's own religious pluralism allowed him to embrace African Americans as fellow seekers of God. The majority of African Americans who met or corresponded with Gandhi framed their commitment to social change in a religious framework. Many served as Christian pastors or taught religion in Black colleges. Gandhi's conception of African American struggles was shaped by a conception of Black spirituality that he developed largely from his interactions with African Americans.

Gandhi's interactions with African Americans challenged him to revise his understanding of caste in India. While his earliest initiatives aimed to end untouchability while preserving caste, Gandhi eventually came to reject caste itself as detrimental to Indian society and contrary to the true spirit of Hinduism. Gandhi's evolving views on caste were both encouraged and constrained by his relationships with African Americans. While Booker T. Washington helped inspire Gandhi's recognition of the dignity of labor, Washingtonian notions of self-help and social harmony limited Gandhi's efforts to confront caste oppression. As Washington moderated his criticism of racial oppression in order to maintain the support of influential whites, Gandhi tempered his social reforms so as to preserve the support of upper-caste Indians. A key dimension of the long history of relationships between Gandhi and African Americans, analogies between race and caste both advanced and constrained Gandhi's understanding of swaraj.

Evangel of Self-Deliverance

In the aftermath of the First World War, Indians in the United States galvanized interest in Gandhi among African Americans. Ten years later, in the late 1920s and early 1930s, a new wave of Indian supporters of Gandhi came to the United States, inspired in part by the desire to refute Katherine Mayo's *Mother India*. In collaboration with liberal white Americans who championed both American racial equality and Indian independence, Indian supporters of Gandhi solidified Gandhi's status among Blacks as a "colored" messiah. While shaping African American conceptions of the Mahatma, these ambassadors were equally influential in shaping Gandhi's views of African Americans. They communicated to Gandhi an image of African Americans that, while at times patronizing, increased Gandhi's sympathy with the struggles of African Americans, helping to endow Gandhi's understanding of the Indian struggle with transnational and transracial dimensions.

In 1928, Sarojini Naidu came to the United States to improve American opinion of Gandhi and the Indian National Congress. A renowned poet and a close confidant of Gandhi, Naidu was also a significant political figure in her own right, having been elected President of the Congress only a few years earlier. Naidu conceived of herself as a disciple of Gandhi, spreading a religiously informed message of emancipation that, like Garvey's UNIA, welcomed followers of many spiritual traditions. In a letter to Gandhi from Cincinnati, Ohio, addressed playfully to "My Mystic Spinner," Naidu presented herself as a missionary for the Mahatma, bringing his good news to African Americans. Referencing Harriet Beecher Stowe, the author of *Uncle Tom's Cabin*, Naidu told Gandhi that in Cincinnati "long ago lived a very noble woman who dedicated..."
her genius to the deliverance of the Negros from their pitiful bondage.” Naidu wrote, “Mine was, like Harriet Beecher Stowe’s, also a message of deliverance from bondage—another version for another land.” Referring to herself as a “Wandering Singer,” Naidu told Gandhi, “The gospel of the Mystic Spinner as interpreted by a Wandering Singer was from first to last, from the initial to the ultimate word, the evangel of self-deliverance from every kind of personal, national, economic, social, intellectual, political, and spiritual bondage.”

Naidu understood the emancipatory potential of Gandhi’s teaching in expansive and explicitly religious terms. She told Gandhi, “I have reached the houses—and I hope the hearts—of the as yet dispossessed Children of America, the Coloured population.” Referring to Blacks as “Children of America,” Naidu evoked Gandhi’s own phrase for Dalits, Harijans, or the children of God. The patronizing undertones in both phrases, “children of America” and “children of God,” surfaced when Naidu declared: “It breaks my heart to see the helpless, hopeless, silent and patient bitterness and mental suffering of the educated Negroes.” Her adjectives—“helpless, hopeless, silent and patient”—dealt Blacks agency in a way that high-caste reformers, including Gandhi, often denied untouchables agency. Naidu made the comparison explicit by calling Blacks “the socially and spiritually outcast children of America.” Once again she referred to African Americans as children while framing race in America as Gandhi did caste in India—as a spiritual matter.

Naidu’s description of African Americans—empathetic, if patronizing—was not without praise for Black initiatives. “They are so cultured, so gifted, some of them so beautiful,” Naidu wrote, “all of them so informed with earnest and sensitive appreciation of all that is authentic in modern ideas of life.” Naidu described the play Porgy, from which the musical Porgy and Bess would be written, as “a transcript from life: written and acted by Negroes.” She praised the play as “so simple, so true, so heart breaking,” and opined, “There is nothing like it in the whole range of modern literature. It is all the tears and all the child laughter of the race and I think it will educate the American white races to a broader consciousness of equality and humanity more powerfully than even Uncle Tom’s Cabin did during the days of slavery.” By praising Porgy as containing “all the tears and all the child laughter,” Naidu returned to the stereotype of Blacks as emotional children, needing care. However, her mistaken belief that Porgy had been written by Blacks transformed her praise of the play into a recognition of the achievements of Black writers. Furthermore, by arguing that white Americans needed a “broader consciousness of equality and humanity,” Naidu explained American racism as a product of white ignorance and inhumanity.

Late in his life W. E. B. Du Bois would credit Naidu with stoking his interest in Gandhi and India. Naidu was only one of several Gandhians who attempted to influence the eminent editor of The Crisis. Their encounters with Du Bois manifested the spiritual approach to social change that Du Bois would immortalize in Dark Princess. Two years before Naidu visited the United States and Dark Princess was published, in the fall of 1926, Du Bois received a long handwritten letter from Simla Hills, India. Its author, a white lawyer from Boston, Richard B. Gregg, had spent the past few years living in India. After six months at Gandhi’s ashram and three months at the school of Rabindranath Tagore, Gregg spent a year teaching science and math in a village in the Himalayas. In the 1950s Gregg would become an important source of Gandhian ideas for American civil rights activists. Writing to Du Bois in 1926, he asserted that British imperialism and American racism stemmed from the same root, “the false pride, blindness, and exploiting selfishness of the white races or nations.” “More than ever,” Gregg wrote, “I am convinced that in essence it is a spiritual and moral attitude which is at fault, and that the only real solution must be in the realm of the spirit.” He told Du Bois that he expected “great improvements” in the world because “the fundamental weaknesses of capitalism are rapidly sapping the strength of white civilization,” while at the same time the other races of the world are realizing their unity and steadily achieving better organization.” As if he were afraid that his emphasis on the spiritual would be lost in the wake of this political analysis, Gregg added in small writing, scrunched between his lines, “These are manifestations of spiritual, inner changes,” and scribbled in parentheses, “(I am not a Socialist).” Gregg need not have worried. Du Bois had developed his own mixture of socialism and spirituality, a synthesis he gave narrative form two years later in Dark Princess.

A few months before Gregg mailed his letter from Simla Hills, Du Bois had sent Gregg a sample copy of The Crisis and a copy of Darkwater. Gregg told Du Bois he was reading Darkwater “with very great interest” and would loan the book to Charles Freer Andrews, a white Anglican missionary and confidant of Gandhi. After visiting South Africa in 1914, Andrews developed a close friendship with Gandhi, calling him “Mohan,” a shortened version of “Mohandas,” and becoming intimately involved in every aspect of Gandhi’s life. Andrews, Gregg informed Du Bois, “has had much wide experience with the race problem in S. Africa, Fiji, China and here in India” and would be “greatly interested” in Darkwater. This was not Du Bois’s first introduction to Andrews. In February 1925 The Crisis had quoted an article regarding imperial wrongs in British East Africa that Andrews had written for Gandhi’s newspaper Young India. It was not until 1929, however, that Andrews met Du Bois during a trip
to the United States. Their meeting led Du Bois to write Andrews, enclosing letters to Gandhi and Tagore that requested articles for The Crisis. Andrews forwarded both notes and told Du Bois that he himself would be happy to write for The Crisis. “There is no magazine,” Andrews explained, “that has helped me so much to understand the situation in America.” In August 1929 The Crisis published a speech in which Andrews discussed Gandhi’s experiences with racial segregation in South Africa and defended “the Christian principle of racial equality.”

In his letter to Gandhi, Du Bois mentioned the pleasure of meeting Andrews and Sarojini Naidu and asked for “a message from you to these twelve million people who are the grandchildren of slaves.” Du Bois added, “I know you are busy with your own problems, but the race and color problems are world-wide, and we need your help here.” Gandhi responded from Sabarmati on May 1, 1929, with what he called “a little love message.” Du Bois published Gandhi’s “little love message” in The Crisis:

Let not the 12 million Negroes be ashamed of the fact that they are the grandchildren of the slaves. There is no dishonour in being slaves. There is dishonour in being slaveowners. But let us not think of honour or dishonour in connection with the past. Let us realise that the future is with those who would be truthful, pure and loving. For, as the wise men have said, truth ever is, untruth never was. Love alone binds and truth and love accrete only to the truly humble.

Gandhi echoed the reference to slavery that Du Bois had made in his request while offering a distinctly Gandhian pronunciation on the virtues of truth, love, and humility. For the readers of The Crisis. Du Bois offered his own summary of the Mahatma and his message: “Agitation, non-violence, refusal to cooperate with the oppressor, became Gandhi's watchword and with it he is leading all India to freedom. Here and today he stretches out his hand in fellowship to his colored friends of the West.”

While Gandhi offered a philosophical meditation on truth and love, Du Bois praised the militancy of Gandhi’s politics.

Like Gandhi, Rabindranath Tagore provided African Americans with an example of an honorable and internationally renowned colored man. Howard University scholar Kelly Miller praised Tagore and declared, “The situation in India is in every particular on a parallel with that of the Negro in the United States.” His analysis of Tagore’s work allowed Miller to conclude, “The relations of the whiter races to the darker ones constitute one vast problem with local and national complexities and variations.” In October 1929 Du Bois published a note from Tagore in The Crisis. The poet wrote, “What is the great fact of this age? It is that the messenger has knocked at our gate and all the bars have given way. Our doors have burst open. The human races have come out of their enclosures.” African Americans, still very much enclosed in the rigid boundaries of the Jim Crow South or the ghettos of the North, might demur at Tagore’s statement that “the human races have come out of their enclosures.” On the other hand, Tagore’s words could be read as a prophecy of future change and a call for the kind of colored cosmopolitanism that Du Bois and The Crisis had long championed. Along with Tagore’s note, Du Bois produced a picture of the poet, introduced Tagore as “colored,” and stated that Tagore had “risen to something quite above the artificial limitations of race, color and nation.”

Du Bois met Tagore in New York in 1930. According to Du Bois, they “found much in common to discuss concerning the color line which was growing in world importance.” While Indians “naturally recoiled from being mistaken for Negroes and having to share their disabilities,” Du Bois wrote, “the Negroes thought of Indians as people ashamed of their race and color.” Du Bois credited his meeting with Tagore with helping “Negroes and Indians realize that both are fighting the same great battle against the assumption of superiority made so often by the white race.”

In September 1931 Du Bois sent a year’s supply of The Crisis to Tagore’s university, Santiniketan, and asked for another letter from Tagore for The Crisis. In the fall of 1931 Du Bois contributed a short tribute to Tagore for a book produced to celebrate the poet’s seventy-fifth birthday. By building on the “beginnings of democracy” laid by Europe and America, Du Bois wrote, “the dark millions of Africa and India can go forward to set new standards of freedom, equality and brotherhood for a world which is in desperate need of these spiritual things.” He concluded, “It seems to me that no one has had a finer vision of such a future than Rabindranath Tagore. I greet him in his quest for common justice for all men.” While articulating his colored cosmopolitanism, Du Bois framed “freedom, equality and brotherhood” as “spiritual things.”

A close friend of both Gandhi and Tagore, C. F. Andrews did much to unite Indians and African Americans in a religiously inspired struggle for “freedom, equality, and brotherhood.” Along with Sarojini Naidu, Richard Gregg, and Tagore himself, Andrews served as a conduit between South Asian and African American freedom struggles. In 1929 Andrews visited the Tuskegee Institute. Gandhi’s esteem for Tuskegee began as early as 1903. In 1922 Dr. N. S. Hardikar, a medical doctor trained in the United States, who would soon found the influential service organization the Hindustan Seva Dal (Indian Service League), wrote Tuskegee asking for information about the school. Robert Russa Moton, principal of Tuskegee,
sent Hardikar Tuskegee’s annual catalog and other promotional materials. After meeting Andrews in 1929, Moton wrote Gandhi that “India, Africa and America joined hands last night.” Andrews also connected Moton with Tagore, arranging a meeting in Philadelphia at which Moton and Tagore discussed exchanging students and professors between Tuskegee and Santiniketan. The Tuskegee Messenger summarized the message that Andrews brought as the “plain unadorned story of the two greatest spirits in the world today, Tagore and Gandhi.” J. T. Sunderland wrote an article on “Rev. C. F. Andrews in America,” which was published in English in the Calcutta journal The Modern Review, and in Hindi in the Hindi Prawas Bharatiya. Another Hindi journal, the Vishaal Bhaarat, published an article on “Andrews in Tuskegee” that offered a history of Booker T. Washington and the founding of Tuskegee and discussed Andrews’s vision for cooperation between African Americans and Indians.

During his journeys abroad, Andrews corresponded with the editor of the Vishaal Bhaarat, Benaresidas Chaturvedi, a journalist with a strong interest in the Indian diaspora. His letters to Chaturvedi demonstrate that, like Sarojini Naidu, Andrews understood his travels in the United States as an opportunity to connect Blacks and Indians. Also like Naidu, Andrews at times employed racial stereotypes of “the Indian” and “the Negro.” On March 9, 1929, Andrews told Chaturvedi, “I am doing my utmost to create a real friendship between the American Negroes who are wonderfully progressive and the Indians, through linking up Tuskegee with Santiniketan.” In June Andrews wrote Chaturvedi from British Guiana. “The nature and temperament of the African,” he declared, “though differing from the Indian, yet in many ways is akin to it; and it has been one of the greatest wishes of my life to point out that kinship, and to bring about that friendly intercourse between India and Africa in different parts of the world.” In explaining the potential for unity between Africans and Indians, Andrews homogenized both groups with racial references to “nature and temperament” and went so far as to suggest a “tropical” disposition that Africans and Indians supposedly shared with other colored people.

While his efforts to connect the Indian and African diasporas were couched in the limiting language of racial diplomacy, Andrews nevertheless fostered solidarities in opposition to the prevailing racial hierarchies of his day. In British Guiana Andrews brought cheers from the crowd when he proclaimed of his time in South Africa with Gandhi, “Believe me, believe me, with my own eyes I saw it—the cause of the African equally with the cause of the Indian.” Andrews told his audience that he had related to Tagore “what he had seen of the great African race in America—about Hampton, Tuskegee, Atlanta, and about his visit in New York where he had met Dr. Dubois and many other great Negro intellectuals as well as great African poets, painters, writers, and novelists who were producing some of the great literature today in America.” Andrews told Tagore that he “brought him the good wishes of those great African people, and that everywhere he had gone the names of Tagore and Gandhi were known and loved in every African household throughout the United States.” After returning from Guiana, Andrews spent a week at the Hampton Institute, Booker T. Washington’s alma mater. The Hampton student newspaper reported that Andrews had “dwelt among the great souls of India, interpreting and thinking, until he too has become, with Gandhi, a symbol of nonresistance and overpowering faith—a believer in Swadeshi, a sympathizer with the oppressed—one with India’s mind.” Linking “nonresistance and overpowering faith” while praising “the great souls of India,” the Hampton student newspaper expressed the blend of religion and politics that C. F. Andrews embodied and that would prove a fertile ground for meaningful interactions between Gandhi and African Americans.

Peanut Milk Politics

On February 24, 1929, African American scientist George Washington Carver wrote Andrews, who was about to end his ten-day visit to the Tuskegee Institute. “Our various, previous conversations, marvelous lectures, followed by our conversation this morning,” Carver declared, “all convince me that a new day is dawning for India.” To contribute to India’s renaissance, Carver outlined a diet involving whole-wheat flour, grits, hominy, and local Indian fruits and nuts. Carver hoped his diet would improve Gandhi’s strength. His vision of the diet extended, however, well beyond Gandhi. Referring to the diet, Carver wrote, “You can use it in your school, they will carry it into the various communities from whence they came, bringing to my mind greater health, strength and economic independence to India.” He ended by mentioning a kind of milk that could be made from soybeans or peanuts.

Born into slavery, George Washington Carver became one of the most internationally renowned African Americans of his generation, known throughout the world for his innovations in agricultural science, most notably his promotion of dozens of uses for the peanut. Carver had been referred to in Gandhi’s newspaper, Indian Opinion, as early as 1909. It was the visit of C. F. Andrews, however, that began more than a decade of interactions between Gandhi and Carver, two men treated as saints in
their day. Their relationship demonstrates that the African American encounter with Gandhi was multidirectional. Indeed, Gandhi came to see Carver as many Blacks saw Gandhi—as a man of profound personal and spiritual virtue.

It is not surprising that matters of diet provided the foundation for the transnational encounter between Gandhi and Carver. Food played a central role in both men’s lives, careers, and faiths. Carver’s association of the diet he offered Gandhi with the “health, strength and economic independence” of India reveals a concern for international politics that previous scholarship has failed to note. Carver’s grand vision for his diet becomes even more significant in light of the fact that Gandhi himself was uniquely prepared to see the diet in such sweeping terms. Diet played a foundational role—simultaneously religious and political—in Gandhi’s vision of his life and work. Gandhi’s use of the Sanskrit word “brahmacharya” reveals the religious significance of diet for him. Brahmacharya is often translated simply as “celibacy.” For Gandhi, however, brahmacharya was best understood in its literal sense—the pursuit of Brahman, the pursuit of God. Sexual abstinence was necessary but not sufficient to the attainment of brahmacharya. Rather, Gandhi encouraged fellow brahmacaris to strive for “control in thought, word and action, of all the senses at all times and in all places.” Achieving such a demanding goal depended, in Gandhi’s mind, upon adherence to a strict diet.

Gandhi connected diet and sexual chastity and linked both to the achievement of brahmacharya. Milk took center stage in these connections. As a vegetarian, Gandhi believed that only milk could provide the strength he needed to be active politically. However, he also felt that milk weakened his ability to be chaste. In his autobiography, written in installments from 1925 to 1929, and in numerous personal letters, Gandhi repeatedly returned to the unfortunate necessity of milk. In the process, he revealed a remarkable compatibility between what he felt he needed and what Carver’s diet provided. For Gandhi, milk impeded spiritual independence from the sensual world but aided political independence from Britain. Carver’s diet offered the ability to avoid such a conflict, harmonizing religious and political pursuits that both Gandhi and Carver understood to be fundamentally interconnected. For both men a diet could bring “greater health, strength and economic independence.”

Carver’s discussion of the diet he sent to Andrews provides insight into his own politics and his understanding of Gandhi. Carver mentioned the diet in several speeches in 1930 and at various times afterward. Several newspapers picked up the story, most focusing on Carver’s contribution to Gandhi’s political efforts. One article proclaimed, “The discoveries of Dr. George W. Carver, well known creative scientist of Tuskegee, may become a factor in the great fight India is making to free herself.” Another declared, “It is, of course, hoped that this menu would add strength and perhaps years of life in which Gandhi could engage in the cause of his country’s freedom.” The fact that most newspapers connected Carver’s diet to Gandhi’s politics provides evidence that Carver himself continued to discuss the diet in the political framework that he originally described to Andrews. In 1937, speaking before a scientific conference attended by the governor of Mississippi, Carver again mentioned his diet for Gandhi. Several newspapers reported the event, all using the same revealing language:

The eminent chemist, born of slave parents in Missouri, and who as a child was stolen and traded for a race horse, also revealed that the lowly Alabama peanut, not the Indian goat, furnishes Mahatma Gandhi with the remarkable strength he possesses. This diet was prepared for him out of peanut milk by Dr. Carver several years ago when Gandhi broke his fast and has since been constantly included. The two correspond regularly.

The words “constantly” and “regularly” make the aforementioned article sound exaggerated. If Gandhi did use the diet, it did not permanently eliminate his need for milk. His correspondence demonstrates that he continued to drink milk throughout his life. However, a detail in Carver’s speech provides evidence that in fact Gandhi did make use of Carver’s diet, if only temporarily, and that Carver himself understood why Gandhi did so. Gandhi had vowed never to drink milk but reluctantly decided that his vow did not include goat’s milk. Carver’s reference to “the Indian goat” thus provides evidence that Carver understood Gandhi’s dietary needs and was reporting fact when he said that Gandhi had used his peanut milk.

The pursuit of God linked peanut milk to politics and Carver to Gandhi. C. F. Andrews served as a bridge between Gandhi and Carver, helping both men understand the similarities between their views on religion. On February 28, 1929, Andrews wrote Carver to thank him for his letter and for their time together. Andrews concluded his note with a revealing sentence: “I am certain that the soul force which you rightly call Divine Love must some day rule the world for Christ is King and Lord of all.” Gandhi often used the phrase “soul force” to translate “sattragraha,” a word coined by Gandhi’s nephew in response to a contest Gandhi organized through his journal Indian Opinion. Gandhi had been unhappy with the English phrase “passive resistance” as a description of his efforts. He felt “passive resistance” was too reactionary and allowed for the possibility of eventual violence on the part of his followers. Sattragraha, combining the
Sanskrit for “truth” and “holding firm,” communicated the more proactive and spiritual meaning that Gandhi attached to his tactics. By stating that Carver translated “soul force” as “divine love,” Andrews indicated that the two had discussed Gandhi’s understanding of satyagraha and that Carver himself had connected Gandhi’s religiosity to his own. Without specific knowledge of each man’s religious ideas, we might see a profound disconnect between satyagraha and divine love, the first seeming to involve active will on the part of people, not God, and the latter emphasizing not truth but love. Carver’s connection of divine love to satyagraha accurately reflected, however, the blend of religion and social activism that he and Gandhi shared. For both men religion defined the purpose of social reform.

Just as Andrews exposed Carver to satyagraha, so he introduced Gandhi to Carver’s faith in God. Soon after leaving Alabama, Andrews wrote Gandhi that Tuskegee was “a real asram, both of prayer and work.” His use of the word ashram and his emphasis on prayer reveal the religious lens with which Andrews viewed both Tuskegee and Carver. A few years later Gandhi asked Andrews to write an article about Tuskegee for Gandhi’s journal Harijan. Gandhi called Tuskegee “that wonderful institute” and asked Andrews whether his firsthand experience confirmed the accounts Gandhi had read in books. Andrews responded with two separate articles on Tuskegee. The first lavishly praised the religiosity of Tuskegee and African Americans in general. In the second, entitled “George Carver of Tuskegee,” Andrews managed to repeat almost every myth about Carver, while simultaneously touching on many of Carver’s most important beliefs. He praised Carver’s scientific achievements and emphasized that Carver chose to remain teaching at Tuskegee rather than earn a much higher salary elsewhere. Andrews stressed Carver’s humility. He wrote, “Never in my life have I seen one so great in character and achievement and at the same time so modest and retiring in temperament.” Such praise seems even more striking coming from such a close friend of Gandhi’s. In strong and moving prose Andrews praised Carver’s active faith and concluded, “He is one of those about whom it is said: ‘Blessed are the pure in heart, for they shall see God.’”

To the end of Andrews’s article on Carver, Gandhi appended a revealing note: “The story of Carver’s life has a lesson for us all… especially for schoolmasters.” The phrase “especially for schoolmasters” highlights a specific lesson Gandhi hoped his readers would take from Carver’s life. In 1934, when Andrews’s article was published, Gandhi was struggling to recruit teachers to work in poor, rural communities. He was thus well prepared to appreciate Carver’s willingness to teach the rural poor for little pay. Carver’s self-sacrificing nature does not, however, completely explain Gandhi’s praise of Carver. The primary concerns of both men coalesced in the 1930s under the aegis of rural development, giving them many reasons to praise each other’s work. Their shared commitment to rural society led to their first direct correspondence. That interaction resulted from and revealed the remarkably similar program of vocational training with which both men addressed the needs of rural people—a program grounded in a theological conception of agrarian sustainability that recognized the need for interdisciplinary approaches to rural poverty but failed to adequately confront the entrenched nature of economic inequality.

Soon after publishing Andrews’s article, Gandhi requested more information about Carver and his agricultural work at Tuskegee. He did so via Richard Gregg, the Boston attorney who had written Du Bois from Simla Hills in 1926. Gregg wrote Carver, asking him to send Gandhi several agricultural bulletins. In his letter to Carver, Gregg explained that Gandhi had started a village industries association to help the Indian peasants to revive some of their indigenous industries and improve their economic position by the use of their own indigenous assets. It was not a coincidence that Gandhi’s project so closely resembled Carver’s work at the Tuskegee Institute. Gandhi’s interest in Tuskegee began during his years in South Africa when he was exposed to the ideas of Booker T. Washington. Writing about Tuskegee, Gandhi often stressed the need for sacrifice and the dignity of labor—both themes that informed his views of Carver. On July 27, 1935, Carver wrote Gandhi, noting with surprise that an earlier letter Carver had sent along with several agricultural bulletins had yet to arrive. He stated he would send more bulletins, and added, “It is indeed a great pleasure and privilege to keep in touch with you. So many people have read your card and have enjoyed it.” Carver concluded, “May God ever bless, keep, and direct you in this marvelous work you are doing.” Although Carver could have meant “this marvelous work” to refer to all of Gandhi’s efforts, the context of the letter indicates that he meant to acknowledge Gandhi’s work with the rural poor. On September 2 Gandhi’s secretary, Mahadev Desai, wrote Carver to inform him that he had received the first group of bulletins Carver had sent and to apologize for writing to ask for them a second time. Desai’s letter demonstrates that Gandhi wanted the bulletins enough to send repeated letters to both Gregg and Carver.

The content of Carver’s bulletins helps explain Gandhi’s high estimation of him. The bulletins aimed to communicate to rural farmers simple ways they could improve their lives. With that goal in mind, Carver wrote
the bulletins with little scientific jargon and published many of them in leaflet form. He used his bulletins to make connections between different fields of knowledge in an effort to confront problems rural people faced. Bulletins addressed how poor farmers could preserve fruit for the winter, produce goods they previously bought, and improve the physical condition of their homes. Gandhi similarly concerned himself with all aspects of rural life. His most renowned experiment in village development, the Sevagram Ashram, aimed to improve every facet of life, from diet and exercise, to the production of food, to the removal of waste. Through the ashram Gandhi fostered a variety of local development projects—what he called "village industries"—such as weaving, pottery, beekeeping, and agricultural experimentation. Like Carver, Gandhi hoped to provide rural people with the means to be economically self-sufficient.

Prayer and other forms of religious practice played a significant role in the communities that both Gandhi and Carver worked to build. It was fitting for C. F. Andrews to call Tuskegee "a real ashram, both of prayer and work." Tuskegee's dedication to regular religious services paralleled the centrality of prayer meetings in Gandhi's ashrams. Carver himself taught a weekly Bible class at Tuskegee for thirty years. Both Gandhi and Carver invested their work on behalf of the rural poor with religious meaning. Carver's bulletins aimed to give poor farmers the means to thrive on their farms, thus protecting a relationship between people and the land that for Carver was both economically and spiritually fulfilling. Similarly, Gandhi introduced the hand-spinning of yarn not only to boycott British goods but also to revitalize a religious connection between people and the production of their basic needs. For that reason Gandhi chose to encourage individual spinning rather than the development of the Indian textile industry. The making of homespun cloth, or khadi, was a spiritual practice that Gandhi engaged in daily.

Both Gandhi and Carver saw rural self-sufficiency as a religious end requiring religious means. Both aimed to empower the rural poor without upsetting what they saw as a divinely sanctioned power structure based on harmony between different classes. In hindsight, both Gandhi's and Carver's efforts at rural development seem doomed to failure. Their appeals for charity failed to acknowledge the structural inequalities imposed by the feudal economy of both the American South and rural India. The legacy of slavery and the brutality of Jim Crow vastly compounded the difficulties African Americans faced in achieving economic independence. Discrimination based on caste, widespread inequality, and the brutality of colonialism likewise limited the potential benefits of gradualist reform in India. Their religiously inspired vision of interclass harmony prevented both Gandhi and Carver from effectively confronting rural poverty.

In 1937, only six months after proclaiming his contribution to Indian independence, the governor of Mississippi, Carver demonstrated one vital difference between his approach to injustice and that of Gandhi. Attending a conference as the honored guest of Henry Ford, Carver chose to eat his dinner in the hallway rather than create the uncomfortable spectacle of a "Negro" eating among whites. Although he admired Gandhi's struggles against the British, Carver never attempted to use Gandhian civil disobedience to combat racism at home. Salt

Between 1930 and 1932, in the wake of Gandhi's dramatic march to the sea, African American interest in India boomed, as the Black press published hundreds of articles on Gandhi and the Indian cause. By confronting the British ban on the production of salt, Gandhi demonstrated the understanding he shared with Carver of the social, religious, and political consequences of diet. It was not the "Alabama peanut," however, but Indian salt, with which Gandhi instructed the world in the power of nonviolent civil disobedience. Gandhi was not the only Indian to inspire admiration in the African American press. In April 1930, as Gandhi reached the sea and nonviolent civil disobedience erupted throughout India, The Crisis wrote, "And now let the world sit and watch the most astonishing of the battles of peace which it has ever seen: [i]he civil disobedience campaign in India, led by Gandhi and Nehru." Sarojini Naidu received considerable press when she assumed leadership of the movement after Gandhi's imprisonment. Gandhi, however, remained the central figure in Black coverage of Indian struggles. Indeed, the Mahatma became a reference point in articles that had nothing to do with India. As during the noncooperation/Khilafat movement, the Black response to Gandhi was neither static nor uniform. Gandhi was seen as a religious figure, a prophet of the dark races, an anti-imperialist, and a bourgeois impediment to mass rebellion. Gandhi's use of nonviolent civil disobedience, while largely responsible for making him a world figure, only partially explains the significance of Gandhi for his African American contemporaries. Calls for a Black Gandhi, increasingly common, often focused not on nonviolence but on the need for strong and determined leadership. Even those who did propose the use of Gandhian satyagraha did little to put their proposals into practice. In the 1930s, at a time of economic depression and violent racial oppression, Gandhi's contribution
to African American freedom movements entailed not specific techniques of protest but the hope that comes with a sense of connection to larger struggles.

For some African Americans, Gandhi's spiritual achievements exceeded in importance his methods of protest. In The New York Amsterdam News, Kelly Miller declared, "The American Negro can learn valuable lessons from Mahatma Gandhi, who represents the best living embodiment of that mind which was also in Christ." Rather than Gandhian satyagraha, however, Miller endorsed the legal approach to racial inequality pioneered by the NAACP. In The Chicago Defender, Drusilla Dunjee Houston similarly praised Gandhi for living Christ's message, while stopping short of suggesting civil disobedience. The Mahatma was "great because he literally follows the teachings of our Master, a thing that our Race might well note, for our leaders do not recognize the power in non-resistance." Houston herself, however, failed to recognize Gandhi's distinction between "non-resistance" and active nonviolent resistance. She argued that "the practice of Christliness will make for us a Race of high place" but emphasized gentleness of spirit rather than civil disobedience.

Langston Hughes also saw Gandhi as Christlike, although that comparison did not inspire his admiration. In 1931 Hughes criticized Gandhi in a poem entitled "Goodbye, Christ." Hughes placed "Saint Gandhi" alongside Aine McPherson, the infamous Pentecostal leader, and Saint Becton, a Harlem preacher portrayed as a charlatan in Hughes's autobiography The Big Sea. All three were "getting in the way of things." His desire to unmask the reactionary potential in organized religion led Hughes to what would prove an unusual criticism of Gandhi for the poet. A year earlier, in December 1930, Hughes had contrasted Gandhi's imprisonment with the spirit of Christmas. In the years to come, Hughes would produce several more poems in praise of Gandhi.

In March 1930 the president of Howard University, Mordecai Johnson, told an audience in Washington, "Gandhi is conducting today the most significant religious movement in the world, in his endeavor to inject religion into questions of economics and politics." To George Schuyler, a columnist for The Pittsburgh Courier and the most consistent Black critic of Gandhi, Johnson's analysis of Gandhi was "unadulterated nonsense." Johnson linked Gandhi to what he understood as the best traditions of the Christian faith. In response, Schuyler directly criticized both Gandhi and Christianity. While Gandhian techniques were "mythical and so unsound," Schuyler asserted, Christianity had already done "more to hinder the Negro's advancement than any one single thing." Schuyler suggested that communism was better suited to helping the Black struggle than either Christianity or Gandhi's methods. A reader of the Courier challenged Schuyler. "There is nothing mythical," the reader declared, "about an economic boycott that encourages the development of home industries to the detriment of imported goods." The letter, signed only P.T.O., recommended Lala Lajpat Rai's England's Debt to India as evidence of the economic injustice of British colonialism in India. In response to Schuyler's criticism of Gandhi's religiosity, P.T.O. gave credit to Gandhi's creative use of the "simple biblical advice" to turn the other cheek, and asked, "Has anyone during the past nineteen hundred years given to the world a more practical and successful interpretation of the Sermon on the Mount?"

While Langston Hughes and George Schuyler both criticized Gandhi's religious politics, other Left-leaning African Americans embraced Gandhi and his religiously inspired approach to social change. Writing in The Crisis in 1930, Du Bois proclaimed, "At last India is rising again to that great and luteal moral leadership of the world which she exhibited so often in the past in the lives of Buddha, Mohammed and Jesus Christ, and now again in the life of Gandhi." Gandhi's questionable approach to class inequality did not prevent Du Bois from placing the Gandhian struggle alongside the Russian revolution as one of the two "great events of the modern world." Du Bois concluded, "The black folk of America should look upon the present birth-pains of the Indian nation with reverence, hope and applause." His praise of Gandhi is especially significant given the fact that although Dark Princess had established India as a source of great religious and revolutionary meaning, Gandhi played practically no role in the story. What few images of the contemporary Indian freedom movement Du Bois offered in Dark Princess were not positive. Gandhi's success at mobilizing large numbers of people, coupled with the American travels of Sarojini Naidu and C. E. Andrews, helped inspire in Du Bois a new admiration for the Mahatma. In October 1931 Du Bois wrote Gandhi, "We are tremendously interested at the effort of the Indian people to achieve independence and self-government."

While Du Bois's interest in Gandhi fluctuated in proportion to Gandhi's success at mobilizing the Indian masses, Du Bois was never inspired to advocate satyagraha. Like Du Bois, the majority of skeptics regarding the transferability of satyagraha nevertheless praised Gandhi's efforts in India. In September 1931, for example, NAACP leader William Pickens called Gandhi "the greatest man of the world and the age" in a highly laudatory article in The New York Amsterdam News. Five months later, in February 1932, Pickens published another article on Gandhi in the Amsterdam News, this one entitled, "Gandhi-ism and Prayer Will Not
Solve Negro's Problem." Pickens asserted, "Those who see in Gandhi's procedure a model method for the solution of the race problem in the United States are people who reason in shallow analogies." Pickens noted that Indians were in the vast majority in their country, while Blacks constituted a distinct minority in the United States. "If the Negro of Mississippi starts a boycott against working for and trading with white people or against buying or employing any of the facilities owned and controlled by whites," Pickens predicted, "the Negro race would be the very first to freeze and starve." Nevertheless, Pickens concluded, "The American Negro may learn much, in spirit and determination, from the Gandhi movement." Gandhi, Pickens wrote, having "organized and inspired the tremendous movement of 360 million people certainly knows that a leader and his people must not stop with praying in cloisters and 'sacred places,' but must go forth bravely into the avenues of struggle."68

Even those African Americans who endorsed Gandhi nonviolent civil disobedience often focused more on other facets of the Indian struggle. Arthur S. Gray of Los Angeles, for example, wrote The Chicago Defender, "We should inaugurate a campaign of nonparticipation in national affairs, civil and political, thereby registering our silent protest." Published with the title "Gandhi-izing America," Gray's letter focused primarily on the need for an independent Black nation.69 Gray's interest in the Indian struggle inspired him to attend a meeting in Los Angeles with several leading Indian Americans, including Bhagat Singh Thind, Dilip Singh Saund, and the attorney S. G. Pandit. Gray sent a report on the meeting to The Negro World, proclaiming "LONG LIVE THE INDIAN REVOLUTION!" The report did not, however, offer suggestions for transplanting Gandhi's strategies into the United States.

In The Negro World, H. G. Mudgal, the Indian Trinidadian foreign affairs correspondent and subsequent editor, covered Gandhi's struggle closely. Rather than nonviolence, British imperialism in the Caribbean and Africa dominated Mudgal's understanding of the struggle in India. Many of Mudgal's articles praised Gandhi without suggesting adapting his techniques.70 Mudgal's writing on India was characteristic of The Negro World as a whole. When The Negro World offered a cover article on Gandhi in June 1930, its title, "Let's Learn Doggedness and Patience from Gandhi," ignored nonviolence.72 At times The Negro World directly argued against Gandhi's nonviolence. In an unsigned editorial entitled "The End of British Imperialism," The Negro World predicted, "Sooner or later, Mahatma Gandhi and his policy of non-violence will have to give way to the more militant aspirations of the surging masses of India." Readers were instructed that "open revolt in India will mark the beginning of the end of British imperialism, in India, and elsewhere," and that "the age-long domination of the darker peoples of the world will soon receive its death-blow."73

Black accounts of Gandhi and the Indian struggle regularly employed notions of colored solidarity. Mary Church Terrell, leader of the International Council of Women of the Darker Races, wrote of Gandhi, "It is gratifying and encouraging to know that the greatest advocate of peace in the world today is a man who belongs to one of the darker races." An article in The Chicago Defender reported that several "leading organizations of Harlem" had asked Gandhi to "address them on racial problems." The article declared, "It is the consensus of opinion here that Gandhi will eventually play the part of Moses and lead all of the darker races from the wilderness of bondage into the light of freedom."75

Du Bois framed Gandhi and the Indian struggle as central to the aspirations of colored people worldwide. In a two-part article in the fall of 1931, Du Bois outlined India's racial diversity: "Some are Negroes; some are black folk, with straight hair; some are of the Chinese type, and some more nearly the European type." Diversity was not, however, the ultimate reading Du Bois offered of India's racial composition. "The great mass of them are brown people," he stated, "with wavy hair, and allied more nearly to the peoples of Africa and of Asia than to those of Europe." To emphasize the affiliation of Indians with "the peoples of Africa," Du Bois turned to history and the Aryan-invasion theory of Indian civilization. He wrote, "Many black civilizations arose here, like that of the Dravidians and the Sumerians. Invaders came in from the east and west, yellow people and white people." In case his readers did not recall the many odors to the darkness of India and Indians in Dark Princess, Du Bois quoted three paragraphs from the novel, beginning, "Out of black India the world was born. Into the black womb of India the world shall creep to die." Having located India within the dark world, Du Bois used his second article to chronicle India's recent history as the story of a dark people rising up against white oppressors. "If we are going to make our way in this modern world," he told his readers, "we must know what the world has been doing to other colored folk and how it has done it, and what they are doing to achieve freedom and manhood."76

As Gandhi's reputation grew, so did Black interest in other Indians who visited the United States. In November 1932 Vithalbhai Patel, an important Indian leader and the brother of one of Gandhi's most influential lieutenants, spoke to an African American audience in Memphis, Tennessee.77 When, in early 1934, Manilal C. Parekh, an author who had written on Gandhi, visited Atlanta to lecture on the Mahatma's message,
Pilgrims to the Mahatma

A religiously inspired commitment to social change connected several influential Black visitors with Gandhi, creating linkages between Gandhian nonviolence and Black Christianity that Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. would later employ to great effect. It is important, however, to resist reading the travels of African Americans to India in the 1930s solely as groundwork for the 1950s. Recognizing the impact of Black religiosity on Gandhi’s evolving views of race and caste returns these journeys to their historical context, opening lines of historical inquiry distinct from, if related to, the transmission of Gandhian nonviolence. Gandhi learned from his visitors as they learned from him.

In 1935 Reverend Howard Thurman and Sue Bailey Thurman and Reverend Edward Carroll and Phenola Carroll traveled to South Asia on a “Pilgrimage of Friendship.” Funded by the Student Christian Movements of the United States and India, the pilgrimage gave the Thurmans and the Carrolls the opportunity to serve as ambassadors, not only between India and the United States but also between Indians and African Americans. Reverend Thurman, a leading Black theologian, served as dean of Rankin Chapel at Howard University, Sue Bailey Thurman, a historian and talented singer, had worked for several years on the staff of the Young Women’s Christian Association (YWCA). The Carrolls were younger than the Thurmans but no less prepared to make the most of their journey. Reverend Carroll had received his divinity degree from Yale, while Phenola Carroll had received a degree in education and was working as a teacher in Virginia. Even before they sailed for India, their journey became news in the Black press, stoking the already widespread Black interest in India.

The impact of the Pilgrimage of Friendship on Indian perceptions of African Americans also began before the trip had started. A few months before the pilgrimage was scheduled to depart, Madeleine Slade visited the United States. The daughter of a British admiral, Slade had become a devotee of Gandhi, taking the name Mirabein. Recognizing her closeness to the Mahatma, Howard Thurman arranged for Mirabein to speak at Howard so that he might learn from her more about Gandhi but also so that she could share her impressions of African Americans with Gandhi. As he had hoped, Mirabein sent positive impressions of African Americans back to Gandhi, echoing earlier reports the Mahatma had received from Sarojini Naidu and C. F. Andrews.

The Thurmans and the Carrolls departed in September 1935 with Colombo, the capital of present-day Sri Lanka, their first destination in South Asia. Upon arrival Reverend Thurman felt an “inner stirring” that he traced to the fact that “the dominant complexes all around us were shades of brown, from light to very dark.” He was in a colored country, where the whites, “despite their authority, were outsiders.” At the Law College in Colombo, the chairman of the law club recited the many historical wrongs perpetrated in the name of Christianity, emphasizing slavery and racial oppression, and then challenged Thurman whether if, by acting “on behalf of a Christian enterprise,” he had not become “a traitor to all of the darker peoples of the earth.” Thurman responded by distinguishing between “the religion of Jesus” and forms of Christianity that had become “imperial.” He told his questioner, “My judgment about slavery and racial prejudice relative to Christianity is far more devastating than yours could ever be.” Thurman had originally refused to lead the pilgrimage out of concern that he would be expected to portray a rosy portrait of Christianity that ignored racism, imperialism, and other forms of injustice. He agreed to go only after being assured that he could speak his mind freely, which he did throughout the trip, prompting discomfort among some white Americans in India.

Thurman recognized that the “color bar” operated differently in the United States and India. At times, racial hierarchies in India favored the Thurmans and Carrolls as “Europeans” while excluding Indians. At a railway junction en route to Calcutta, for example, the Thurmans discovered that their Indian student companion was not allowed entry in the “European” section of their hotel. In a report he wrote soon after the trip, Thurman compared the color dynamics of British rule in India and the United States, with an eye on where leverage could be applied in pursuit of justice. Thurman wrote, “The Indian is the victim of color prejudice at the hands of a white conqueror who is expressing himself in a land which he has stolen.” The “American Negro,” in contrast, “along with the American white man, is a foreigner in a land stolen from the American
Gandhi’s statement that Africans could not have seen “the purpose or utility of non-violence” did not prevent him from proclaiming, after meeting with the Thurmans and the Carrolls, “It may be through the Negroes that the unadulterated message of non-violence will be delivered to the world.” The contrast between this prophetic statement and Gandhi’s views of Black South Africans indicated a shift in his understanding of “Negroes” that resulted in part from his interactions with African Americans. When Sue Bailey Thurman asked Gandhi how she should react if her brother was lynched, Gandhi suggested nonviolent noncooperation:

I must not wish ill to these, but neither must I co-operate with them. It may be that ordinarily I depend upon the lynching community for my livelihood. I refuse to co-operate with them, refuse even to touch the food that comes from them, and I refuse to co-operate with my brother Negroes who tolerate the wrong. That is the self-immolation I mean.

By ignoring the consequences of such “self-immolation” for a minority, Gandhi’s advice appears grossly impractical. Nevertheless, his advice does demonstrate Gandhi’s faith in the ability of African Americans to deliver “the unadulterated message of non-violence” to the world.

Gandhi’s respect for Christianity strengthened his belief in the nonviolent potential of Black freedom struggles. He told his guests, “Ahimsa means ‘love’ in the Pauline sense” and declared, “Seek ye first the kingdom of Heaven and everything else shall be added unto you. The Kingdom of Heaven is ahimsa.” At the end of the gathering, Gandhi requested the hymn, “Were You There When They Crucified My Lord?” Sue Bailey Thurman led the singing. The Thurmans returned from India dedicated to spreading knowledge of Gandhi and the Indian struggle. They offered lectures on India throughout the United States and raised funds for a scholarship that brought young African American women to Tagore’s school at Santiniketan.86

In addition to demonstrating Gandhi’s growing interest in Black struggles and the religious foundations of his interactions with many African Americans, the meeting between the Thurmans, the Carrolls, and Gandhi also revealed the continued prominence of comparisons between race and caste. A few weeks before he left for India, Howard Thurman had written to an American supporter of Gandhi that as an African American he could “enter directly into informal understanding of the psychological climate” of Dalits. While recognizing differences between caste in India and race in America, Thurman stated that the experiences of Blacks and Dalits did not “differ in principle and in inner pain.”87 It was not Thurman, however, but Gandhi who raised the issue of caste during their meeting. When asked why his movement had failed to oust the British,
Gandhi stressed the debilitating impact of untouchability. After recording Gandhi's description of the segregation of Dalits, Thurman succinctly noted the overlap between the oppression of Dalits and African Americans: "He was striking close to home with this." Asked how he proposed to counter caste oppression, Gandhi stated that he had adopted a Dalit child and had begun referring to Dalits as Harijans in an effort to reverse the stigma attached to the word "untouchable." Gandhi declared, "I became the spearhead of a movement for the building of a new self-respect, a fresh self-image for the untouchables in Indian society."88 Gandhi's emphasis on "self-respect," rather than on the legal, economic, and political underpinnings of caste inequality, earned criticism in India and the United States. Like Howard Thurman, however, the majority of African American observers of caste tended to praise Gandhi's initiatives, even as they criticized the continued oppression of Dalits.

In January 1937 Benjamin Mays, dean of the School of Religion at Howard University, and Channing Tobias, a leading Black figure in the Young Men's Christian Association (YMCA), traveled to India to attend the 1937 World's Conference of the YMCA. Like Howard Thurman, Benjamin Mays made of the trip an opportunity to assess racial discrimination in other parts of the world. Onboard the Queen Mary, Mays noted the coldness that British passengers showed to Indians and the "lack of prejudice" Indians displayed toward Blacks. He also sensed hostility between Indians and Anglo-Indians, a hostility that he compared to tensions between light- and dark-skinned Blacks. Mays published an account of his journey entitled "The Color Line around the World" in The Journal of Negro Education. "It is my firm conviction," Mays wrote, "that the British-Indian situation, though greatly aggravated and complicated on account of caste, is further complicated because the Indians are colored people and do not belong to the so-called 'white race.'" Mays labeled the Raj "imperialism built on racism."89

Like the Thurmans and the Carrolls, Mays met with a variety of leading Indians. He arrived in Bombay in time for the nearby All-India Congress, where he spoke with the Congress president Jawaharlal Nehru and his sister, Vijayarakshmi Pandit, herself a crucial figure in the history of Indo-American relations. With limited time in India, Mays chose to see Gandhi rather than the Taj Mahal. Gandhi later told him, "You chose wisely. When you come to India again, the Taj Mahal will be there. I may not be here."90 In a ninety-minute meeting with Gandhi, conducted in Wardha on New Year's Eve, Mays asked Gandhi about the practicality of nonviolence on a large scale, as well as about the relevance of nonviolence to a minority confronting an oppressive majority. Gandhi responded by defending the utility of nonviolence on a mass scale. He stated that "a minority can do much more in the way of non-violence than a majority" and, as an example, he offered his own experience in South Africa. Gandhi also noted that Jesus taught nonviolence and declared, "When Daniel defied the laws of the Medes and Persians, his action was non-violent." Clearly impressed by the Mahatma, Mays wrote that Gandhi "did more than any other man to dispel fear from the Indian mind" and concluded, "When an oppressed race ceases to be afraid, it is free."91

Although the account of the conversation between Mays and Gandhi published in Gandhi's collected works makes no reference to caste, Mays remembered discussing at length why Gandhi had attacked only untouchability and not caste itself. In his autobiography, Mays wrote, "Gandhi made it clear to me that he was not fundamentally against caste. He believed in caste. He described it as an economic necessity." Gandhi presented caste as a useful "division of labor" while castigating untouchability as a perversion of caste. Mays challenged this assessment, using as evidence his own interactions with Dalits. In Mysore, the headmaster of a school for Dalits asked Mays to visit the school, explaining that he had singled out Mays because he was Black. When Mays suggested that Channing Tobias was also "a Negro," the headmaster replied that Tobias was too light-skinned for the purpose. Mays understood the significance of his dark skin when after eating with the students he was introduced as "an untouchable who had achieved distinction." Mays remembered, "The headmaster told me that I had suffered at the hands of the white men in the United States every indignity that they suffered from the various castes in India and that I was proof that they, too, could be 'somebody worthwhile' despite the stigma of being members of a depressed class." Mays wrote, "At first I was horrified, puzzled, angry to be called an untouchable, but my indignation was short-lived as I realized, as never before, that I was truly an untouchable in my native land, especially in the Southern United States." In his autobiography, Mays offered a scathing assessment of caste, concluding that caste had "done more to retard India" than British imperialism. Mays found caste worse than segregation in the United States where, Mays asserted, there was at least "some social conscience across racial lines." In India, Mays wrote, he could detect no such social concern across caste lines. "Of course," he added, "Gandhi was an exception."92

Channing Tobias also probed Gandhi on questions of caste as well as nonviolence.93 According to Harijan, Tobias told Gandhi, "Negroes in [the] U.S.A.—12 million—are struggling to obtain such fundamental rights
as freedom from mob violence, unrestricted use of the ballot, freedom from segregation, etc." When Tobias asked for a message for "my Negro brothers," Gandhi replied, "With right which is on their side and the choice of non-violence as their only weapon, if they will make it such, a bright future is assured." In the midst of his conversation with Gandhi, Tobias raised a question regarding the recent decision of the maharaja of Travancore to open all temples to Dalits. Tobias asked, "Do you think Travancore's example will be followed by other States in the near future?" Gandhi answered, "I shall be surprised if it is not." Tobias did not contest this optimistic assessment of the fight against the exclusion of Dalits from temples. Rather, like Benjamin Mays, Tobias demonstrated concern regarding caste in India, while framing Gandhi as a noble defender of the rights of Dalits. In a letter published in The Chicago Defender, Tobias stated that Gandhi was living "in a village of outcasts in order to set the example for high caste Indians to abolish caste." Mays and Tobias, as well as the Thurmans and the Carrolls, offered no indication that they were aware of Indian critiques of Gandhi's approach to caste.

The most renowned critic of Gandhi's approach to caste, Dr. Ambedkar, used the resurgence of American racism in the aftermath of Reconstruction to question whether Indian independence would signal the end of untouchability. In his fierce polemic, What Congress and Gandhi Have Done to the Untouchables, published in 1945, Ambedkar offered over three pages on the betrayal of African Americans after the Civil War. After quoting liberally from Herbert Aptheker's The Negro in the Civil War, Ambedkar concluded, "The Untouchables cannot forget the fate of the Negroes. It is to prevent such treachery that the Untouchables have taken the attitude they have with regard to this 'right for Freedom.'" Ambedkar compared Lincoln and Gandhi, criticizing both. After quoting Lincoln's infamous interchange with Horace Greeley, Ambedkar concluded, "Obviously the author of the famous Gettysburg oration about Government of the people, by the people and for the people would not have minded if his statement had taken the shape of government of the black people by the white people and for the white people provided there was union." While Lincoln was willing to emancipate the slaves to save the Union, however, Ambedkar wrote, "Mr. Gandhi's attitude is let Swaraj perish if the cost of it is the political freedom of the Untouchables." It is fitting that Ambedkar turned to the history of race in America to criticize Gandhi's approach to caste. Understanding Gandhi's evolving views on caste requires probing his use of race/caste analogies often forged through interactions with African American struggles.

The Washingtonian Gandhi

As early as 1910 Gandhi compared racial discrimination in the United States to caste prejudice in India. Lamenting anti-Asian xenophobia, Gandhi attacked such "colour prejudice" as evidence that "the freedom which the Americans boast of is vanishing." Referencing untouchability, he then declared, "The kind of racial discrimination which America practices, we have practiced against our own people in India." In 1928, when questioned by an American woman, Gandhi offered four reasons why the "plight of the untouchable" was not as severe as the treatment of "the Negro in America." Coming in the aftermath of the Mother India controversy, when many Indians used American racism to defend caste in India, Gandhi's response to his American interrogator should be read in part as an effort to guard India's reputation. Gandhi's condemnation of American racism should not be ascribed entirely, however, to national pride. His interactions with African Americans inspired in Gandhi a strong and lasting aversion to American racial oppression. His sympathy for the struggles of Black Americans makes it even more significant that, in contrast to his response in 1928, the vast majority of his frequent comparisons between race and caste underscored the severity of caste oppression in India. It was most often to Americans that Gandhi emphasized the injustice of racism. To Indians he stressed the need to confront untouchability. In shifting his use of the race/caste analogy, Gandhi tailored his argument to his audience.

By comparing oppressions of race and caste, Gandhi often aimed to criticize untouchability in India. Writing in Young India in 1924, he argued that caste oppression in the South-Indian princely state of Cochin was "much worse" than even the racial policies of the government of South Africa. Lest his criticism of untouchability be interpreted as applying solely to Cochin, Gandhi added, "I have no desire to single out Cochin for its disgraceful treatment of untouchables; for it is still unfortunately common to Hindus all over India, more or less." In 1926 Gandhi published an article on "race arrogance" in which he decried "the injustice that is being daily perpetrated against the Negro in the United States of America in the name of and for the sake of maintaining white superiority." In a demonstration of his increasing use of the Negro/Untouchable parallel, Gandhi proclaimed, "Our treatment of the so-called untouchables is no better than that of coloured people by the white man." Even after Mother India, Gandhi continued to use the racial wrongs of the West to criticize, rather than justify, caste oppression in India. In August 1933 the magazine India and the World asked Gandhi and Tagore to convey messages on the one hundredth anniversary of the emancipation
of slavery in the British Empire. Both chose to acknowledge the perseverance of forms of slavery. While Tagore found slavery “in our plantations, in factories, in business offices, in the punitive department of government where the primitive vindictiveness of man claims special privilege to indulge in fierce barbarism,” Gandhi presented untouchability as an especially insidious form of slavery. He wrote, “India has much to learn from the heroes of the Abolition of Slavery, for we have slavery based upon supposed religious sanction and more poisonous than its Western fellow.”

In July 1933 Gandhi published an article in Harijan called “An Example to Copy.” The example in question was the work of Booker T. Washington’s Tuskegee Institute and its predecessor, the Hampton Institute, founded by Samuel Chapman Armstrong, a former Union general. Gandhi wrote, “There is no doubt that the work of Armstrong at the Hampton Institute and of Booker T. Washington at the Tuskegee is worth studying by all Harijan workers and Harijans.” While he asserted that “the Tuskegee Institute is a model for Harijans,” Gandhi noted that the analogy did not hold “in all respects.” For him, high-caste Indians should feel an even greater “duty” to help Dalits than “white men” should feel towards American Negroes. The key difference for Gandhi was that caste prejudice in India had been made “a matter of religion” and was therefore more grievous and intractable. Thus Gandhi again reversed the argument, which he made four years earlier in 1928, that caste prejudice was a lesser evil than racism.

Gandhi’s understanding of race and caste owed much to his over forty years of interest in the work of Booker T. Washington. During his years in South Africa and through his correspondence with George Washington Carver, Gandhi had learned much about Washington and the work of Tuskegee. During the 1930s Gandhi continued to educate himself about Washington and his legacy, often explaining his interest in terms of caste. In April 1933 Gandhi wished Goparaju Ramachandra Rao, a renowned atheist and anti-untouchability reformer better known as “Gora”, “every success in producing an Indian Tuskegee.” He told Rao, “I knew much about Booker T. Washington even when I was in South Africa and I have great regard for him.” Gandhi cautioned, however, “You have kept before you a worthy model, but you cannot be an Indian Booker T. Washington. Only a Harijan can be that.” In October 1933 Gandhi wrote C. F. Andrews asking for articles about Tuskegee. “For the sake of Harijans,” he explained, “I have been reading literature about that wonderful institute.” In a conversation with a young Dalit social worker in 1944, Gandhi wrote, “You have heard of Booker T. Washington. We have to produce better workers than even him in order to achieve our object.”

Washington deserves partial credit for inspiring Gandhi’s evolving ideas about caste. While Gandhi continually re-forged his approach to caste in response to a variety of pressures, he repeatedly explained his views on caste by referencing Washington’s example. Like Washington, Gandhi taught self-help and vocational education. While Gandhi’s strategy for opposing imperialism differed markedly from Washington’s accommodationism, Gandhi’s attitude to caste oppression, like Washington’s cautious approach to racism, emphasized conciliation rather than confrontation. Until late in life Gandhi desired to preserve caste while getting rid of untouchability, a position that paralleled Washington’s public endorsement of “separate but equal” racial segregation.

A belief in the dignity of labor, and especially manual labor, was central to Gandhi’s praise of Washington and Gandhi’s approach to “uplifting” oppressed castes. In 1933, while suggesting that Tuskegee and Hampton were examples “worth studying by all Harijan workers and Harijans,” Gandhi proclaimed, “Let it be noted that in both, great stress is laid upon the dignity of manual labour.” In 1937 he told a group of Indian educators, “I once more express my satisfaction at your efforts to establish an institute for the Adi Karnañãças on the lines of the Tuskegee Institute of Booker T. Washington.” He called for “many such institutions all over the country” and encouraged his “educated friends” to recognize “that when they are propagating intellectual culture, they must also inculcate the principle of dignity of labour as is done in those institutions.”

Despite his Washingtonian enthusiasm for vocational education, Gandhi recognized the limitations of education via manual labor. In June 1934, at a meeting of Harijan workers in Poona, Gandhi was asked if “it was right to encourage Harijan boys to become B.A.s or M.A.s, when unemployment was rife among graduates, and whether it would not be better if they took to technical education.” Gandhi replied that reformers should not expect Harijans to embrace industrial education before other castes. He stressed that academic training “had its own value for Harijans.” Nevertheless, Gandhi hoped that “Harijans would study the life and work of Booker T. Washington, whom he looked upon as one of the great men of the world, and draw their inspiration from it.” On another occasion Gandhi encouraged industrial education for all children. He stated, “Booher T. Washington tried it with considerable success.”

As Washington defended segregation, while aiming to end racial inequality, Gandhi defended varnadharma, the division of society into four distinct social and economic groups or varnas, even as he attacked untouchability. In the same edition of Young India, in which he said that “our treatment of the so-called untouchables is no better than that of
coloured people by the white man,” Gandhi made clear that his opposition to untouchability did not extend to varnadharma as a whole. A correspondent had questioned why Gandhi did not suggest dining across caste boundaries as a practical means of attacking caste. Gandhi responded, “All I have advocated is abolition of the fifth varna.” “The untouchables,” Gandhi argued, “should, therefore, merge in the fourth division.” In the same speech in which he called for many Tuskegee “all over the country,” Gandhi encouraged his listeners to provide village children the training necessary to pursue the vocation “to which they were born.” That phrase reveals Gandhi’s desire to maintain some form of caste, even while ending untouchability.108

Gandhi’s approach to caste mirrored many of the limitations of Washington’s approach to race in the United States. In June 1935 Gandhi told a group of Harijan Sevaks (reformers aiming to end caste oppression) that it would take a long time and much suffering to combat untouchability. He then asked, “And have we tried enough and suffered enough? Look at Booker T. Washington. Have any of us suffered as much as he did?” Thus Gandhi encouraged upper-caste Hindus to change their lives to suffer as Dalits and Blacks had suffered. When asked if Dalits should be encouraged to leave their ghettos and attempt to live among high-caste Hindus, however, Gandhi said, “This is more easily said than done. If all the caste Hindus become reformers your question won’t arise. Today the reformers would be powerless to defend Harijans from molestation if they settled in savarna quarters.” Rather than invite physical confrontation, as he had done repeatedly in struggles against the British Raj, Gandhi preferred less aggressive strategies to touch the hearts of the higher castes. After criticizing the conception that Dalits were inferior, Gandhi offered an analogy that demonstrated his patronizing approach to Dalit advancement. He asked, “Supposing I have a diseased child, what shall I do with it? Shall I discard it, shall I consider it low? No, I shall have to remind myself that it is suffering for my sins, and that therefore it deserves extra care from me.” Although he immediately declared that Dalits were “far superior to us,” Gandhi’s analogy between Dalits and a “diseased child” remained a glaring example of his patronizing attitude toward Dalits.109

Dalits in exchange for greater numbers of reserved seats. Emphasizing the positive consequences of the fast without discussing the lost opportunities, many supporters of the Mahatma turned the fast into an iconic moment in his struggle against untouchability. C. F. Andrews wrote Benarsidas Chaturvedi that Gandhi’s fast had “impelled” him to dedicate his life “to removing ‘untouchability’ in the West, i.e., the Colour Bar.”110 Du Bois wrote, “There is today in the world but one living maker of miracles and that is Mahatma Gandhi. He stops eating, and three hundred million Indians, together with the British Empire, hold their breath until they can talk sense. All America sees in Gandhi a joke, but the joke is America.”111 Praising Gandhi for his opposition to untouchability allowed African Americans to find inspiration for their own struggles. But in lauding Gandhi uncritically, many Americans, Black and white, forfeited the opportunity to pressure Gandhi to confront the limitations of his approach to caste oppression.

The African American press was not always uncritical of Gandhi’s views on caste. During the 1920s Gandhi avoided either advocating or criticizing inter-dining and intermarriage between castes. Instead, he repeatedly stated that neither was a part of his strategy to end untouchability.112 In contrast, in the book he finished at Tuskegee in 1929, C. F. Andrews presented Gandhi as opposed to inter-dining and intermarriage. Andrews quoted Gandhi as saying, “I would never give my consent to such a marriage, because it would be contrary to my ideas of religion thus to transgress the boundaries wherein we were born.”113 If Gandhi opposed inter-dining and intermarriage between castes in India, then what did Gandhi think of Blacks and whites eating together and marrying each other? Gandhi responded to that question in a statement published in 1934 by the Baltimore Afro-Americans in which he claimed that either Andrews had been misunderstood or had incorrectly communicated his views. Gandhi wrote, “Prohibition against other people eating in public restaurants and hotels and prohibition of marriage between coloured people and white people I hold to be a negation of civilisation.”114 In fact, Andrews’s assessment of Gandhi’s outlook accurately represented Gandhi’s early views on caste. By the 1930s, however, Gandhi had begun to change his opinions and by the 1940s he would openly advocate inter-dining and intermarriage as a means to ending untouchability.115

It is difficult to distinguish the influence of Washington or other African Americans from the other factors that shaped Gandhi’s evolving perspectives on caste. A stronger case can be made that Gandhi’s admiration for Washington, in conjunction with his interactions with other African Americans, played a decisive role in furthering Gandhi’s commitment to a transnational
conception of colored solidarity. One of Gandhi's most impassioned refer-
ces to Washington came in a discussion of racial prejudice in Gandhi's
*Satyagraha in South Africa*, most of which was written in Yeravda Central
Jail from November 1923 until February 1924. Discussing discrimination
against Indians in South Africa, Gandhi declared, “The dislike of the brown
races has at present become part and parcel of the mentality of Europeans.”
As an example, Gandhi wrote:

Even in the United States of America, where the principle of statutory equality
has been established, a man like Booker T. Washington who has received the
best Western education, is a Christian of high character and has fully assimilated
Western civilization, was not considered fit for admission to the court of
President Roosevelt and probably would not be so considered even today!
The Negroes of the United States have accepted Western civilization. They
have embraced Christianity. But the black pigment of their skin constitutes
their crime, and if in the Northern States they are socially despised, they are
lynched in the Southern States on the slightest suspicion of wrongdoing.\[16\]

After the outbreak of the Second World War, and especially after Ameri-
can entry in the war, Gandhi's pointed criticism of American racism
would take on new significance as American politicians worried about
the impact of American racism on foreign opinion of the United States.
During and after the war, Gandhi’s example would help inspire a wave of
nonviolent civil disobedience that brought Jim Crow even further into
the glare of world opinion. Through his influence on Gandhi, Booker T.
Washington contributed to efforts that far exceeded his own.
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