A ‘Seedbed’ for Post-Colonial Leaders: Empire, Internationalism and the Left at LSE, 1919-*c.*1950

A thesis presented for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy in the History Faculty at the University of Oxford

Word count: 82,845

Brant Moscovitch
St. Antony’s College

Hilary Term 2017

Thesis Abstract

This thesis explores the transition between an imperial and post-colonial world by assessing the intellectual and political education of post-colonial leaders from India, as well as Africa, the West Indies and Canada, who studied at the London School of Economics and Political Science [LSE]. The period under scrutiny, from the end of World War I to the early 1950s, witnessed an increasing number of students from British colonies studying in UK universities, with LSE in particular becoming one of the most diverse in the country. At the same time, a number of factors combined to make LSE a fruitful place to examine the larger themes of higher education's place in late imperial history, the intellectual background of post-colonial leaders and the role of internationalism in nationalist movements. This includes the expansion of LSE's faculty to include the Marxist Professor of Political Science Harold Laski [1926-50], who developed close relationships with colonial students, the School's leading role in the research and teaching of the social sciences and its location in central London, which positioned it within walking distance of myriad organisations that offered students the opportunity to network with co-nationals and peers from other colonies while actively engaging in contemporary debates.

The overarching argument is that the classes and political experiences overseas students at LSE were offered promoted graduates inclined towards particular varieties of internationalism, socialism and a belief in the power of the social sciences to transform society by facilitating expert advising and planning. In doing so, LSE was both highly progressive but also less radical than previously thought, demonstrating consistency with

nineteenth and early twentieth century notions of the imperial ‘civilising mission’ and reformed liberalism.

History Faculty Extended Abstract

This thesis seeks to deepen our understanding of the formative world-views held by post-colonial elites. It pursues this objective by examining the intellectual and political experiences of a group of colonial students who attended university in the United Kingdom, particularly by focusing on those who studied at the London School of Economics and Political Science [LSE]. The period under inspection, from the end of World War I until the early 1950s, witnessed increasing numbers of colonial students throughout Britain, with LSE in particular becoming one of the most ethnically diverse universities in the country. Future leaders, such as the Indian Defence Minister V.K. Krishna Menon [1957-62], Canadian Prime Minister Pierre Elliot Trudeau [1968-79; 1980-84] and Kenyan President Jomo Kenyatta [1964-78], grappled with new challenges to imperialism and the prevailing economic and political systems in their studies and in the political experiences they had as a result of being in London. As these students and many more emerged from the classroom, they assumed important positions as politicians, diplomats and intellectuals at home and internationally, making the legacy of overseas education in Britain highly relevant to the end of empire and the foundation of a post-war, post-colonial world.

Several specific factors about the School make it an enticing institution to study the development of ideas that informed the early thinking of post-colonial leaders. During the interwar period, LSE experienced a growing reputation for excellence in the emerging social sciences under the Directorship of Sir William Beveridge [1919-37], with students supplementing their study of traditional fields such as law and medicine with new disciplines. Professor of Political Science Harold Laski [1926-50] developed close and

lasting relationships with several colonial students, and became involved in anti-colonial politics in London. At the same time, Professor of Anthropology Bronislaw Malinowski [1927-42] attracted students from Africa and Asia, while many more flocked to the classes of economists Friedrich von Hayek, Lionel Robbins and William Arthur Lewis, an LSE student before becoming the School's first black lecturer in 1938. The assemblage of colonial elites and leading academics, surrounded by politically-engaged groups in the centre of London, offers a chance to better understand the development of some of the fundamental aspects of post-colonial thinking on politics and society.

The phenomenon of overseas study not only led to an international movement of people, but also of ideas. Colonial elites were drawn to Britain in large part because of the institutions, culture and language that the British Empire spread. This in turn created a paradox. Colonial youths were attracted to British universities and inns of court to enhance their job prospects, prestige and facilitate admission into the colonial services. It is perhaps one of the great ironies of late imperial history that many of these students, who British officials hoped would become natural allies in strengthening the bonds and administrative capacities of colonial rule, were destined to become anti-colonial activists and eventually inherit power at the dawn of decolonisation after World War II. As much research has demonstrated, the emergence of post-colonial states and the thinking that shaped them was often rooted on ideas, policies and institutions that arose during colonial times. This thesis aims to contribute to how we understand the legacy of higher education in Britain on the animating ideas of post-colonial elites.

Virtually all histories of colonial students in Britain focus on national or regional groups. This project supplements existing scholarship by providing a detailed study of

colonial students at one institution, allowing for greater exploration of affiliation between different colonial groups and comparison in how students from different colonies embraced, rejected or adapted the same ideas. LSE both reflected general trends, including the expansion of overseas study after World War I, while also encouraging the spread of particular ideas. To be sure, this study seeks to place the university and the phenomenon of overseas study at the centre of a transition between late colonial and early post-colonial history.

I argue that the classes and political experiences students had inside LSE and more generally in London encouraged three particular trends. Firstly, they promoted the development of varieties of rooted cosmopolitanism and internationalism, in particular a tendency towards anti-colonial solidarity, which saw an unprecedented level of cooperation between groups from different colonies. Secondly, they advanced a belief in the power of the social sciences to promote better government policy in the colonies through research undertaken by university-trained experts. Thirdly, through the teachings of Harold Laski in particular, they fostered a style of socialism, 'economic democracy', that sought a compromise between liberal ideas and Marxism that was attractive to students searching for a third way between capitalism and Stalinism. In furthering these ideas, LSE was highly progressive, yet at the same time demonstrated consistency with nineteenth and early twentieth century ideas of the imperial civilising mission and reformed liberalism.

The School promoted these trends directly, through its many intriguing faculty members and the ways in which its students engaged with them, and indirectly, as a result of its location in central London and the organisational and political opportunities this

provided. The primary purpose of this study is hence to explore these ideas and worldviews; while I devote significant attention to individual students, it is primarily for the objective of assessing how their time in London affected the ideas that coloured their emerging worldviews.

A major subplot to this primary narrative is the inconsistency of how students engaged with these ideas. Although I argue that an overarching trajectory presents itself amongst politically active students, I also seek to demonstrate how and why some resisted prevailing winds. During the interwar period, a remarkable array of students from different colonies cooperated with each other in denouncing European imperialism. Yet an underlying commitment to nationalism and the existence of internal rivalries and irreconcilable divisions between groups from different colonies significantly undermined solidarity. While Laski's students, moreover, largely engaged with his ideas in an approving way, a noteworthy minority developed thoughtful rejections to his thinking. LSE's impact left a wake of powerful ripples that flowed into the post-colonial era, yet the waters were uneven.

Students were selected according to several criteria, including how representative they were of predominant trends and resistance to those tendencies. This project does not strive to be a comprehensive assessment of colonial students in Britain or LSE specifically. Rather, it focuses on those who were most politically active while in London and following graduation. Availability of sources, including under-used student dossiers held at the LSE Archives, books, articles and research they produced as well as memoirs also influenced who I decided to focus on. I dedicate particular attention to Indians, as they comprised the largest national group of students at LSE. To a lesser extent, I also

emphasise the experiences of Africans, West Indians and Canadians. Despite significantly different historical trajectories, particularly regarding the latter group, important similarities were apparent in how they engaged with their studies to warrant inclusion, especially in how students responded to Laski's teaching. Indeed, this study aspires to encourage a broader transnational view of the history of ideas in the late British Empire.

The main body consists of five thematically organised chapters. The opening chapter examines how philanthropists, internationalists imperialists and anti-colonial nationalists all used overseas study as a form of soft power to advance their worldviews following World War I. Building from the experience of LSE students and faculty, I suggest the prevalence of distinct but often overlapping models of foreign study. I further argue that increasingly during the interwar period, imperialists and anti-colonial nationalists embraced the language and aims of internationalism to further their objectives.

The second chapter examines the extent to which anti-colonial activists from different colonial backgrounds cooperated with each other during the interwar period. Students engaged with each other on a variety of platforms, resulting from encounters that reinforced similarities inside and outside the classroom, encouragement from communists to work together and the possibility of strengthening nationalist movements through cooperation. This produced varieties of cosmopolitanism and internationalism that embraced aspects of English culture and local cultures while also fostering a sense of unity amongst students from distinct colonial backgrounds. This trend reached new heights in the 1930s, as students rallied against Italy's invasion of Abyssinia, the Spanish

Civil War and the Second Sino-Japanese War. I assess the pivotal role of LSE graduate V.K. Krishna Menon and his anti-colonial group, the India League, in promoting transnational engagement. Lastly, I measure successful attempts at cooperation against the limits of solidarity, which included factionalism on the left, divisions within nationalist groups and mistrust between different colonial groups.

The third chapter examines efforts to apply the social sciences to colonial problems. As a leading exponent of the social sciences, LSE was uniquely placed to encourage the idea that the scientific study of society could offer new insights into improving social welfare and political administration, at home as well as in the colonies. In the 1930s, courses that were used to train white colonial administrators also became popular with non-white colonial students, many of whom opted for them in addition to, or rather than, pursue traditional subjects such as medicine or law. In so doing, they claimed the expertise to advance the independence and development of their own societies, rooted in a combination of their own familiarity with colonialism and their educational and political experiences in London.

The final two chapters explore the much-discussed but scantily analysed role of socialism at LSE, focusing on the relationship students had with Harold Laski. The penultimate chapter seeks a more substantial appreciation of the politics and political ideas that students were exposed to at LSE. It focuses on Laski's teaching, as well as how he reinforced classroom experiences through his personal and political engagement with students. In direct contrast to Beveridge's hopes for non-partisanship, Laski helped make the LSE experience one in which practical political engagement was encouraged through his words and example. While Laski's thinking contained numerous contradictions, I pay

particular attention to how he communicated his understanding of what he called 'economic democracy' to his students. This chapter emphasises the importance of personal relationships and charisma within the university in furthering theoretical outlooks as well as forging practical political alliances.

Chapter five continues the discussion about socialism, focusing on how students responded to Laski's thought following graduation. A diverse range of students appreciated and criticised his message, underscoring both the specific aspects of the left that LSE's colonial students embraced while also illuminating the lumpiness of left's influence. I suggest that students found Laski's concept of economic democracy, which advocated a highly-regulated Marxist-inspired state that maintained parliamentary democracy, particularly useful in their search for a system that shunned both capitalism and Stalinism. I further argue that the regional diversity of Laski's admirers reflects the role of LSE, and British education more generally, in encouraging the spread of ideas transnationally. I conclude the chapter by arguing that a smaller group of Laski's students, far from embracing his teachings, used Laski as a bogeyman to argue for more liberal policies, highlighting, as in chapter two, the limits of how overseas study 'globalised' particular ideas.

Acknowledgements

This thesis would not have been possible without the intellectual and personal help I have been exceptionally fortunate to receive from many different sources. I am particularly grateful to Maria Misra for accepting this project, for never losing faith, always pushing me to do better and more than anyone showing me how to put a major project together. I am also especially thankful to Nick Owen for his crucial feedback and his prompting me to become more critical of evidence, historical trends and established wisdom. Before coming to Oxford, I was fortunate enough to benefit from the erudition of several historians at McGill University. I will always remember Valentine Boss's love of teaching and belief that scholarship remains above all a pursuit of truth; I am moreover indebted to Lorenz Lüthi for his friendship and guidance, and to Neil Cameron for his enchanting conversation and for planting in my head the initial seed that grew into this project.

I have been immensely fortunate to benefit from the feedback of countless scholars and graduate students who have taken the time to help me strengthen this thesis and enhance my intellectual experience at Oxford. This includes, among others, John Darwin, Chris Bayly, Caroline Baron, Ben Mountford, Harshan Kumarasingham, Kate Kennedy and the entire Transnational and Global History Seminar. Throughout the process, St. Antony's College has provided a home away from home and more nourishment for intellectual and personal growth than I could have ever asked for. I am grateful to Paola Cubas, Graham Jevon, Marina Klavina, David Passarelli, Agrima Bhasin, Jason Pack, Andy Flower, Maryhen J. Morales, Chilombo Musa and Justina Spencer for their stimulation and good humour. My work has furthermore benefitted

from the time and attention of more archivists and librarians than I can mention who have generously attended to all my requests great and small, including Sue Donnelly at LSE. I am likewise thankful to the Fonds de recherche Société et Culture, the Beit Fund and the Institute of Historical Research for their generous financial support.

Last but certainly not least, I wish to thank my family and friends for their unending support. I have greatly appreciated the interest in my work and encouragement received from Harry and Vivian. I am grateful to Seyma Afacan, Olson, Trish Crombie, Sam Keys, Ben Bowen, Katie Corker, Mike McGrath, Austin Metka, Troy Vettese, James Newman and Vanessa Gaudio for their conversation and good humour, for inspiring me to be better and for teaching me what friendship is. I am supremely fortunate to have Anushree Banerji's love, warmth and energy, which has kept me inspired, entertained and happy, whether she has been near or far. Above all, I thank Mom and Dad, and Mr. Flowers and Theira, for their endless love, support and friendship, which never ceases to warm and delight my heart and makes this thesis, and everything, possible.

It goes without saying that I bear sole responsibility for any errors in this study.

Contents

Abbreviations

BMP	Bronislaw Malinowski Papers
CBMP	C.B. Macpherson Papers
CAS	Commonwealth and African Studies Library
CPGB	Communist Party of Great Britain
GLMP	G.L. Mehta Papers
IASB	International African Service Bureau
ICS	Indian Civil Service
ICIC	International Committee on Intellectual Cooperation
IIIC	International Institute for Intellectual Cooperation
IIE	Institute of International Education
KMP	V.K. Krishna Menon Papers
LAC	Library and Archives of Canada
LAI	League Against Imperialism
LSE	London School of Economics and Political Science
LP	Frederick Lugard Papers
NAUK	National Archives of the United Kingdom
NMML	Nehru Memorial Museum and Library
PGMP	P.G. Mavalankar Papers
RRP	Renuka Ray Papers
RCA	Rockefeller Centre Archives
SWJN	Selected Works of Jawaharlal Nehru
SWMG	Selected Works of Mahatma Gandhi
SWMNR	Selected Works of M.N. Roy
UBBE	Universities Bureau of the British Empire
UTA	University of Toronto Archives
WALP	William Arthur Lewis Papers
WBP	William Beveridge Papers

Introduction

In his autobiography, the Jamaican academic Gladstone Mills referred to the period he had studied in Britain as laying 'a seedbed for the germination, and emergence of future colonial leaders' in politics, the professions, academics and other areas'.[1] Mills had attended the London School of Economics and Political Science [LSE] from 1944-47.[2] After returning to Jamaica, he became a respected academic at the University of the West Indies and in 1973 was approached by Prime Minister Michael Manley, who studied at LSE during the same period, to become Chairman of the Electoral Advisory Committee, a body assigned to reform the island's electoral system. As Mills alluded, their cases were hardly unique; rather, they were representative of a trend that saw colonial youths sojourn to Britain, where they would live and study before returning home to assume leading roles in decolonisation and the development of states like Jamaica, which gained independence from Britain in 1962.

The object of this thesis is to explore how the intellectual and political experiences of colonial students shaped the future leaders that so many of them became after graduation. How, for instance, did the local preoccupations of a colonial student relate to the political and educational realities they faced in Britain, and to those of a student from other colonies with divergent values and historical trajectories? What ideas germinated from Mills' 'seedbed', and what processes, interactions, debates, hierarchies, networks and cultural exchanges help us assess what those ideas were? What were the implications of this flow for how we understand the legacies of empire, in particular the location, timing and significance of a movement of ideas that British imperialism

[1] G. Mills, *Grist for the Mills: Reflections on A Life* (Kingston, 1994), pp. 84-5.
[2] Gladstone Mills, student dossier, LSE.

facilitated through overseas study? How can students help us assess the amorphous border areas between empires, nations and emerging internationalist and cosmopolitan thinking and structures, as well as the colonial roots of post-colonialism? What qualities distinguished a colonial, or post-colonial leader, and what united the two?

In addressing the questions raised by the experience of Mills and many others, this thesis aspires to contribute to ongoing debates in several historiographic areas, including late imperial history and early post-colonial history, the history of internationalism, and the relatively new field of global intellectual history. It seeks to do this through the lens of LSE's colonial students, during a time of rapid development in the School's history in the interwar period, when it made significant contributions to the social sciences that students from the colonies were increasingly taking, hired new professors such as Bronislaw Malinowski, and most notably Harold Laski, who developed close ties with their pupils, and reflected the swiftly changing political landscape in both Europe and its colonies. This introduction begins by surveying the relevant secondary literature and outlining the primary contributions this thesis aims to make. It continues with a brief history of LSE's founding, relationship to the wider University of London and development through the interwar period, emphasising LSE's focus on the social sciences as to why it is a particularly fruitful institution to examine these questions. Lastly, it will end by providing a definition of terms this thesis employs that have not yet been explained, an examination of the sources this thesis is based on, and by signposting its structure and trajectory.

Colonial Students in Britain

Greater attention has recently been devoted to the history of colonial students attending British institutions of higher education, especially regarding South Asians.[3] Building on Shompa Lahiri, who examined students in the larger context of South Asian migrations to Britain, Sumita Mukherjee has shed light on the phenomenon's expansion in the late nineteenth century, its causes, including the desire for prestige and career advancement, and its relationship to questions of race and racism in Britain that many students faced.[4] Mukherjee argued that a sojourn in Britain led to the development of what has been called the 'England-returned', the colonial student, particularly from India, who was shaped, politically and socially, by their formative experiences and connections in Britain.[5] For both Mukherjee and Lahiri, a chief result of this was the development or deepening of their nationalism and hostility to empire, often as a result of being confronted by the idea and practice of freedom and democracy, which contrasted starkly to the violence and oppression many were familiar with in the colonial state.[6] This was the case with many prominent nationalists, including India's first Prime Minister, Jawaharlal Nehru, who studied at Cambridge University from 1907 to 1910.

---

[3] Earlier works on colonial students tended to be sociological studies. See: *Colonial Students in Britain: A Report by PEP* (London, 1955); A.T. Carey, *Colonial Students: A Study of the Social Adaptation of Colonial Students in London* (London, 1956); L. Braithwaite, *Colonial West Indian Students in Britain* (London, 2001). For a sociological analysis of Indian students in Britain, see A.K. Singh, *Indian Students in Britain: A Survey of their Adjustment and Attitude* (London, 1963). An earlier, shorter study was undertaken by the director of colonial scholars (originally part of the Crown Agents but transferred to the Colonial Office in 1941) John Keith. See J.L. Keith, 'African Students in Great Britain', *African Affairs*, 45, no. 179 (1946), pp. 65-72. These initial reports highlighted issues of racism, difficulties associated with cultural adaptation and isolation. They identified that networks students formed, the activities they engaged in, the perceptions they developed about Britain and ideologies they encountered were of political significance given that their status in colonial societies made it likely they would play important roles in newly independent countries.

[4] S. Lahiri, *Indians in Britain: Anglo-Indian Encounters, Race and Identity, 1880-1930* (London, 2000); S. Mukherjee, *Nationalism, Education and Migrant Identities: The England-Returned* (London, 2010).

[5] S. Mukherjee, *Nationalism, Education and Migrant Identities*.

[6] Lahiri, *Indians in Britain*; Mukherjee, *Nationalism, Education and Migrant Identities*. For more general accounts of South Asians in Britain, see R. Visram, *Asians in Britain: 400 Years of History* (London, 2002), p. 262-3; A. Burton, *At the Heart of The Empire,* 1998); M.H. Fisher, *Counterflows to Colonialism: Indian Travelers and Settlers in Britain, 1600-1857* (New Delhi, 2004); M. H. Fisher, *A South-Asian History of Britain: Four Centuries of People from the Indian Sub-continent* (Oxford, 2007).

Like Mukherjee and Lahiri, I also focus on Indian students, given their numbers – 1339 and steadily increasing by 1927-28 – and their later significance in Indian politics, particularly leading up to and following independence.[7] Yet while Indians also form the largest group of students analysed in this thesis, I examine colonial students more broadly. By 'colonial student', I mean to signify anyone hailing from a British colony or Dominion studying in a university in the United Kingdom, including from Africa and the West Indies, as well as Canada, whose overseas students, I will suggest, shared similar intellectual spaces to their colonial counterparts. To be sure, while total numbers are often unreliable, by the 1927-28 academic year there were at least 1102 Africans studying in British universities.[8] Scholars examining African and West Indian students in Britain have also focused on the prejudice that they faced and the responses it provoked. As with research on South Asian students, Hakim Adi, Mark Matera and most recently Leslie James have demonstrated how struggles against empire and racism drove students together, with metropolitan centres and their universities acting as central nodes, where Africans and West Indians, as well as black Americans, could find common cause.[9]

This body of literature has augmented our understanding of how the migration of colonial students for higher education extended ties of language, culture, politics and the interpretation and implementation of law, entrenching British power and culture while also empowering colonial elites with a set of tools, in the form of knowledge, moral

[7] 'University of London: Students from overseas in the universities of Great Britain and Ireland 1927-28', William Beveridge Papers [WBP], 5/29, LSE.
[8] 'University of London: Students from Overseas in the Universities and University Colleges of Great Britain and Ireland 1927-1928', WBP, 5/29, LSE.
[9] H. Adi, 'West African Students in Britain, 1900-1960: The Politics of Exile', in D. Killingray (ed.), *Africans in Britain* (London, 1994); M. Matera, *Black Internationalism and African and Caribbean Intellectuals in London, 1919-1950* (Rutgers University Ph.D. thesis, 2009); L. E. James, *'What We Put in Black and White': George Padmore and the Practice of Anti-Imperial Politics* (London School of Economics and Political Science Ph.D. thesis, 2012).

rhetoric, and contacts, that served to challenge that authority. One of the primary ways I hope to move this work forward is by expanding the examination of colonial students beyond specific countries or regions. By focusing on one institution, which as we shall see contained high concentrations of foreign students, this investigation draws on the experience of Indians, Africans and West Indians, emphasising interactions, similarities, and divergences in a containable space that reflected the wider trends and legacies of colonial study in Britain and its global implications.

The first two chapters use the interactions between students and the phenomenon of overseas study that helped make them possible, to deepen our understanding of the development and scope of interwar internationalism. By internationalism, I mean the expression of support for an idea or ideal of cooperation between states or the organisation of world politics through institutions.[10] As new research has demonstrated, the interwar period witnessed a creative flurry of thinking on internationalism, by Europeans and colonial leaders, despite its fraying and eventually tragic failures in the 1930s. This was perhaps most clear in a recent contribution by two leaders in the field, Glenda Sluga and Patricia Clavin, whose *Internationalisms* highlighted the development of several forms of internationalism, even those involving seemingly diametrically opposed philosophies, like fascism, which occasionally overlapped through individuals, institutions and networks.[11] As the imperial project lost moral authority after World War One in the face of the twin threats of Wilsonian democracy and Bolshevism, internationalism provided a source for new thinking on empire as well as justification,

[10] I follow the broad definition of internationalism used by Glenda Sluga and Patricia Clavin. See G. Sluga and P. Clavin, *Internationalisms: A Twentieth Century History* (Cambridge, 2016), p. 3.
[11] G. Sluga and P. Clavin, *Internationalisms*; D. Brydan, 'Axis Internationalism: Spanish Health Experts and the Nazi "New Europe", 1939-1945', *Contemporary European History* 25, 2 (2016), pp. 192-211.

leading to intersections between imperialism and attempts to promote international institutions and internationalist mores that were, ironically, encouraged by imperialists as well as anti-colonial nationalists.[12]

Interwar universities, as institutions located within nation states but also containing large foreign student populations, offer microcosms for detailed analysis of these trends.[13] The relationship between higher education and empire has been well established. Andrew Porter has gone so far as to refer to 'Britain's Empire as the world's greatest-ever educational enterprise'. [14] Building on Eric Ashby's scholarship on Commonwealth universities in the 1960s, Porter's work, along with Tamson Pietsch's body of research, has examined the expansion of British educational facilities in the empire, including the building of universities (and, in the case of Africa and the West Indies, not building them), ties between the state and missionary schools and local reaction, and the eventual choice facing colonials seeking higher education, namely to attend British colleges, universities, inns of court and medical schools, or build their own.[15] Over the last decade in particular, renewed interest in the links between empire and higher education has built on new thinking about networks in history to contribute to an expansive concept of Britain and 'Britishness' as well as notions of imperial federation that sought closer ties between Britain and its settler colonies. Pietsch's

[12] E. Manela, *The Wilsonian Moment: Self-Determination and the International Origins of Anticolonial Nationalism* (New York, 2009).
[13] For more on 'micro-spaces' as units of historical analysis, see P. Burke, *A Social History of Knowledge II: From the Encyclopédie to Wikipidea* (Cambridge, 2012), p. 188.
[14] A. Porter, 'Empires in the Mind', in P.J. Marshall (ed.), *Cambridge Illustrated History of the British Empire*, (Cambridge, 1996), p. 194.
[15] Porter, 'Empires in the Mind', p. 201. For Ashby, see: E. Ashby, *Universities British, Indian, African: A Study in the Ecology of Higher Education* (London, 1966); E. Ashby, *Community of Universities: An Informal Portrait of the Association of Universities of the British Commonwealth 1913-1963* (London, 1988). See also, J. Hargreaves, 'The Idea of a Colonial University', *African Affairs* 72, no. 286 (Jan., 1973), pp. 26-36.

research focuses on academic mobility throughout universities in Britain and its settler colonies through the lens of imperial networks that fostered a 'British academic world'.[16] Yet, as Pietsch notes, the opposite was also true: as universities drew colonial students to Britain, one unintended consequence was to facilitate the creation of anti-colonial networks that sought to undermine imperial authority and promote new identities, including a sense of anti-colonial solidarity. Existing studies by imperial historians of the role of higher education in empire have devoted less attention to the phenomenon of overseas colonial study and its effects.

Chapter one seeks to add to the scholarship on empire and education by furthering our understanding of the institutions, scholarships and individuals who considered, promoted or expressed doubts about overseas study and, in doing so, enlarge our conception about the distinctiveness as well as the similarities of separate approaches to thinking about overseas study, focusing on the concerns and hopes articulated by proponents of imperialism, internationalism and anti-colonial nationalism. Advocates of each position voiced layered views on foreign study. Imperialists understood the encouragement of Dominion subjects to study in Britain very differently than that of Indians, whose radicalisation they feared, while the attitudes of many self-identified internationalists were shaped by the ideological variant they supported, from socialist internationalism to efforts by philanthropists and intergovernmental organisations to use student mobility as a tool to decrease nationalist tensions. For independence leaders such as Jawaharlal Nehru and Mohandas K. Gandhi, who had also studied in Britain, overseas education was seen through the lens of anti-colonialism and the need to develop skills

[16] T. Pietsch, *Empire of Scholars: Universities, Networks and the British Academic World, 1850-1939* (New York, 2013).

and contacts that could be useful in building the institutions of a new state. As I argue, however, the positioning on foreign study by imperialists, internationalists and anti-colonial nationalists was also characterised as much by their similarities as by their differences in how they assessed the potential risks and rewards of an educational sojourn in Britain. Internationalists and anti-colonial nationalists, for instance, expressed overlapping views on the threats of 'denationalisation', by which they meant the difficulty that might be encountered reintegrating culturally and intellectually after being abroad, while all groups embraced the goals of interwar internationalism and the hopes of building a more equitable and peaceful world after World War I. By interrogating these divergent yet intersecting views of overseas study in Britain, I aim to underscore the usefulness of considering students from different colonies together, which among other things highlights the increasing infusion of internationalism into imperial and nationalist debates in the interwar period.[17]

If these trends characterised the positions espoused by those with specific interests in the outcomes of overseas study, how students experienced internationalism, and how their observations affected their understanding of individual and collective relationships with co-nationals and peers from other colonies, is the central question I explore in chapter two. The expansion of empires undermined social structures and tore countless communities apart, while uniting others in new diasporic populations that generated nationalist, inter-colonial and universalist ideas.[18] While both Mukherjee and Lahiri note that some students cooperated with peers from other colonies and embraced

[17] For how interwar internationalism eroded higher education links between Britain and its settler colonies, see T. Pietsch, *Empire of Scholars*, esp. chapter eight.
[18] D. Armitage, 'The International Turn in Intellectual History' in Darrin M. McMahon and Samuel Moyn (eds.) *Rethinking Modern European Intellectual History* (New York, 2014), p. 240.

internationalist sentiments during the interwar period, their focus on nationalism and India limits their assessment of what that internationalism consisted of, and the extent to which there was interaction between different colonial student groups.[19] Historians including Stephen Howe and Elleke Boehmer have explored the emergence of Britain and London as spaces which facilitated colonial encounters and political contacts.[20] I seek to add to this work by emphasising the role of universities, which by attracting colonial subjects to Britain, played a significant part in a larger imperial phenomenon, in which empires spurred the movement of people and ideas and created cosmopolitan spaces.[21] Universities presented students with an institutional base from which to engage with contemporary ideas and politics that would continue to be highly relevant during decolonisation. Grasping the emergence of internationalist and cosmopolitan individuals and groups of like-minded students at LSE and why students chose to engage with some ideas and not others cannot be accomplished without a grounding in national histories and nationalist aspirations, which were often the motivating factors for cooperation. It is, however, highly important to recognise the development of something different, beyond preoccupations with nations and nationalism. In addition to students' relationships with centres and individuals of imperial authority, they also forged inter-colonial networks,

[19] For Indian-Irish connections in the interwar period, see: K. O'Malley, 'Metropolitan Resistance: Indo-Irish Connections in the Inter-War Period', in S. Mukherjee and R. Ahmed (eds.), *South Asian Resistances in Britain 1858-1947* (London, 2012). See also R. Visram, p. 301; S. Mukherjee, *The Experience of the England-Returned: The Education of Indians in Britain in the Early Twentieth Century and its Long-Term Impact* (University of Oxford, D.Phil thesis, 2007), p. 233; S. Lahiri, *Indians in Britain,* p. 179. Lahiri discusses earlier Indian-Egyptian ties, as well as the importance of Turkish and Irish nationalist leaders Mustafa Kemal and Éamon de Valera respectively as models for young Indians. See also E. Boehmer, *Empire, the National, and the Postcolonial, 1890-20: Resistance in Interaction* (Oxford, 2002).
[20] S. Howe, *Anticolonialism in British Politics: The Left and the End of Empire, 1918-1964* (Oxford, 1993); E. Boehmer, *Indian Arrivals, 1870-1915: Networks of the British Empire* (Oxford, 2015).
[21] R.J. Holton, 'Cosmopolitanism or Cosmopolitanisms? The Universal Races Congress of 1911', *Global Networks* 2, no. 2 (2002), pp. 153-170.

creating cultural and intellectual shared spaces which allowed for political activism between disparate colonies as well as the development of anti-imperial discourses.

Chapter two identifies the development of several varieties of cosmopolitanism and internationalism that arose from a combination of experiences both inside LSE and in the social and political organisations students joined in London. These were rooted in how students engaged with the historical struggles of their countries, as well as their immersion in British culture and the tensions it produced, and their relationships with each other. I devote particular attention to the expressions of solidarity between students from different colonies that intensified during three international crises in the 1930s: the Second Italo-Abyssinian War [1935-36], the Spanish Civil War [1936-39] and the Second Sino-Japanese War [1937-45]. I contend that these events and the reactions they incited highlighted key elements to students' internationalism, including the influence over students exercised by socialist groups like the Communist Party of Great Britain, apparent similarities between the racism and militarism of fascism and that of empire, and the ethnic and regional solidarities produced through increased interaction, cooperation and activism. The three wars served to strengthen solidarities produced by classroom experiences and student groups, and encouraged a wider colonial solidarity that was expressed in a myriad of ways, from student and political organisations to co-authored newspaper editorials. In each case, overseas study and the movement of people it promoted, offers the chance to contribute to existing work on how students both reflected and shaped cosmopolitanism and internationalism, as well as how different regional, cultural or ethnic expressions of internationalism were reactions to similar

trends and political realities and structures, including empire, racism, and the increased mobility of people.

Yet, at the same time, the argument of connectivity should not be taken too far, as these attempts at solidarity and the ideologies they produced were porous, sometimes contradictory and occasionally in open conflict with each other. V.K. Krishna Menon, who after graduating from LSE was central in many efforts to build cross-colonial unities, provides an instructive case study adding to our awareness of these grey zones. Some existing scholarship highlights the potential risk of overemphasising connections at the loss of minimising friction between and within colonial camps.[22] Less noted is the equally important reality that interactions also illuminated divisions, rivalries and the scope for misunderstanding, as well as the overriding preoccupation with nationalism. As Frederick Cooper has suggested, some academics have failed to complicate stories of connectivity with their limitations.[23]

Histories of Knowledge and Global Intellectual History

In addition to advancing our understanding of internationalism, the embrace by historians of international, as well as global analytical frames, has demanded greater investigation into the creation and movement of knowledge and ideas to which the study of student mobility, and of LSE especially, can make significant contributions.[24] By the end of the nineteenth century, European governments drew on the knowledge obtained in their colonies to establish institutes or departments designed to train colonial officials, including the École colonial, which was founded in 1889 to train administrators in

[22] See, for instance, H. Bhabha, *The Location of Culture* (London, 1994).
[23] F. Cooper, *Colonialism in Question: Theory, Knowledge, History* (Berkeley, 2005), p. 10.
[24] D. Armitage, 'The International Turn in Intellectual History' in Darrin M. McMahon and Samuel Moyn (eds.) *Rethinking Modern European Intellectual History* (New York, 2014), pp. 232-252.

France, the International Colonial Institute, founded in Brussels in 1894, and the *Insituto Coloniale Italiano*, founded in Rome in 1906, as well as institutes in Amsterdam, Lisbon and Hamburg.[25] Engagement with and use of colonial knowledge augmented established fields of inquiry and helped create new ones focusing on colonial studies. Chairs of colonial history were established in Leiden in 1902 (which trained officials of the Dutch East Indies), in Oxford in 1905 (the Beit Professorship in Colonial History) and in Berlin in 1911.[26]

The objective of the third chapter is to add depth to our grasp of how the changing relationship between governments and knowledge effected overseas study by colonials, and how overseas students in turn used their knowledge to advocate for political change. While Indian ICS probationers had been trained in Britain since the late nineteenth century, the interwar period witnessed more students from Africa and the West Indies taking courses about the colonies and contributing to the founding of new ones. Their increased presence raised new questions not only about how colonial knowledge was collected but also about how it was conveyed to and ultimately perceived by non-white colonial students, and who the ultimate authority on the colonies should be. This development could lead to multi-layered relationships. Marc Matera has, for instance, noted that Eric Williams, later the first prime minister of Trinidad and Tobago [1962-81], studied in the shadow of Reginald Coupland, second Beit Professor at the University of Oxford, whose views he denounced as promoting a sentimental and inaccurate view of history, in particular the idea that the end of slavery was procured by a 'band of

[25] P. Burke, *A Social History of Knowledge II,* pp. 128-9.
[26] Burke, *A Social History of Knowledge II,* p. 129.

humanitarian' imperialists.[27] Who possessed more credible expertise in this debate? From the rise of the so-called professional society in the nineteenth century, 'experts' were understood as deriving 'expertise' and the label that accompanied it because they had acquired accreditation, often involving certification of a university.[28] The importance placed on specialised knowledge, and the stamp of expertise via academic accreditation, increased in the twentieth century, and by the interwar period it was not only sought by Europeans, but it was also being pursued and acquired by colonial elites.[29] The Oxford historian, like the colonial officer who 'knew his natives', was being challenged by non-white colonials for the respect accorded to the modern expert.

My work seeks to add to Matera's research on the acquisition of expertise by colonials and their contribution to colonial knowledge by focusing on key individuals at LSE. Even in mutually beneficial relationships the identity of the expert regarding the colonies was becoming more contested. One such relationship emerged between the one time LSE student and eventual Professor Bronislaw Malinowski and future President of Kenya, Jomo Kenyatta [1964-78]. A series of developments furthered the connection between academic subjects on the one hand, including anthropology, and empire on the other, from attempts to rationalise colonial administration to the new respect accorded to the social sciences and their increased funding, in large part from the Rockefeller Foundation.[30] One of Malinowski's contributions was the notion of 'practical anthropology', which was meant to utilise his discipline to serve imperial administration

[27] M. Matera, 'Colonial Subjects: Black Intellectuals and the Development of Colonial Studies in Britain', *The Journal of British Studies* 49, 2 (April, 2010), p. 409.
[28] Burke, *A Social History of Knowledge II,* p. 172.
[29] Matera, 'Colonial Subjects', p. 390; Burke, *A Social History of Knowledge II,* pp. 172-82.
[30] R. Dahrendorf, *LSE: A History of the London School of Economics and Political Science, 1895-1995* (New York, 1995), pp. 159-70; See also: Liping Bu, 'Education and International Cultural Understanding: The American Elite Approach, 1920-1937', in R. Garlitz and L. Jarvinen (eds.), *Teaching America to the World and the World to America: Education and Foreign Relations Since 1870* (New York, 2012).

by providing colonial governments with knowledge in order to better serve the interest of colonial subjects and to teach future colonial officials. The relationship he formed with Kenyatta allowed the former to extend his contacts to a Kikuyu elite with unique insights into his society, and the latter to acquire the Western-educated stamp of expertise from a renowned institution.[31] Yet, as we shall see, Kenyatta and Malinowski disagreed when it came to the question of colonial independence.

To assess these tensions, chapter three examines the development of courses in anthropology and colonial development at LSE, exploring the role of the social sciences in promoting the idea of the expert planner capable of facilitating the economic and social development of colonial societies.[32] It focuses on the transition between when courses were designed to teach white colonial administrators to the emergence of courses which attracted black Africans and students of African descent, including Kenyatta and William Arthur Lewis, who claimed expert knowledge of their own societies. Indeed, in the latter case, a West Indian student who was denied work in his native St. Lucia on racist grounds, became LSE's first black lecturer and a pioneering figure in development economics. With Lewis, we see another step in the relationship between knowledge and empire in the formative period of a new discipline, international development, that emerged as a product of colonial development as well as the impact of individuals like Lewis.[33] I argue that LSE was fundamental in this evolution, contributing to the development of colonial studies, but also more broadly through its status as a leading

[31] B. Berman, "Ethnography as Politics, Politics as Ethnography: Kenyatta, Malinowski and the Making of Facing Mount Kenya," *Canadian Journal of African Studies* 30, 3 (1996), pp. 313-334
[32] J.M. Hodge, *Triumph of the Expert: Agrarian Doctrines of Development and the Legacies of British Colonialism.* (Athens, Ohio, 2007); D. Ross, 'Changing Contours of the Social Science Disciplines', in Theodore M. Porter and Dorothy Ross (eds.) *The Cambridge History of Social Science: The Modern Social Sciences* (Cambridge, 2003), pp. 205-37.
[33] J.M. Hodge, 'British Colonial Expertise, Post-Colonial Careering and the Early History of International Development', *Journal of Modern European History* 8, 1 (April, 2010), pp 24-45.

institution in the teaching of and research in the social sciences and its role in creating experts thought to be capable of helping governments govern more efficiently.

The relationships between Malinowski and his students, and the development of Arthur Lewis's thinking, contribute to the ongoing efforts by historians to dismantle simplistic narratives of the diffusion of knowledge, usually from Europe abroad. In tandem with both the proliferation of histories of knowledge and the global turn, global intellectual history has emerged as a separate discipline, with its own journal, manifesto and hubs at Cambridge University, Columbia University and in Berlin, and has inspired questions about scale, scope and time for intellectual history. What is global, if anything merits the word?[34] How does it relate to empire, to nations and internationalism? The answers become harder still when we engage with the increasingly established porousness of each category, as well as the murky and very much intertwined border areas between them.[35] The history of interwar colonial students and the relationships they formed with professors and each other, has much to offer to this effort.

The final two chapters form the crux of the thesis' aim of contributing to our understanding of the mechanisms, processes and individual characteristics that facilitate the movement of political ideas and approaches to politics, in particular beyond national and regional borders. The chapters pivot on Harold Laski, his thought and teachings, relationships with students, and ultimately how his pupils interpreted his work. Laski promoted socialism in his voluminous writings, frequent speeches, and in his lectures, which were attended by many future post-colonial leaders. Although often rigid in its adhesion to socialist dogma, Laski's thought nevertheless reflected the malleability of

[34] S. Moyn and A. Sartori, *Global Intellectual History* (New York, 2013), p. 5. See also the journal of *Global Intellectual History*, launched in 2016.
[35] S. Conrad, *What is Global History?* (Princeton, 2016).

political ideologies, incorporating liberal and pluralist elements in its makeup, which were in turn conveyed to students. The historiographical omission of his role in an exchange of political ideas that transcended countries as distinct as India and Canada is surprising given that Laski's teaching, especially of foreign students, is widely acknowledged as his most lasting legacy.[36] Most existing commentary suggests that Laski, and British education more generally, promoted a strong bias towards socialism in foreign students.[37] The American politician Daniel Patrick Moynihan summed up this position most colourfully with his belief that British universities exerted a lasting influence over the ideological beliefs of leaders throughout the decolonising world. Laski in particular, Moynihan wrote, 'once molded the minds of so many future leaders of the "new majority"', by which he meant anti-capitalist countries hostile to the United States.[38]

Yet as Bayly's work on Indian liberalism argued, liberal democratic ideas can be traced in the thinking of those traditionally considered socialist and sympathetic to the Soviet Union, including Jawaharlal Nehru, while liberals like G.K. Gokhale could cite Laski to support their own positions.[39] Laski, though a self-declared Marxist, maintained liberal and pluralist elements in his thought into the 1930s, and arguably throughout his life, raising questions about the malleability of political ideologies, how his teachings were interpreted, their impact on the history of late colonial and early post-colonial

[36] For a general biography of Laski's life and work, see I. Kramnick and B. Sheerman, *Harold Laski: A Life on the Left* (London, 1993). For more in depth accounts of Laski's ideas, see P. Lamb, *Harold Laski: Problems of Democracy, the Sovereign State and International Society* (New York, 2004); P. Lamb, 'Laski's Ideological Metamorphosis', *Journal of Political Ideologies* 4, no. 2 (1999), pp. 239-260; and M. Newman, *Harold Laski: A Political Biography* (London, 2009).
[37] See, for instance, Kramnick and Sheerman, *Harold Laski*.
[38] D.P. Moynihan, 'The United States in Opposition,' *Commentary* 59, 3 (August, 1975), p. 44.
[39] C.A. Bayly, 'The Ends of Liberalism and the Political Thought of Nehru's India', *Modern Intellectual History* 12, 3 (2015), pp. 606, 621. See also, C.A. Bayly, *Recovering Liberties: Indian Thought in the Age of Liberalism and Empire* (Cambridge, 2012).

Indian political thought, and how, more generally, ideas are exchanged, embraced and altered when moving transnationally. Furthermore, to how many distinct geographies can they travel to, and how many times can they be filtered through different cultural lenses, before losing historical coherence and preclude general conclusions?

To begin answering these questions, I examine Laski's thinking in the context of his teaching and activism, and argue that Laski formed the centre of an intellectual hub for overseas students, particularly those from India. I discuss Laski's core ideas, including his conception of 'economic democracy', which, as becomes clear, was Laski's attempt to marry core liberal tenets to Marxism. My primary aim is to demonstrate what Laski taught and how he communicated to his students, stressing the importance of his charisma as a teacher and his involvement in politics, particularly Menon's anti-colonial group, the India League, where Laski spoke on numerous occasions in favour of both Indian independence and the necessity for economic democracy in South Asia. In addition to contributing to our understanding of the central role of teaching in Laski's historical significance, I strive to underline the relevance of personality and charisma in the spread of ideas.

I further argue that Laski's students from various regional backgrounds embraced his effort to merge aspects of liberalism with Marxism in their search for a third way between Stalinism and capitalism. In addition to the methods outlined above, which enhanced how Laski's message was received, this development resulted from a variety of factors, including dissatisfaction with Bolshevik political oppression and capitalist economic exploitation, exposure to British thinking via local, Anglo-educated networks, and experiences of democracy in practice in Britain, all of which combined to induce

students to favour socialism tempered with a respect for parliament and constitutional democracy. The impressive breadth of Laski's appeal reflects an intellectual network in many ways dependent on India's key role in the British empire and the educational migrations it created, as well as a wider colonial world, which, as we shall see, included prominent Canadians students such as the future Prime Minister Pierre Elliot Trudeau. A weaker but still palpable connection involved British or American-educated Chinese students. In the latter case, the disintegration of central authority following the end of the Qing dynasty and dissatisfaction with a post-war settlement that dismissed China's interests spurred creative thinking about politics and a thirst for foreign ideas, including liberalism.[40] Such engagement with outside ideas, moreover, was strengthened and justified seemingly in concordance with more local thought and tradition, from Gandhi in India to the ancient philosopher Lao Tzu in China.

Laski's legacy, as seen in students from such diverse backgrounds, contributes to our understanding of how overseas study facilitated the movement of ideas in the twentieth century. As the concluding sections to the final chapter argue, however, while this is a remarkably far-reaching intellectual legacy, the term 'global intellectual history' and its far-reaching, suggestions of globality, should be employed only with caution and numerous caveats.[41] Firstly, Laski's influence over his students was by no means uniform, a fact illustrated by the case of M.R. Masani, a fervent socialist at LSE who became disillusioned with Soviet practices before eventually adopting a classical liberal critique of the Nehruvian state who used Laski as a Marxist bogeyman. Secondly, as we shall see below, Laski's students formed a highly select group of individuals whose

[40] R. Mitter, *A Bitter Revolution: China's Struggle with the Modern World* (Oxford, 2005), p. 104.
[41] See F. Cooper, 'How Global do we want our Intellectual History to be?', in S. Moyn and A. Sartori (eds.), *Global Intellectual History*.

experiences were far removed from the vast majority of their co-nationals. Nevertheless, despite these limitations, the chapter seeks to encapsulate an argument that runs throughout the thesis: namely, that against the backdrop of overlapping world-historical developments, including the rise of anti-colonial nationalism, the decline of empire and the moral authority of capitalism that was increasingly seen as synonymous with it, and the rise of Soviet communism, LSE and the individuals it contained, relationships it spawned and knowledges it espoused, formed a significant and enduring legacy on the history of ideas and early post-war, post-independence approaches to politics.

LSE: A Different Intellectual Project, A New Elite

As this introduction has argued, a complex set of relationships and exchanges shaped overseas students. This included the institution they attended, the courses it offered, and even the views on duty, responsibility and leadership its faculty advocated. Before becoming India's first female advocate, Cornelia Sorabji studied at Balliol College, Oxford, under Benjamin Jowett. The reforming don shared a view that Oxford exuded more generally, which held that university education was meant to craft leaders. For his part, Jowett encouraged his many famous students, including Alfred Milner and Lord Curzon, to exercise their moral duty to do good in the world, an opportunity, he believed, that empire offered.

As chapter three argues, LSE is closer to this vision than previously thought. The Fabian approach to empire, as outlined by George Bernard Shaw, emerged from the Boer War and embraced a liberal imperial attitude that was to later inspire thinking on colonial development, and in turn what became international development after World War II.[42]

[42] M. Cowen and R. Shenton, 'The Origins of Fabian Colonialism in Africa', *Journal of Historical Sociology* 4, 2 (July, 1991), pp. 143-174.

Yet it was nevertheless a different kind of intellectual project, an institution of knowledge production and a factory for facts and expertise which were to be employed towards practical political and social ends. One of the results was, as Marie Scot has suggested, that LSE produced an elite, albeit a new variety of elite distinct from Oxbridge.[43] As the above suggests, there are several reasons why LSE merits focused attention. The School is distinct in the history of British higher education, as well as indicative of changing notions of knowledge and approaches to research, society, imperialism and Britain's place in the world. LSE was founded in 1895 by the Fabian socialists Sidney and Beatrice Webb, along with George Bernard Shaw and Graham Wallas. Its underlying philosophy envisioned it as a research institution, which made it a very different type of intellectual project to Oxbridge, and indeed was founded at the time when red brick universities were proliferating throughout England.[44] From its initial prospectus in 1895, the School advocated for the primacy of concrete facts, particularly regarding the 'study and the investigation of the concrete facts of industrial life and the actual workings of economic and political relations'.[45] The Webbs, and Sidney especially, believed that once facts were uncovered, they would then lead to social and political reform. In economics, for instance, this historical-applied version challenged the emphasis on theory advocated by Alfred Marshall at Cambridge University. Initial disciplines included economics, statistics, commerce, banking, currency and finance; commercial and industrial law; and political science.[46]

[43] M. Scot, *La London School of Economics and Political Science 1895-2010: Internationalisation universitaire et circulation des saviors* (Paris, 2011).
[44] M. Scot, *La London School of Economics and Political Science.*
[45] Dahrendorf, *LSE*, p. 20.
[46] Dahrendorf, *LSE*, p. 20.

In significant ways, the School's founding orientation was less towards the empire than towards a mixture of concurrent trends in Europe and London. It drew inspiration from the research-intensive German university model, as well as from the increasing interest in the social sciences symbolised by the founding in Paris in 1872 of *l'École Libre des Sciences Politiques*.[47] The relationship to the continent continued into the interwar period, with Europeans like Fredrich von Hayek and Bronislaw Malinowski, as well as academic refugees, including the sociologist Karl Manheim, being welcomed in the 1930s. More locally, the early 1890s witnessed in London the rising belief that the British metropole required improved university education. As the centre of an empire at its zenith, it was felt that the city ought to have prestigious centres of learning. This belief coincided with a growing interest in economic and social problems, prompted by the birth pangs of mass democracy, increased urbanisation and the industrial revolution. Manchester, Oxford and Cambridge each possessed a Chair in Political Economy, though it was studied amongst other subjects. University College London and King's College London also had chairs, but they were part time and attracted few students.[48]

LSE was incorporated into the University of London in 1900. A federal institution, the University of London's growth was largely dependent on its constituent members, including University College London (1826) and King's College London (1829). The University's federal composition provided for significant intermingling. Many students attended lectures at LSE, including Laski's, despite being based at other constituent colleges, while for others the metropole provided a meeting ground, in political organisations as well as cafes and restaurants. By the late nineteenth and early

[47] Its name was changed to Institut d'études politiques de Paris (commonly referred to as Science Po) in 1945.
[48] F.A. Hayek, 'The London School of Economics 1895-1945', *Economica* (February, 1946), p. 1.

twentieth century, the increasing role of higher education in thinking about empire led to the creation of new institutions, including the London School of Tropical Medicine[49], established in 1899, and the School of Oriental and African Studies [SOAS], founded in 1916. Both became constituent members of the University of London, and both symbolised the intertwined relationship among universities, knowledge and empire, with the former being funded by B.D. Petit, a Bombay Parsi, and the latter designed specifically to facilitate colonial administration by increasing awareness about the cultures and languages of the ruled.

The School itself expanded considerably after World War I. In 1919, William Beveridge became Director, a position he would hold until 1937. This period, dubbed a 'rebirth' by Beatrice Webb, witnessed the further expansion of the social sciences and LSE's contribution to their development. Its expansion was again fuelled by international developments, in particular the growth of American philanthropy in the form of large grants from the Rockefeller Foundation, which became an important international supporter of the social sciences in the 1920s.[50] In part for these reasons, the School was consistently one of the most ethnically diverse universities in the country. During the Lent term of 1922 there were three hundred and forty students from overseas studying at LSE, one hundred and nineteen alone from the self-governing dominions and India.[51] This figure had nearly doubled by the late 1920s and early 1930s, with a slight decline after 1929 attributable to the Depression.

Foreign Students at LSE, 1926-1931[52]

[49] Later the London School of Tropical Hygiene and Medicine.
[50] Dahrendorf, *LSE*, pp. 159-70.
[51] 'Enrollment', Folder 1, 31/44, LSE.
[52] 'Enrollment', Folder 6, 31/44, LSE.

1926-27 (623)
1927-28 (607)
1928-29 (653)
1929-30 (645)
1930-31 (582)

The numbers and their accuracy fluctuated due to the political and economic turmoil of the following decade.[53] Yet they identify LSE as a highly diverse institution, with twenty per cent of its approximately 3000 students coming from abroad.[54]

For several reasons, including the prestige of Oxford and its Rhodes Scholarship, which has attracted students from former colonies around the world, as well as the entertaining, partially fact-based yet simplistic narratives built by critics like Moynihan, LSE and its relationship with colonial students flew under the academic radar. In fact, the international historian Odd Arne Westad recently remarked that LSE 'provides plentiful opportunities to mull over the postcolonial situation'.[55] The historian and public intellectual Ramachandra Guha asserted that the School 'has had a colossal influence on the intellectual history of the modern world'.[56] This impact, he wrote, was perhaps even greater than that of Cambridge and Oxford; while Jawaharlal Nehru and Indira Gandhi attended these universities respectively, many of their key advisors, including V.K. Krishna Menon, P.N. Haksar and B.K. Nehru, went to LSE.[57] Ivor Jennings, the British lawyer who served as Vice Chancellor of both the University of Ceylon and the University of Cambridge remarked that the 'ghosts of Sidney and Beatrice Webb stalk

[53] See reports on the Work of the Education Department, (1929-39).
[54] Dahrendorf, p. 173.
[55] O.A. Westad, *The Global Cold War: Third World Interventions and the Making of our Time* (New York, 2005), p. 417. Westad was Professor of International History at LSE before moving to Harvard University in 2015. More generally, Westad was commenting on the creation of new educational institutions at the turn of the century designed to train imperial administrators, including indigenous elites. See Westad, p. 76.
[56] R. Guha, 'The LSE and India', *The Hindu*, 23 November 2003, accessed 7 February 2011 at http://www.hindu.com/thehindu/mag/2003/11/23/stories/2003112300120300.htm
[57] Ibid.

through the pages of the text of the Directive Principles of the Indian Constitution', in part due to its primary author, the LSE graduate B.R. Ambedkar.[58]

Definition of Terms

In the course of this introduction, I have defined certain key terms used throughout the thesis, including 'colonial student', 'internationalism', and 'expertise'. A few remaining concepts and terms must be delineated. By cosmopolitanism, I mean an openness to live with and cooperate with people of distinct cultural and ethnic backgrounds. As Sugata Bose and Kris Manjapra have written, this has not necessarily operated in conflict with nationalism, and at times could be generated from a pragmatic desire to accomplish nationalist goals through cooperation with different peoples.[59] I employ 'post-colonial' to signify something that is no longer imperial though still heavily shaped by empire. Far from marking the end of colonialism, post-colonialism 'signals a critical engagement with the present effect – intellectual and social – of centuries of "European expansion" on former colonies and on their colonizers'.[60] When I use the term 'post-colonial leader', I am referring to leading figures in the political and intellectual affairs of countries emerging from colonial rule or having gained independence, but who are still shaped by experiences that occurred during, and often as the direct result of, empire, including overseas study in Britain.

The term 'elite' also warrants further explanation. To begin with, the phrase is marked by two primary intersections and potential contradictions. Firstly, colonial subjects were subservient to their colonial masters, at least in theory. In fact, imperial

---

[58] Ibid.
[59] S. Bose and K. Manjapra (eds.), *Cosmopolitan Thought Zones: South Asia and the Global Circulation of Ideas* (Basingstoke, 2010), p. 3.
[60] W. Anderson, 'Postcolonial Technoscience', *Social Studies of Science* 32, no. 5/6 (Oct.-Dec., 2002), p. 644.

historians have long suggested that empire relied on collaboration between metropolitan and local elites, with many in the colonies benefitting from the relationship.[61] Many of the colonial students in this study were elites in their societies, by virtue of their prior education, facility in English, and the financial resources needed to fund a trip abroad. Yet there were notable exceptions, including B.R. Ambedkar and K.R. Narayanan, who, against all odds, were able to study abroad and join an educated elite despite their Scheduled Castes background. Pierre Trudeau, whose time at LSE was, as we shall see, described as that of a nobleman on a grand tour, met and befriended Narayanan, a fellow student of Harold Laski. Trudeau himself returned to Canada to advocate for French Canadian rights against an oppressive French Catholic clergy and anglophone elite, while Renuka Ray, another Laski student, fought for women's rights against an ingrained patriarchy in both colonial and independent India. In the context of this thesis, an 'elite' student is someone who had access to travel and educational opportunities unavailable and often unimaginable to most of their peers, a phenomenon which helped them gain the credibility needed to become significant leaders in politics, business, international affairs and academics.

I also use the concept of 'soft power', particularly in the first chapter. As Joseph Nye has argued, the international mobility of students and scholars has played a key role in how nations seek to exert soft power, or the attainment of social, political or cultural goals through persuasion as opposed to coercion.[62] As I argue in chapter one, imperial officials, internationalists, anti-colonial nationalists and philanthropists all understood

[61] See, for instance, J. Darwin, *Unfinished Empire: The Global Expansion of Britain* (London, 2012), esp. pp. 207-10.
[62] J. Nye, 'Soft Power and Higher Education', report, 1 January 2005, accessed 16 March 2016 at https://net.educause.edu/ir/library/pdf/ffp0502s.pdf

overseas study as a form of soft power that offered the opportunity to advance their particular worldviews. Power of a different sort was integral to the establishment of 'colonial knowledge', another term I use extensively, defined by one leading historian as 'the form and content of the knowledge that was produced out of and enabled resource exploitation, commerce, conquest, and colonization'.[63] This thesis is primarily interested in the content of knowledge about the colonies, the relationships built around it, and the ability of colonial students to both draw from and contribute to that knowledge for personal and political ends. Last but not least, I draw on the concept of imperial liberalism. As a great deal of research has shown, liberal imperialists in Europe from the late eighteenth and nineteenth centuries imagined empire as a vehicle for uplifting colonies supposedly through science and culture.[64] While many LSE figures, most prominently Laski, were strong advocates of Indian independence in particular, I argue that Malinowski's 'practical anthropology' and his belief in the necessity and even duty to use colonial knowledge and facts to improve the life of colonial subjects was rooted in older traditions of imperial liberalism.

Sources

In its entirety, this project has relied heavily on under-used student dossiers, as well as other student writings, including diaries, memoirs, theses, newspaper and journal articles. The dossiers, housed at the LSE Archives, helped lead to a clearer image of what students were doing while attending LSE, what classes they were enrolled in and which organisations they participated in, who their advisors were and where they derived their

[63] T. Ballantyne, 'Colonial Knowledge', in S. Stockwell (ed.) *The British Empire: Themes and Perspectives* (Malden, MA., 2008), p. 178.
[64] J. Pitts, *A Turn to Empire: The Rise of Imperial Liberalism in Britain and France* (Princeton, 2005); U.S. Mehta, *Liberalism and Empire: A Study in Nineteenth-Century British Liberal Thought* (Chicago, 1999).

funding from. Some were more complete than others, and their personal papers, including most notably lecture notes and correspondences, enhanced the emerging picture of what activities students engaged in and how they reacted to faculty members like Harold Laski. In particular, the V.K. Krishna Menon papers and the Pierre Elliot Trudeau papers, held at the Nehru Memorial Museum and Library in New Delhi and the Library and Archives of Canada in Ottawa, respectively, provided detailed lecture notes from and contemporary commentary on LSE classes.

Memoirs pose obvious problems for accuracy, subjectivity and memory, yet consistent themes emerged from student recollections that made a compelling case for the formation of several general conclusions, including the widespread affinity they displayed for Laski's teachings and the development of internationalist and cosmopolitan sentiments that were both directly and indirectly related to their university experiences. For South Asian students, the Indian Political Intelligence records at the British Library have been a significant help in painting a picture of student activities as well as cross-referencing, substantiating and occasionally debunking claims or oversights made in memoirs. LSE staff and faculty papers have also contributed to understanding the relationships between students and their teachers. Furthermore, government and bureaucratic papers, including those of the Colonial Office, were helpful, as were collections at the Rockefeller Center Archives in Sleepy Hollow, New York, in illuminating a larger story of the increased attention devoted to overseas study during the interwar period that forms the basis of chapter one. Inversely, archival inaccessibility eliminated some potentially fruitful lines of inquiry, including Laski's relationship with

Ceylonese students.[65] Michael Manley, moreover, who was a student at LSE following World War II before eventually becoming Prime Minister of Jamaica [1989-92], credited Laski with his influencing his thinking, but time and resources did not permit further investigation of this line.

Elite Prosopography

Before concluding with the outline, a word must be said about the idea of a group biography, which informs this thesis. In her book, *Windows Into the Past*, the South Asian and imperial historian Judith Brown explained that her approach sought to use 'individual life histories to probe broad historical themes, and to anchor more theoretical discussions in the lived experiences of real people'.[66] Among other things, Brown used the alumni register of Balliol College, Oxford to delve into the educational backgrounds of the ICS probationers who were based there, the history of British administration in India and the increasing presence of Indian ICS probationers in the UK at the turn of the century.[67] This thesis embraces a similar methodological tactic insofar as it is specifically concerned with the ideas and politics students encountered during overseas study and how they engaged with and shaped evolving trends; unlike pure biography, it hence uses LSE students as lenses to examine broader historical developments.

While much of the literature over the last three decades, sparked by Subaltern history, has illuminated the lives and contributions of the underrepresented in history, this

[65] Ceylonese leftists N.M. Perera and Leslie Goonewardena each studied at LSE, and both went on to become founding members of the Trotskyite Lanka Sama Samaja Party [LSSP], established in Ceylon in 1935, eventually reaching its height of influence in the 1960s and 1970s. Perera did his BSc (econ.) from 1927-29, eventually earning a Ph.D. in 1933 on the Weimar constitution with Laski as an advisor, and a DSc on 'Some Aspects of Comparative Parliamentary Procedure', which compared Germany, England, France and the United States. See N.M. Perera, student dossier, LSE; Leslie Goonewardena, student dossier, LSE.

[66] J. Brown, *Windows into the Past: Life Histories and the Historian of South Asia* (Notre Dame, 2009), p. 4.

[67] Brown, pp. 23-35.

is very much a political-intellectual history of elites, albeit one which is broadly defined. It does not aspire to be pure intellectual history, but rather it hopes to add to our understanding both of how ideas emerge and how they are considered in terms of their practical applicability by political actors. Elite prosopography carries inherent risks, including the potential hazard of neglecting major changes that were taking place in the political, social and economic opinions in the lower classes who did not have access to overseas education.[68] Yet the intellectual and political figures in this study were destined to have significant influence in their countries following graduation. A better understanding of them and the ideas and experiences to which they were exposed while abroad thus offers the chance to gain insight into the role of overseas study in the transnational movement of ideas and customs.

Outline

The central figure in this thesis is Harold Laski, and for good reason. This project was originally conceived as a group biography focused exclusively on Laski and his students hailing from British colonies, in particular India, allowing for an assessment of the development of political thought and thought processes in the early post-war, post-colonial eras. As it progressed, however, it became both more focused in some ways and significantly broader in others, with empire increasingly becoming the primary analytical lens, given that the ties Laski formed with students were overwhelmingly with colonial students; at the same time, student dossiers, memoirs and other writings following graduation suggested that Laski's story and that of his students were threaded into a larger fabric with other important patterns that merited increased attention, including the LSE as an institution and location for the development of the social sciences, and a

[68] L. Stone, 'Prosopography', *Daedalus* 100, no. 1, Historical Studies Today (Winter, 1971), p. 62.

widespread belief in internationalism that blossomed amidst the nationalist headwinds blowing from late colonial India and interwar Europe. As may now be evident, the conceptual approach that helped structure this thesis worked in reverse. Reading the memoirs, dossiers and personal papers of Laski's students that inspired my original interest highlighted a near uniform interest in internationalism and colonial solidarity, which itself posed questions about student mobility and its relationship to colonial nationalism, imperialism and interwar internationalism. At the same time, Laski's socialism and his teaching were inseparable from the development of the social sciences at LSE.

This evolving approach lent itself to an organisational structure that, although following a loose chronology from the end of World War I to the early 1950s, is thematic. The first two chapters are less focused with student classroom experiences, but rather explore questions of internationalism between the world wars that shaped overseas study as a phenomenon as well as the political experiences of overseas students. The first chapter examines how after World War I, imperialists, anti-colonial nationalists and internationalists were inspired to understand the expansion of overseas study as a way to promote their particular worldviews, including closer ties between Britain and the Dominions, collaboration between Britain and English-educated Indian elites, and anti-colonial nationalism, particularly in India. I analyse each position in turn, ultimately concluding that despite retaining distinct characteristics and objectives, each vision embraced aspects of internationalism and significantly influenced the lives of colonial students by creating an emerging architecture of overseas study through new scholarships and social centres.

This discussion from above sets the stage in chapter two for a more specific examination of how LSE students experienced, reacted to and in many cases promoted the internationalism and cosmopolitanism that overseas study helped make possible through student mobility. The central claim in this chapter is the development of a broad-based anti-colonial solidarity among students. It begins by exploring student interactions and friendships that emerged in and around LSE. The School's location in London, the centre of myriad student and political organisations, many of which were cosmopolitan in composition and outlook and espoused internationalism, is shown to be fundamental to understanding the developing political positions students held. It then proceeds to examine the cooperation between students from different colonies under the aegis of Menon's India League and its Communist allies, to protest a series of international crises in the 1930s: the Second Italo-Abyssinian War, the Spanish Civil War and the Second Sino-Japanese War. These wider struggles added to existing student experiences and promoted solidarity. I close by suggesting that collaboration was uneven and subject to limitations, which I again highlight through Menon, in particular his interactions, in LSE and London, with Africans as well as with fellow Indians.

The following three chapters focus on emerging disciplines in the social sciences at LSE, specific faculty members, classes students took and ideological positions to which their studies exposed them. In chapter three, tensions and synergies between internationalism and empire that are explored in the first two chapters are further examined in the development of the social sciences and colonial studies. I set out by examining Bronislaw Malinowski's promotion of 'practical anthropology' in the context of LSE's increasing interest in the 1930s in becoming a centre for the teaching of colonial

administrators. I continue by examining the development of classes in anthropology and colonial development at LSE. Through the lens of then-student Jomo Kenyatta and the eventual LSE lecturer Arthur Lewis, I argue that overseas study encouraged colonial students and leaders to desire university-certified 'expertise', which was increasingly seen as necessary for the development of colonies, and the resulting label of being an 'expert' and the credibility it conferred.

The final two chapters continue these analyses of faculty and courses by highlighting Laski's legacy on colonial students whose thinking was shaped by overseas study in Britain. Chapter four examines Laski's thinking in the context of his teaching and activism. I discuss Laski's personal background and his central ideas, including his conception of 'economic democracy', and how he communicated them to his students. It argues that Laski formed the centre of an intellectual hub for overseas students and emphasises the importance of his charisma as a teacher and his involvement in student political affairs, especially regarding Indian independence, as reasons why he attracted students. Chapter five builds on this to explore Laski's enduring role in his students' thinking by examining how they used and evaluated his thought after graduation. It affirms that Laski's students from diverse regional backgrounds embraced his effort to merge aspects of liberalism with Marxism in their search for a third way between Stalinism and capitalism. To be sure, in noting how several Chinese students also produced similar assessments, I conclude this chapter by connecting liberal Chinese students in the UK to a larger transnational history of ideas in which non-Western activists pursued ideas abroad to strengthen their societies, in part through overseas

study.[69] The thesis ends just beyond 1950, the year of Laski's passing, which also marked a transition at LSE, in part symbolised by the assumption of conservative philosopher Michael Oakeshott to Laski's chair, as well as the independence of India (1947) and the increasing rigidity of the Cold War.

[69] For Japanese students in the UK, see: K. Noboru, *Japanese Students at Cambridge University in the Meiji Era, 1868-1912: Pioneers for the Modernization of Japan* (trans.) Ian Ruxton (Morrisville, 2004); for Chinese students sent to the U.S. see Ye, Weili, *Seeking Modernity in China's Name: Chinese Students in the United States* (Stanford, 2001), p. 8. For Chinese students in Tokyo, see Ye, p. 9.

1

Imperialism, Internationalism and the Idea of Overseas Study After World War I

Introduction

The introduction to this thesis noted polemicists who suggested that LSE shaped the political and ideological views of colonial elites who attended the School during the period under scrutiny. On a broader level, this argument implied that the phenomenon of overseas study, by allowing students to engage with ideas and networks of people they encountered in London, contributed to shaping the politics of the post-imperial period. Ironically, these opinions were expressed in apparent ignorance of the rich debates over the nature and ends of overseas study that transpired during the interwar period. In the aftermath of World War I, officials at LSE and beyond, including at new intergovernmental agencies, as well as philanthropists, government bureaucrats and those considering ways to strengthen or weaken the British Empire alike, increasingly came to see overseas study as a form of soft power, defined by the political scientist Joseph Nye as the ability to co-opt rather than coerce.[1] To be sure, students were seen as potential conduits though which particular worldviews could be transmitted abroad.

Existing research on British views of overseas study focuses on the periods before World War I and after World War II. This includes developments in the ICS that brought Indian students to the UK in hopes of grooming collaborators to ensure a competent and loyal bureaucracy, as well the origins and evolution of scholarships designed to strengthen bonds between Britain and the dominions, most notably the Rhodes

[1] J. Nye, 'Soft Power and Higher Education', report, 1 January 2005, accessed 16 March 2016 at https://net.educause.edu/ir/library/pdf/ffp0502s.pdf. Indeed, Nye has affirmed that the culture and political ideas students are exposed to abroad can have significant ideological influence on individuals and (by extension) the countries they return to, while also increasing the soft power of the receiving country.

Scholarship.[2] It also concentrates on the new funding for colonial scholarships made available by the Colonial Development and Welfare Acts [1940 and 1945] and the intensification of debates after World War II that linked the treatment of students in Britain to the future of the colonial empire.[3] This scholarship has revealed both the extent to which overseas study was considered an important part of Britain's ability to project influence, as well as the lack of overarching coordination that was absent from these efforts. It has nevertheless generally overlooked the interwar period, when the Empire was threatened by the expansion and intensification of Indian nationalism, the economic ramifications of the Great Depression and the emergence of new ideas regarding how to maintain international stability after World War I, all of which led to a revaluation of policies on overseas study.

In what follows, I argue that imperialists, internationalists and anti-colonial nationalists all promoted student mobility and the development of transnational educational networks to advance conceptions of empire, peace and nationalism respectively. The potential uses of foreign students led to the emergence of distinct but often overlapping models of overseas study that blurred the lines between British national and economic interests with empire as well as internationalism. Imperialists embraced overseas students as a means to deepen ties with the settler colonies as well as to encourage the development of loyal civil servants in India. After World War I, these goals persisted, yet they became increasingly intertwined with the language and

[2] C. Dewey, 'The Education of a Ruling Caste: The Indian Civil Service in the Era of the Competitive Examination', *English Historical Review* 88, no. 347 (April, 1973), pp. 262-285; P. Ziegler, *Legacy: Cecil Rhodes, The Rhodes Trust and Rhodes Scholarships* (London, 2008); T. Pietsch, 'Many Rhodes: Travelling Scholarships and Imperial Citizenship in the British Academic World, 1880-1940', *Journal of the History of Education* 40, no. 6 (2011), pp. 723-739; E. Riedi, 'Women, Gender, and the Promotion of Empire: The Victoria League, 1901-1914', *The Historical Journal* 45, no. 3 (Sept., 2002), pp. 569-99.
[3] A.J. Stockwell, 'Leaders, Dissidents and the Disappointed: Colonial Students in Britain as Empire Ended', *The Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History* 36 no. 3 (2008), p. 494.

aspirations of interwar internationalism. South Asian anti-colonial leaders, meanwhile, searched for a balance between their commitment to nationalism and India's reliance on British education, while also developing their own internationalist aims. Each vision, while retaining distinct characteristics and objectives, embraced aspects of internationalism and significantly influenced the lives of colonial students by creating an emerging architecture of overseas study through new scholarships and social centres.

Good Ones to Encourage, or Spoilt Lads?

When Gokal Lal Mehta[4] sought admission to LSE in 1936, his application received a peculiar amount of interest. The aspiring Indian student missed the application deadline and boasted only a mediocre academic record from his prior studies in India. Yet LSE Director William Beveridge received several pleas to admit the student regardless. One came from his brother, K.L. Mehta.[5] K.L. proposed that his brother be admitted as an occasional (non-full time) student, and then be transferred to internal status in 1937.[6] A second appeal was sent by a member of the House of Lords, who highlighted that Mehta was a Rajput, and hailed from a good family that ought to be encouraged:

> They are of feudal upper classes of that distinguished but mediaeval State, Udaipur and several members of the family have been high up in the public services of their own state; but they are more go-ahead than most of the ruling classes there, and if they come to work in British India and take places which would otherwise go to Bengalis, I think it would be to the advantage of British India.[7]

[4] Not to be confused with Gaganvihari Lallubhai Mehta, also referred to as G.L. Mehta, who became prominent in Indian business and foreign relations, serving as Ambassador to the United States from 1952 to 1958. The two students have been confused in LSE's student dossiers.
[5] K.L. Mehta to W. Beveridge, 14 July 1936, G.L. Mehta, student dossier, LSE.
[6] K.L. Mehta to Miss Evans, 24 July 1936, G.L. Mehta, student dossier, LSE.
[7] Lord Napier to W. Beveridge, 9 October 1936, G.L. Mehta, student dossier, LSE.

Mehta's family was from the Rajasthan Agency, semi-independent under British sovereignty. His older brother, who had already used an LSE degree as a springboard to a career in the ICS, enhanced their reputation of loyalty. In Mehta's case, Beveridge stood firm against the political pressure, but admitted Mehta as an occasional student in 1936, as his brother had suggested, before permitting him entry as an internal student in 1937.[8]

The degree to which colonial students were viewed as being useful enough to manipulate university and imperial policy varied significantly. Beveridge was generally optimistic about overseas students, emphasising 'the value to the general body of students of being brought into contact with, and having special opportunities of learning the views and ideas of, students from other lands and peoples'.[9] On a direct level at LSE, however, there was little attempt to attract colonial or overseas students. Despite its high proportion of colonials, the School did not offer any specific scholarships to attract them. Following his death, a Harold Laski Scholarship was created for students pursuing the study of government.[10] Yet notwithstanding his support for Indian nationalism, colonial students did not figure into discussions about this or any other funding scheme. The number of Indians at LSE was in fact restricted by quota during the period under study.[11] This was not uncommon in Britain. Oxford, for instance, imposed informal quotas on Indian

[8] G.L. Mehta, student dossier, LSE. See also letter from W. Beveridge to P. Hartog, 12 October 1936.
[9] H. Perraton, *A History of Foreign Students in Britain*, p. 74.
[10] Harold Laski Scholarship Bequest by Dame Caroline Maule, 46/50, LSE. The end result of awarding the scholarship to the student who earned the highest marks in papers on 'Government' and 'Political Ideas' was close to what Laski had desired, which was to award the Scholarship to a student studying government who had obtained the highest marks in the 'British Constitution' paper.
[11] W. Beveridge to Sir P. Napier, [n.d.] in G.L. Mehta, student dossier, LSE. No specific number is alluded to.

students in order to ensure an equal spread throughout its colleges, a measure some complained was motivated by racial prejudice.[12]

For Indian students with a better academic record than Mehta, there were other, if limited, funding schemes available. Two Government Scholarships were created beginning in the 1880s, with the establishment of technical scholarships in 1904. By 1929-30, two hundred and two men and twenty-four women received Government of India, Provincial or State Scholarships to finance study abroad.[13] Students could take these Scholarships to attend institutions in other countries (usually for specific subjects, such as studying French in France or in the case of one student, 'x-radiation' in Upsala, Sweden) but the vast majority went to Britain.[14] In 1929-30, they studied subjects as diverse as engineering, teaching, history, economics, commerce and radiology; at LSE, they studied economics, commerce and banking.[15]

One State Scholarship was awarded to B.R. Ambedkar, who earned the first doctorate, a D.SC (Econ), given to an Indian student at LSE in 1923. Ambedkar was an irregular case for numerous reasons. The majority of overseas students came from at least middle class, professional backgrounds. While most foreign students required some degree of familial financial support to fund an education abroad, including travel by steam ship, tuition and room and board, there were notable exceptions. Ambedkar, born in the Central Provinces [Madhya Pradesh], was the first Scheduled Caste student from his community to study at Elphinstone College, Bombay.[16] Awarded the Baroda State

[12] 'Report on the Work of the Education Department, 1934-35', (London, 1936); S. Mukherjee, *Nationalism, Education and Migrant Identities,* p. 22.
[13] 'Report on the Work of the Education Department, 1929-30', (London, 1930). See report for more on other smaller scholarships, state scholars and grants in aid.
[14] Ibid.
[15] Ibid.
[16] B.R. Ambedkar, student dossier, LSE.

Scholarship for three years, Ambedkar moved to the United States in 1913 and enrolled at Columbia University.[17] Upon returning to London in 1920, he relied on his own savings, loans from the Maharaja of Kolhapur and assistance from his friend Naval Bhathena.[18] After submitting his dissertation in 1922, he hoped to do further research in Bonn, but plans failed to materialise. His thesis, later published as *The Problem of the Rupee* garnered criticism for having anti-colonial implications but was accepted and published in 1923. In 1927, he was formally awarded a Ph.D. from Columbia as well.

Scholarships for colonial students outside India were even rarer. This was attributable to a lack of universities, less developed colonial services and India's relative strategic importance, but funding was still obtainable for a lucky few. LSE student William Arthur Lewis, whose time in Britain will be further examined in chapter three, received one of the few Government Scholarships available in the West Indies for study at a British university in 1932.[19] Another LSE student from the West Indies, Gladstone Mills, had a similar trajectory. Mills was from a non-elite (he described it as comparatively poor) rural background and won one of the few scholarships available to study at Jamaica College in 1931.[20] He went on to secure an ISSA Scholarship from the Government of Jamaica beginning in 1944 for three years.[21]

Government Scholarships were limited, but nevertheless indicative of the hope, exemplified by the case of Mehta, that students who did journey to England could become effective collaborators in the imperial project. It is widely recognised that one of

[17] 'Off to Columbia, and on to London', accessed 22 March 2013 at http://www.columbia.edu/itc/mealac/pritchett/00ambedkar/timeline/1910s.html (accessed: March 2013)
[18] 'How to Organize the Downtrodden', accessed 22 March 2013 at http://www.columbia.edu/itc/mealac/pritchett/00ambedkar/timeline/1920s.html (accessed: March 2013)
[19] 'Extension of Scholarship for W.A. Lewis', CO/321/362/3, NAUK.
[20] G. Mills, *Grist for the Mills*, p. 30.
[21] G. Mills, student dossier, LSE.

the most effective elements in maintaining imperial power involved ensuring collaboration with natives, who could be co-opted to serve imperial interests.[22] The British tactic varied across time and space, relying on the self-interest of local businessmen and princes in India, to the Lugardian policy of indirect rule in parts of Africa popular during the interwar period. Throughout the nineteenth century, educated, and loyal, colonial allies became important facilitators of colonial administration, especially in India. British education provided a means to encourage British cultural and intellectual norms, while transmitting the skills necessary for colonial service. In his Minute on Indian Education, T.B. Macaulay famously argued in 1835 for a Utilitarian, Western-style education to create a class of interpreters between the British and the governed. With the expansion of the number of Indians studying in Britain in the early twentieth century, and more still after World War I, many of whom studied to enter the ICS, overseas education assumed even greater importance in this phenomenon.

That importance, to be sure, carried rewards as well as risk. Just as overseas students like Mehta were encouraged, others were feared as potential threats to imperial control. As will be further explored in chapter four, British officials were concerned with student radicalism in India and Britain. The note Mehta's advocate wrote to Beveridge reflected common racial and gendered stereotypes that satirised and demeaned some Indians, the so-called Bengali Babu in particular, as overeducated and effeminate. That Mehta would be preferable to a Bengali highlighted the element of danger associated with a group that drew on its English education to spearhead the incipient Indian nationalist movement through anti-British boycotts following the partition of Bengal in 1905 as well as the development of Indian self-sufficiency, or *swadeshi*.

[22] J. Darwin, *Unfinished Empire: The Global Expansion of Britain* (London, 2012), pp. 207-210, 227-8.

As Indian students in Britain became more numerous in the twentieth century, their presence posed increased political and security challenges to British officials. As early as 1908, Sir Curzon Wyllie, Aide to the Secretary of State, remarked, 'I have no hesitation in saying that the root of dissatisfaction in India is to be found among Indian students in this country'.[23] Ironically, less than a year later, he was assassinated in Britain by a radical Indian student. While the vast majority of Indian students were either apolitical or more focused on using British education to enhance their career prospects than engaging in political struggles, the assassination prompted increased attention on Indian students in Britain, with New Scotland Yard closely monitoring political radicalism, including suspected links with nationalists operating in England.[24]

British intelligence reported on progressive societies and individual students throughout the UK, including at LSE, Oxford and Cambridge, who were vocal anti-colonialists and suspected of having ties to the Communist Party of Great Britain [CPGB] or its affiliated organisations.[25] Perhaps the most infamous instance of political recruitment inside a university surfaced in 1951 with the exposure of Guy Burgess (member of the Cambridge Apostles Society), Kim Philby, Anthony Blunt and Donald Maclean, as part of the "Cambridge 5" spy ring, so known for having been recruited by the Soviet NKVD in the 1930s while students at Cambridge. The CPGB also sought recruits from colonial nationalist groups, which it supported by bestowing them with financial and organisational aid. While communist groups in Britain, including the CPGB, pursued new followers from a variety of sources, such as dockworkers in poorer

[23] Quoted from: S. Lahiri, *Indians in Britain,* p. 127.
[24] Mukherjee, *Nationalism, Education and Migrant Identities*, p. 19.
[25] 'Indian Students in the UK: Subversive Influences at British Universities, Report by Sir Aziz ul-huque, Note on Arrangements for University Admission, 1941-44', The Universities and Extreme Politics, 4 April 1940, L/PJ/12/638, File 808/40, BL.

areas, they also recruited directly in universities. In one case, the Colonial Department of CPGB asked Shapurji Saklatvala, a British Marxist of Parsi origins, to meet Indian students in London before they finished their studies in Oxford, and he was provided with information on the political views of members of the Oxford Majlis, a debating society for Indian students.[26] These efforts stirred fears that Indians could export radical ideas from Britain into India.

Responding to these suspicions about Indian students, the Viceroy of India, Lord Linlithgow, expressed the flailing hope of imperialists, writing that 'a number of lads who should from their parentage and circumstances play a useful part in the India of tomorrow have been spoilt'.[27] The degree to which this was true, of course, depended on what was meant by serving a 'useful part' in India's future. With India's leading nationalists having been educated in Britain and with other Indians engaging with communist operatives in the UK, the expectation that education could breed imperial collaborators appeared to be failing. But there were other hopes as well, cultural and internationalist, as well as those that applied to different parts of the Empire, that became increasingly promoted during the interwar period.

'A Gift to the Empire': Promoting the Dominion

If those evaluating the role of Indian students in the UK saw in their young subjects both opportunities and cause for alarm, students from the settler colonies presented entirely different prospects. Indeed, students from the settler colonies once again underscored the tantalising possibilities overseas study offered to enhancing

[26] Mukherjee, *The Experience of the England-Returned*, pp. 225-6.
[27] Marquess of Linlithgow to Private Secretary to the Secretary of State, 20 November 1941 in 'Indian students in the UK: subversive influences at British universities; report by Sir Aziz ul-huque; note on arrangements for university admission, 1941-44', L/PJ/12/638, file 808/40, BL.

particular visions of empire, while highlighting a lack of coordination and overall policy. Most famously, in 1902, the mining magnate Cecil Rhodes called in his will for the use of a scholarship to promote the unity of the British Empire through overseas study at his alma mater, Oxford. Rhodes emphasised the leadership of the Anglo-Saxon race in particular. His original will did not include scholarships for India, and only did so upon revision in 1940. The first Indian to be awarded a Scholarship was not until independence in 1947 and there were no black African recipients until the 1960s.[28] As we will see, Rhodes was by no means alone in seeking to use overseas study as a means to perpetuate Britain's ties with the settler colonies.[29] While this hope persisted after World War I, however, it also began to assume new characteristics. A debate that Beveridge became involved in stressed the continuing importance of the settler colonies in British thinking about overseas study, while also underscoring how such aspirations evolved amidst the emergence of new conceptions about foreign study in the interwar period.

With an increasing number of foreign students in London, the housing situation became critical in the late 1920s, when plans were proposed for a new social and residential centre for foreign students. In 1928, just before finishing a two-year stretch as Vice Chancellor of the University of London, Beveridge made the case for a new social club and some residences, catering to British and foreign students alike, asserting that this university contained 2248 of the total 4875 overseas students in British Universities.[30] A memorandum for the proposal stated that:

The relative importance of London as a centre for overseas students is probably a

[28] For black Africans, see: A. Kirk-Greene, 'Doubly Elite: African Rhodes Scholars, 1960-90', *Immigrants & Minorities* 12, no. 3 (1993), pp. 220-235.
[29] Pietsch, 'Many Rhodes: Travelling Scholarships and Imperial Citizenship in the British Academic World, 1880-1940', *Journal of the History of Education* 40, no. 6 (2011), pp. 723-739.
[30] W. Beveridge to Mr. Shepardson, 18 February 1928, WBP, 5/34, folder 1, LSE.

> growing one. London with its great store houses of learning, the British Museum and the Record Office and its opportunities for specialised study will almost certainly attract growing numbers of post-graduate students.[31]

As we will see in the succeeding chapter, their concentration in the metropole provided students unique experiences, from attending museums to political rallies and protests against British imperialism. Yet their growing presence also afforded opportunities to those seeking to strengthen imperial bonds. Beveridge, who had secured funding from the American businessman and philanthropist John D. Rockefeller Jr. for LSE's interwar expansion, also inquired as to the potential of him assisting in the erection of a centre for international students.[32] Rockefeller was uninterested, but Beveridge was able to attract the attention of another potential backer, Frederick Craufurd Goodenough, Chairman of Barclays [1917-1934].

Goodenough was born in Calcutta [Kolkata] in 1866. The son of a merchant, he worked his way up Barclays chain of command. As chairman, he believed the bank should serve British imperial interests and he expanded operations considerably throughout the Empire, including in the West Indies, Egypt, West Africa and South Africa.[33] It was on a banking visit in Canada when he met Canadian students who claimed they felt lost while studying in London.[34] Committed to the Empire, the experience helped prompt Goodenough to became a champion of dominion student

---

[31] 'Notes as to the suggested social and residential quarter for the University of London particularly in connection with overseas students', 22 June 1927, WBP, 5/34, folder 1, LSE. It again draws a comparison with the rest of Britain. 'London is much the largest centre for University students from overseas. Of the 2400 full-time students coming to the British Isles from the British Empire overseas in 1925-26, 860 are in London as compared to 407 in Edinburgh, 352 in Cambridge and 272 in Oxford. Of the 1406 foreign students from overseas, 440 are in London as compared with 261 in Oxford, 207 in Cambridge and 99 in Edinburgh, that is to say London has just under one third of the foreign overseas students and more than one third of the imperial overseas students. These figures relate to full-time students only. If part-time students were included London would have a still larger share'.

[32] W. Beveridge to R. Fosdick, 9 March 1928, WBP, 5/34 folder 1, LSE.

[33] G. Jones, *British Multinational Banking, 1830-1990* (Oxford: 1993), pp. 148-53.

[34] J. Sacks (ed.), *The World in London Square: A Portrait of Goodenough College* (London, 2011).

migration to London. He lacked Rhodes' more grandiose aspirations, yet he was steadfast in raising City funds for the expansion of residences in London for students of the Empire exclusively, with particular emphasis on white males from Britain and the dominions.

Goodenough's gendered and racial vision of overseas study clashed with Beveridge's more inclusive stance, and he opposed efforts to convince him otherwise. In their correspondences, Beveridge and others became exasperated with Goodenough.[35] Beveridge and his successor as Vice Chancellor of the University of London in June 1928, Gregory Foster, both favoured a social centre and club, modelled on Hart House, a student centre in Toronto, which could encourage interaction between students by providing libraries, sports, dining and debating facilities.[36] Foster foresaw a residential hall catering to students from the dominions and colonies but open to students from elsewhere as well.[37] Yet after their efforts to take over a site in Bloomsbury foundered, Goodenough's vision prevailed. He created a trust to raise funds for the project, which opened as London House in 1931, eventually adopting his name and evolving into what became known as Goodenough College in 2001.

It was envisioned to provide a collegiate experience based on the Oxbridge model that would facilitate interaction between students of the Empire and Britons, as it was felt that London's size and lack of facilities for foreign students encouraged either atomisation or prompted students to seek out only co-nationals. The notion was rooted in the idea of forging stronger links between Britain and its settler colonies and built off

[35] W. Beveridge to P. Kerr, 31 October 1928, WBP, 5/34 folder 2, LSE.
[36] Dixon Fox to S. Duggan, 6 March 1928, WBP, 5/34, folder 2, LSE; W. Beveridge to P. Kerr, 31 October 1928, WBP, 5/34, folder 2, LSE. Hart House was exclusive to men.
[37] G. Foster, 'Some observations on the Preliminary Memorandum (signed by Mr. Goodenough) on the Proposals for the establishment of a Residential Collegiate hall in London etc', 7 August 1928, WBP, 5/34 folder 2, LSE.

Victorian conceptions of imperial federation, which aspired towards the eventual possibility of a supranational federal state. As Pietsch has shown, several scholarships were established at the turn of the century, by British universities and settler universities, that aspired towards this end. At a conference in 1903, for instance, both the 1851 Exhibition Scholarships (established in 1891 with proceeds from the Great Exhibition) and Rhodes' then new venture were promoted as advancing not only educational objectives but also the imperial goal of closer unity by encouraging students from the Empire to come to Britain.[38]

It is noteworthy that while the alternative plan favoured by Beveridge and Foster lacked Goodenough's racial dimension, it nevertheless promoted some of the central goals that preoccupied the Barclays chairman, including the importance of improving facilities in the imperial metropolis and the potential for higher education to further imperial unity. As would have been familiar a quarter century earlier, it was advertised as a proposed 'gift' from London to the Empire.[39] 'From the point of view of imperial unity', a memorandum read, 'one of the most important needs of the present time is the provision in London of a social and residential centre which would help make London a real home town to students from the overseas dominions'.[40]

Unlike Goodenough's view, however, their conception also reflected a new trend that by the 1920s saw apologists for empire embrace the language and goals of interwar internationalism. In his attempt to convince Rockefeller to fund their project, Beveridge had indeed appealed to internationalism. In addition to the general benefit it would mean

[38] T. Pietsch, 'Many Rhodes: Travelling Scholarships and Imperial Citizenship in the British Academic World, 1880-1940', p. 731.
[39] 'Foundling Hospital as a Gift from the City of London to the Empire', 24 October 1927, WBP, 5/43 folder 1, LSE.
[40] Ibid.

for overseas students, Beveridge affirmed the project could advance Rockefeller's stated goal of the 'development of better international understanding through increased contacts between young people of all nations at the University stage'.[41] Goodenough College, as it would become known, would eventually fulfil at least the latter part of this hope, housing students from around the world. Yet the competing visions that sought to animate it from its inception reflects the now well established body of research that examines the fluidity between notions of imperialism and internationalism after World War I.[42] In the approach assumed by Beveridge and Foster, we see a transition from views which saw overseas study as a tool to strengthen the bonds of empire to incipient attitudes that were struggling to reconcile imperialism and internationalism.

Creating International Minds

In order to understand this development and how it affected British approaches to overseas study, we must first turn our attention to the rise of what Akira Iriye has called cultural internationalism, or the promotion of international cultural exchange.[43] Developments in communication and transportation spurred early efforts at the end of the nineteenth century, including the establishment of the Red Cross, advocacy for international law and transnational athletic competitions, including the rebirth of the Olympic Games in 1896.[44] The development of cultural internationalism intensified dramatically after World War I, when statesmen, educators and philanthropists sought

[41] W. Beveridge to R. Fosdick, 9 March 1928, WBP, 5/34, folder 2, LSE.
[42] See, for instance, M. Mazower, *No Enchanted Palace: The End of Empire and the Ideological Origins of the United Nations* (Princeton, 2009), especially his discussion of Jan Smutts fusion of ideas concerning internationalism and imperialism in ch. 1, 'Jan Smutts and Imperial Internationalism'.
[43] A. Iriye, *Cultural Internationalism and World Order* (Baltimore, 1997).
[44] See, for instance, Gorman, p. 2.

new ways to decrease the nationalist tensions they deemed responsible for the breakdown of peace, including through increased attention to educational exchanges.

As we have noted, Beveridge and Foster appealed to internationalism when seeking funding from New York. Their effort was both genuine and practical. A Baptist animated by a Christian ideal of brotherhood, Rockefeller sought to use international higher education as a means of furthering mutual understanding between cultures and avoiding future wars.[45] The American financier was a committed internationalist and philanthropist, and was particularly sanguine about the prospects of education. In addition to supporting LSE's expansion during the interwar period, he also funded the International Education Board, incorporated in 1923, which encouraged education internationally, with special emphasis on agriculture and the natural sciences. It provided grants to universities, research institutes and individuals, including the physicists Enrico Fermi and Niels Bohr.[46]

Rockefeller was one of several prominent American internationalists who promoted overseas study as a means to advance the cause of peace. During the war, Stephen P. Duggan began lobbying for funds that could be devoted to an organisation that would promote understanding between disparate peoples, suggesting that particular focus be assigned to international educational cooperation.[47] Duggan was an internationalist who eventually became Director of the Council on Foreign Relations from its founding in 1921 until 1950. In 1919, he helped found the Institute of

[45] John D. Rockefeller Jr., 'International House', historical subject files, series III: alumni, series XIX: student life, box 392, p. 11, Columbia University Archives.
[46] Rockefeller Foundation, accessed 20 August 2013 at http://rockefeller100.org/exhibits/show/education/international-education-board.
[47] 'Memorandum upon the origin, organisation and activities of the Institute of International Education, 1923-37', Box 106, File 1066, Laura Spellman Rockefeller Memorial, RCA.

International Education [IIE] in New York City. The IIE sought to promote study and understanding between Americans and peoples from other countries through educational exchange. A non-profit organisation, it was founded in part by a grant from the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.[48] The IIE signalled a desire to expand exchanges in higher education and to organise them more rationally.[49]

In addition to Duggan, who became Director from its inception until 1946, the IIE's founders included Nicholas Murray Butler, the President of Columbia University and the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, and Elihu Root, a former U.S. Secretary of State [1905-09]. The organisation's first annual report emphasised the importance of creating an 'international mind', a phrase borrowed from an earlier book by Butler, and furthering the understanding between different peoples around the world.[50] It sought to make knowledge of exchange opportunities available to students, cooperating with other foundations to alert Americans about scholarships available to study in foreign countries.[51] It also organised educational tours for American students to see Europe and published a guidebook for foreign students explaining the American system of higher education.[52] One of its early successes occurred in 1921, when a Russian Student Fund was created to provide assistance to Russians whose studies were interrupted by the Revolution and Civil War. [53] Over 600,000 USD was raised, helping six hundred students

[48] 'First Annual Report of the Director', Institute of International Education. (New York, 1920), p. 2.
[49] Ibid., p. 3.
[50] 'First Annual Report of the Director', Institute of International Education, (New York, 1920), p. 1. Butler used the phrase in his book, *The International Mind: An Argument for the Judicial Settlement of International Disputes* (New York, 1913). Others used the phrase as well, including the American psychologist George Herbert Meade. For the latter, see G. Sluga, *Internationalism in the Age of Nationalism* (Philadelphia, 2013), p. 40.
[51] 'Second Annual Report of the Director', Institute of International Education, (New York, 1921), p. 10.
[52] 'Memorandum upon the origin, organisation and activities of the Institute of International Education, 1923-37', box 106, file 1066, Laura Spellman Rockefeller Memorial, RCA.
[53] 'Russian Student Fund 1922-24', Laura Spellman Rockefeller Memorial, RCA.

study throughout the U.S.[54] The numbers were small when compared to the thousands of Russian and Ukrainian students who emigrated to nearby countries (many to Czechoslovakia) in succeeding years, but still substantial.[55] Indeed, they were indicative of an emerging desire to promote international understanding through student mobility.[56]

That desire went far beyond encouraging cultural links between Russia and the U.S., and beyond the IIE and the West in general. While the IIE's internationalism was Eurocentric, Rockefeller's support for international students was broader. The greatest example of this was the building of International House in New York City, funded by Rockefeller and other philanthropists. The origins of the House dated to a chance meeting between the secretary of the upper Manhattan Young Men's Christian Association [YMCA] and a forlorn Chinese student in 1909. Over the next decade, the secretary, Harry Edmunds, drew from his serendipitous encounter to improve the lives and opportunities of foreign students in New York. His efforts culminated in 1924, with the founding of International House. Rockefeller called it one of the great forces for peace in the world.[57] It was a residential, recreational and social centre for students from all over the world, including four hundred dormitories for men and one hundred and twenty-five for women.[58] The institution's members were diverse, including Chinese, Indians and Filipinos, and it advertised to European and non-European students alike.[59] Rockefeller

[54] S. Duggan, *A Professor at Large*, p. 76.
[55] Alexis Wiren to B. Ruml, 21 August 1924, 'Russian Student Fund 1922-24', Laura Spellman Rockefeller Memorial, RCA.
[56] Alexis Wiren to B. Ruml, 16 July 1924, 'Russian Student Fund 1922-24', Laura Spellman Rockefeller Memorial, RCA.
[57] J.D. Rockefeller Jr. to George W. Wickersham, 11 June 1924, International Education Board, International House, 1923 - April 1925, series 1.1, box 4, folder 66, RCA.
[58] Ibid.
[59] For instance, in booklets such as the 'Directory of Chinese Students in America, 1936-37', box 219, folder 5: Chinese students, 1870-1990s, historical subject files, series XIX: student life, sub-series XIX.1: General, Rare Book and Manuscript Library, Columbia University Archives.

followed up his New York venture by funding residential houses in Chicago and Berkeley, California, each housing approximately five to six hundred international students.[60]

Across the Atlantic, the development of a separate project in London drew on the same hope that inspired Rockefeller. Indeed, a like-minded British advocate for overseas students, Mary Trevelyan, visited and admired Rockefeller's Houses.[61] Born in 1897, Trevelyan devoted much of her life to London's overseas students. Like Rockefeller, World War I prompted in her a belief that overseas study could be an antidote to hyper-nationalism. From 1933, Trevelyan became warden of Student Movement House, a meeting point for overseas students in London. It had been originally launched by a student-led Christian group, Christian Student Christian Movement [SCM], to pay tribute to fallen students from World War I. Like many other groups at the time, it became increasingly internationalist in its outlook during the interwar period. Several LSE students were members of SCM, including the Nigerian H.O. Davies and St. Lucian William Arthur Lewis. In Trevelyan's memoir, she emphasised that she was witnessing a historic trend that began after World War I.

> Every year since the Great War hundreds of young men and women from many lands have poured into this country in search of knowledge. London, the greatest cosmopolitan city in the world, has always been the Mecca of overseas students; London has received them, though not always with that friendly welcome which would make them feel at home. The importance of such a vast migration of the youth of the world to our capital city cannot be overestimated.[62]

[60] A final Rockefeller-funded International House was developed as a recreational centre for students at Cité universitaire in Paris. See 'Ninth Annual Report of the Director', Institute of International Education, (New York, 1928). It opened in 1936.
[61] M. Trevelyan, *From the Ends of the Earth,* p. 113-19.
[62] Ibid., p. 11.

Trevelyan made it her mission to ensure that London provided a hospitable home away from home. Part of her motivation was to prevent isolation and loneliness, particularly for non-Europeans. 'Both in Oxford and Cambridge,' she warned, 'most coloured students are very happy and enjoy a normal social life in college, but in a large modern, non-residential university like London it is far more difficult, for the lodging problem alone is great for everybody and it is not only the coloured man who is lonely'.[63] Unlike Oxbridge students, London's pupils could be spread out throughout the city, making socialising more challenging and facilitating isolation. Her Student Movement House, first located in a stately Georgian building on London's Russell Square, was not initially a residence, but rather provided a means for international students to meet and socialise. Among other facilities, Student Movement House offered a billiards-games room and white marble fireplaces. The total membership by the late 1930s was 1000, a third being British, as well as over a hundred and fifty from India.[64] This included LSE student Jomo Kenyatta. The Trinidadian historian C.L.R James went so far as to say that life for West Indians would have been dreadful had it not been for a few institutions like this.[65]

Trevelyan fluently expressed the interwar ideal of promoting international understanding through overseas students. 'The actions of many of the older generation', she noted, 'have led to World War. Is it too optimistic to hope that the great student migrations of the last twenty years may be a real factor in the rebuilding of the world

[63] Ibid., p. 51.
[64] M, Trevelyan, *From the Ends of the Earth* (London, 1942), pp. 19, 175.
[65] E. Jolly, *Cultural Imperialism as Home? Mary Trevelyan and Student Movement House, 1932-1946* (Sheffield Hallam University MA thesis, 2014), pp. 42-6.

after the war on a saner basis of trust and tolerance between one nation and another?'[66] Adults had plunged the world into war, she argued, and exposing the youth to diverse nationalities could pave the way to a better future. Such idealism echoed what was being heard in New York, and elsewhere. To be sure, internationalist sentiments were expressed through a myriad of cultural, educational and non-governmental associations that promoted friendship and solidarity between university students through particular versions of internationalism and transnational student mobility across the Atlantic.

One such group was the International Student Service [ISS]. The ISS grew out of the World Student Christian Federation, created in Sweden in 1895, which sought to promote Christianity and international peace. It provided a number of services to students in distress, and was particularly involved in funding student refugees affected by the World Wars.[67] LSE student Wu Enyu, for instance, was originally supposed to be funded by the Chinese Ministry of Education.[68] When his funding from home was interrupted by the Sino-Japanese war and he experienced difficulty financing his education, LSE agreed to remit by loan his tuition fees on the condition that the ISS was helping him 'substantially'.[69] The same agreement was available to LSE Chinese students P.L. Tang, Chiang Pei-Hua, Wu Wen-Hui and Chen Yao-Sheng.[70] More generally, the ISS also sponsored cultural cooperation, attempting, for example, to bring Jews and anti-Semites together.[71]

---

[66] M. Trevelyan, *From the Ends of the Earth*, p. 12.
[67] James Parkes, 'The Story of the International Student Service', n.d., V.K. Krishna Menon Papers, box 1, file 3/4, NMML.
[68] Admission application form, Wu En Yu, student dossier, LSE.
[69] Dean of Postgraduate studies at LSE to Miss N. Challoner (of the ISS), 17 November 1936, Wu En Yu, student dossier, LSE.
[70] Ibid.
[71] James Parkes, 'The Story of the International Student Service', n.d., Krishna Menon Papers, box 1, file 3/4, NMML.

Other associations existed along stricter religious or gender-specific lines, such as the Pax Romana organisation, created in 1921 as an international federation of Catholic students and intellectuals, and the International Federation of University Women, established in London to promote friendship among university women.[72] Like the ISS, these groups were rooted in pre-war efforts to promote versions of internationalism and had ambitious transnational goals, targeting groups they hoped to help or ideologies they wished to foster.

In a separate strain of internationalist thinking that also saw opportunities in overseas study, the newly formed Soviet Union promoted students to attend specially designed universities to encourage socialism internationally. The Comintern, founded in 1919 to promote communism abroad, funded institutions for international students, including the International Lenin School for Western Communists, the Communist University for National Minorities of Western Countries, the Communist University of Toilers of China and the Communist University of the Toilers of the East [KUTV] for other Asian students, as well as black and white Africans.[73] These Comintern schools operated for a limited time, yet they reflected the breadth of thinking about how to promote political objectives internationally through overseas study. While touring the USSR in 1927, LSE Indian student Minoo Masani met Malayan, Black and Chinese students from the Oriental and Sun-Yat-Sen universities.[74] Asian students, including Vietnamese and Chinese leaders Ho Chi Minh and Deng Xiaoping, heavily outnumbered

[72] A. Iriye, *Global Community: The Role of International Organizations in the Making of the Contemporary World* (Berkeley, 2002), p. 38; J. Goodman, 'International Citizenship and the International Federation of University Women before 1939', *History of Education* 40, no. 6 (2011), pp. 701-721.

[73] I. Filatova, 'Indoctrination or Scholarship? Education of Africans at the Communists University of the Toilers of the East in the Soviet Union, 1923-1937', *Paedagogica Historica: International Journal of the History of Education* 35, no. 1 (1999), p. 44.

[74] M.R. Masani, *Bliss was it in that Dawn,* p. 31.

Africans, yet future African leaders attended the schools as well, including Jomo Kenyatta, who went to KUTV in 1932 prior to enrolling at LSE.

One of the instructors at KUTV was the Indian communist M.N. Roy. Earlier in Tashkent, Roy had founded the Communist Party of India in 1920. He also led the Central Asiatic Bureau of the Comintern and an Indian Military School that sought to train Indian professional revolutionaries. When the School closed following a deal with the British, Roy moved to Moscow to become an instructor of Marxism and colonialism at KUTV and continued educating a cadre of future revolutionaries.[75] He cautioned about the danger of idealising student life in the U.S. and Europe, specifically warning against being lulled by reactionary student bodies in Western universities. Rather, he asserted that for Indian students to become more useful, they should connect with the 'international movement of revolutionary youths'.[76] Despite KUTV's efforts to this end, Roy disliked the concentration of power in Moscow, eventually breaking with Stalin and proceeded to Berlin.[77]

Roy was not the only one who had difficulties with Soviet tactics. Students were bestowed a highly politicised and ideological education and few creature comforts.[78] Many Africans and black Americans experienced racism.[79] One KUTV assessment of Kenyatta suggested he was critical of the education:

---

[75] M.N. Roy, *M.N. Roy's Memoirs* (New York, 1964), p. 526.
[76] M.N. Roy, 'On students and the National Struggle', 10 May 1923, in Sibnarayan Ray (ed.), *Selected Works of M.N. Roy,* vol. II, 1923-1927, (New York, 1988), p. 222.
[77] Manjapra, p. 46.
[78] Filatova, pp. 53, 51.
[79] For a more sanguine view of the Comintern universities, see: W. McClellan, 'Africans and Black Americans in the Comintern Schools, 1925-1934', *The International Journal of African Historical Studies* 26, no. 2 (1993), pp. 371-90. McClellan argues that they did provide education, albeit for a small cohort of black migrants, which played a part in the assault on racism and colonialism in the twentieth century. For his discussion on the racism of white Americans, Britons and Canadians see pp. 376-7; for Soviet racism, see p. 387.

> Joken [Kenyatta] has started to doubt the validity of his national reformist way but at the same time he does not consider our way, the way of revolutionary struggle, to be correct as well…At one of the meetings he contrasted our school and the bourgeois school and declared that the bourgeois school is higher than ours in every sense, and in particular a bourgeois school teaches and gives the opportunity to think independently.[80]

Kenyatta's criticism spoke to Moscow's pedagogical failures, yet his presence exemplified the importance placed on foreign study across regional and ideological boundaries. Students – if they embodied the right ideas – could be highly useful.

The most ambitious effort to promote the international mobility of students, scholars and knowledge at the time emerged from two European bodies. The first was founded in 1922, when the newly created League of Nations established in Geneva the International Committee on Intellectual Cooperation [ICIC] to promote dialogue between intellectuals, artists, scientists, researchers and students beyond the confines of the nation state. The project was supported by a number of prominent internationalists, including Albert Einstein, Madame Curie, the philosopher Henri Bergson and the British classicist Gilbert Murray. An affiliated organisation, the International Institute for Intellectual Cooperation [IIIC], was established in Paris in 1926 and was to act as the executive arm of the League Committee.[81] Another British classicist, Alfred Zimmern, became the deputy director of the IIIC between 1926-30. The two bodies were the forerunners to the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization [UNESCO], formed after World War II.

The recent rejuvenation of interest in the League of Nations has tended to overlook the role of overseas study in thinking about how to improve cultural

[80] Quoted from Filatova, p. 61.
[81] For more on the International Committee on Intellectual Cooperation and the International Institute of Intellectual Cooperation, see D. Laqua, 'Transnational Intellectual Cooperation, the League of Nations, and the Problem of Order', *Journal of Global History* 6, no. 2 (July 2011), pp. 223-247.

understanding.[82] Within the sphere of intellectual cooperation, the activity of the League of Nations was to encourage 'collaboration between nations in all fields of intellectual effort in order to promote a spirit of international understanding as a means to the preservation of peace'.[83] The ICIC's objective was to advance intellectual co-operation through 'international collaboration with a view to promoting the progress of general civilisation and human knowledge'.[84] Cultural, intellectual and academic exchange was seen as a way to achieve these general goals, as well as more specific aims. Marie Curie, for instance, advocated for the exchange of advanced scientific students, while Gilbert Murray supported the exchange of secondary school teachers.[85]

In regards to universities, the ICIC promoted literary, artistic and scientific exchange of information, in part through student and professor exchanges. In 1923, the ICIC discussed advancing the understanding between European and Oriental peoples, a League aim more generally, by promoting the study of modern languages. It recommended that professors be given facilities to visit foreign countries to study the languages they taught. Students, moreover, were to be encouraged to be more mobile through reductions in travel expenses, tuition, maintenance, and perhaps facilitating a Master to accompany them.[86] The ICIC also called for inter-university correspondence between students and for the foundation of foreign study scholarships for university

[82] For instance, S. Pedersen, *The Guardians: The League of Nations and the Crisis of Empire* (Oxford, 2015).
[83] Conference for the Reduction and Limitation of Armaments Documentary Material forwarded by the International Organisation on Intellectual Co-operation, 24 February 1932, Minute Book of the British National Committee for Intellectual Cooperation, ED 25/25, NAUK.
[84] Ibid.
[85] 'Ninth Annual Report of the Director', International Institute of Education, (New York, 1928), p. 4.
[86] Committee on Intellectual Cooperation Sub-Committee on Inter-University Relations. Resolutions by the Sub-Committee concerning mutual International Assistance for the study of modern language, literature and civilisations, 28 April 1923, ED 25/1, NAUK.

students studying modern languages.[87] To advance understanding between civilisations, the ICIC additionally suggested that universities establish permanent missions comprised of scholars, artists, professors and students, and make every effort to allow foreign universities or learned bodies to do the same in their country.[88] It advised that in doing so, every effort should be made to 'study the contemporaneous life of the country chosen, in all its aspects, and to train specialists who, when they return to their own country, will devote their time to teaching the language, literature, art and history of the country selected'. [89] To help advance its objectives, the ICIC established national committees in several countries, in and outside Europe, including throughout Latin America, China and Japan.[90]

The League's bodies devoted to intellectual cooperation had limited goals, primarily seeking to promote exchange by providing students and professors with information regarding other countries and their educational facilities, encouraging prospective migrants to then take the initiative themselves. [91] Especially after 1929, it was poorly funded. Perhaps most restrictive, as Daniel Laqua has highlighted regarding League of Nations interest in education more generally, was the national nature of education. Laqua quotes the French politician and internationalist Léon Bourgeois, who noted that 'Systems of education, scientific or philosophical research may lead to great

[87] Ibid. For promotion of professor and student exchanges, see also: A. Hill to Halecki, 11 January 1924, ED 25/1, NAUK.
[88] Committee on Intellectual Cooperation Sub-Committee on Inter-University Relations. Resolutions by the Sub-Committee concerning mutual International Assistance for the study of modern language, literature and civilisations, 28 April 1923, ED 25/1, NAUK.
[89] Ibid.
[90] ICI Suggestions Relative to the Organisation of National Committees on International Co-operation, ED 25/1, NAUK.
[91] They understood their role as helping to coordinate and organise existing institutions, including the World's Student Christian Federation, the International Students' Confederation, the Pax Romana and the International Federation of University Women. See: 'Complete Text of the Recommendations of the Committee on Intellectual Co-operation in University Matters', 6 November 1924, ED 25/4, NAUK.

international results, but they would never be initiated or would never prosper if they were not bound up with the deepest national sensibilities'.[92]

These limitations hampered League efforts to promote educational exchange. Yet their efforts and successes, as with the many similar organisations that were born from the ashes of World War I, underscored a budding trend in the history of overseas study. Increasingly, student mobility was seen as an innovative way to shape post-war international relations in a direction likely to increase understanding and the chance of peace. That belief, held by international organisations, philanthropists and those devoted to the well-being of overseas students generally, also shaped the approach to colonial students assumed by imperial institutions.

Ambassadors of Great Worth: An Imperial Internationalism?

When the ICIC was being established, a British organisation responded that it already specialised in most of what the ICIC proposed to do.[93] The ICIC'S detractor, the Universities Bureau of the British Empire [UBBE] (later the Association of Universities of the British Commonwealth), was a bureau of information for academics and students in the Empire. Founded in 1913, it organised conferences and congresses, promoted greater cooperation between the far-flung universities of the Empire, and, like the ICIC and IIE, encouraged academic mobility and provided students with information on available courses and scholarships. It also collaborated with organisations pursuing similar goals. In America, the IIE represented the UBBE and supplied it with information about foreign students in the U.S.

[92] Laqua, 'Transnational Intellectual Cooperation, the League of Nations, and the Problem of Order', pp. 238-9.
[93] ED 25, NAUK.

Cooperation with the ICIC proved to be more tenuous at first. While some Britons, such as Murray, were supportive of the ICIC, the Foreign Office was more sceptical.[94] Eventually initial fears, which included a concern that it would become a tool of French propaganda subsided, or were at least muted by practical considerations.[95] The UBBE liaised with the ICIC until 1929, when Foreign Office pressure from Foreign Secretary Austen Chamberlain led to the creation of a British National Committee [of Intellectual Cooperation], as much out of concern about London appearing obstinate by not engaging with Paris and Geneva as it was about pretences to internationalism.[96]

Britain's acceptance of the ICIC did not signal a turn away from imperial institutions like the UBBE, but it was reflective of imperialism's embrace of the language and aims of internationalism after World War I. Some saw the British Empire as a League of Nations 'in miniature'. In his 1920 book, *The British Commonwealth of Nations*, the historian and League of Nations official H. Duncan Hall examined the relationship between the British Empire and the League. He emphasised the internationalism of the Empire, arguing that because of its vast size, inclusion of diverse civilisations and efficiency, it possessed 'a far greater capacity for international co-operation than the larger, less intimate, and more cumbersome League.'[97] Hall believed the English-speaking peoples had a unique talent for international cooperation, and therefore had a 'great duty' to be the 'torch-bearers of internationalism'.[98] This effort to foster internationalism could involve several features, including developing international

[94] G. Murray to A. Hill, 22 January 1923, ED 25/2, NAUK.
[95] S. Gaselee (FO) to A. Hill, 2 January 1928, ED 25/4, NAUK.
[96] ED 25, NAUK.
[97] H.D. Hall, *The British Commonwealth of Nations* (London, 1920), p. 359
[98] Ibid.

institutions, helping to fight poverty, hunger and disease, advancing a just dispersal of world resources, as well as 'promoting the interchange of students and teachers'.[99]

Hall was not alone in envisioning the Empire as an agent of peace. In 1921, at the first Congress of the UBBE after the First World War, Lord Curzon, then serving as Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, praised the spread of universities throughout the world and claimed that they strengthened the 'spiritual fellowship of mankind'.[100] He called for the collection and distribution of information that could facilitate the movement of scholars as well as providing 'opportunities for students of outside or foreign Universities to complete their course in English Universities, and vice versa'.[101] For Curzon, Germany's recent defeat created an opportunity for English universities to become the 'Mecca of the educational world'.[102] According to the former Viceroy of India, the UBBE's success in these endeavours would determine how the institution would be judged. Concluding his remarks, Curzon posited that the UBBE could not only play an important part in strengthening the ties of the British Empire, but that it could also 'aspire to a wider and more cosmopolitan range of influence, and that as it draws within its orbit the educated intelligence of other countries, and notably of America, it may exercise an appreciable influence on the peace of the world'.[103] In fact, the UBBE had national, imperial and international goals.[104]

[99] Ibid.
[100] Lord Curzon in: *Second Congress Proceedings,* (London, 1921), p. 5
[101] Ibid.
[102] Ibid.
[103] Ibid, p. 6.
[104] ED 25/1, NAUK.

At the 1926 Congress, delegates were present from universities throughout the Empire, including from numerous Indian universities.[105] By the mid 1930s, the UBBE's University Information Bureau and Advisory Committees had been established in practically every province in India.[106] In 1936, two newly created administrative units in India, Sind and Orissa, set up a Students' Advisory Committee and Students' Information Bureau respectively at the suggestion of the High Commissioner. The Bureau and Committees were regularly supplied with calendars and prospectuses of British educational institutions and were periodically notified of changes in regulations that could affect admission of Indian students.[107] All this was meant to save students 'a good deal of trouble and possibly disappointment if they first consulted one of the' two.[108] To be sure, like the ICIC, these efforts were often hampered by underfunding and met with mixed, or delayed success.[109] The creation of scholarships for research students within the Empire was desired, for instance, as early as 1903, yet the UBBE did not establish them until 1960 (by which time it had been rebranded the Association of Universities of the British Commonwealth).[110] If its limitations highlighted the challenges inherent to turning ideas into policy, the UBBE's goals and achievements nevertheless signalled both the soft power value that was placed on students from the Empire as well as efforts to use imperial institutions to pursue larger internationalist goals.

The cosmopolitan ambitions of cultural internationalism, which Curzon suggested must be part of the UBBE's mission, also influenced organisations with more specific

[105] *Third Congress Proceedings,* (London, 1926), p. xvii. This included S. Radharkrishnan from the University of Calcutta.
[106] 'Report on the Work of the Education Department, 1935-36', (London, 1937), p. 11.
[107] Ibid.
[108] Ibid.
[109] Ibid.
[110] E. Ashby, *Community of Universities* (London, 1988), p. 4.

roles as well. One institution that was generally optimistic about South Asian students in Britain particularly was the Indian Students' Department. The Department was established in 1910 as a centre for Indian Students, as well as people interested in India and Indian students. It was transferred from control of Secretary of State in Council to the High Commissioner for India in 1920.[111] Even before imminent independence became a realisable goal after World War II, the Department signalled an imperial and internationalist orientation, affirming that study in Britain was an important imperial matter, regardless of what happened later, likely suggestive of a future in which India attained home rule or independence.[112] On the one hand, this amounted to the milder flip side on the coin of collaboration, using foreign study to foster alliances and ensure Britain's strategic interests in South Asia. The students would 'undoubtedly prove to be ambassadors of great worth, ready and willing to do all they can to foster the most friendly relations and understanding between the two peoples'.[113] A pleasant experience in Britain, intellectually stimulating while also generally agreeable, was strategically advantageous and should be encouraged.

On the other hand, the Students' Department was articulating a more layered view of overseas study, one that involved a cultural internationalist component as well. Students could be valuable interpreters of West to East and vice versa,

> helping to spread, during their sojourn abroad, a wider and more enlightened knowledge of the traditions and culture of their own country, and, on their return to India, taking back with them aspects, ideas and ideals of Occidental culture which have most impressed them. They, with their experience and first-hand knowledge of European educational conditions, will also be in a position when they have embarked, as it is hoped most of them in due course will, on careers of service and distinction to India, to be of real service in the way of giving valuable

[111] 'Report on the Work of the Education Department, 1920-21', (London, 1922).
[112] 'Report on the Work of the Education Department, 1936-37', (London, 1938).
[113] 'Report on the Work of the Education Department, 1936-37', (London, 1938).

> and salutary advice to the young compatriots who propose to follow in their footsteps and leave their motherland to join Universities abroad.[114]

It was hoped that postgraduate students in particular would exchange experiences and spread international goodwill.

> 'These older and more mature students are usually brought into close contact, not only with their teachers, but also with other senior students from home and overseas likewise engaged on research work. What may perhaps best be called international friendships which tend to mutual respect and understanding may thus be formed, fruitful for goodwill on all sides.'[115]

By the 1930s, the Indian Students Department bemoaned that there were not enough grants available to Indians. It complained, for instance, that while the 1851 Exhibition Scholarships for the first time opened one of their Overseas Science Research Scholarships to India in 1937, other important imperial scholarships still excluded the subcontinent, perhaps a swipe at the Rhodes Trustees.[116]

For the Students' Department, as well as the Board of Trade and other imperial officials, the relevance of colonial students was significantly enhanced when they were seen not only as tools to advance the cause of internationalism but as playing a role in larger economic, cultural and strategic anxieties. Apprehensions were particularly acute regarding potential competition from American universities, which could be an alternative destination for colonial students and result in collateral damage for British economic interests. Enquiries about the U.S., as well as Japan, increased throughout India, including Allahabad, Bombay, Lahore and Madras.[117] As early as 1922, the Indian Students' Department reported that 'American manufacturers and business men are more generous in their provision of facilities for Indian students than are English manufacturers

[114] 'Report on the Work of the Education Department, 1935-36' (London, 1937), p. 12.
[115] Ibid.
[116] 'Report on the Work of the Education Department, 1936-37' (London, 1938).
[117] 'Report on the Work of the Education Department, 1920-21', (London, 1922).

and business men'.[118] The inability or unwillingness of English manufacturers to provide Indian students with facilities for practical study was seen to result in their going to study in the U.S. instead, where they would 'learn to compete with the English manufactures' and after completing their degrees and entering the business world, 'naturally tend to resort to America' for their contracts, machinery and other requirements.[119]

These concerns increased following the Great Depression and often coincided with internationalist sentiments as well. In 1933, what became the Committee on the Education and Training of Students from Overseas was launched '…to investigate the possibility of encouraging students to come to the U.K. from overseas for education and training…'[120] The Overseas Trade Development Council, in collaboration with the Board of Education, was behind the effort to form the Committee.[121] It reflected the aspiration of encouraging better cultural relations while also encouraging British trade.[122] It was part of on-going larger debates about British culture and institutions, at home and abroad, which also saw the birth of the British Council in 1934.[123] The Committee devoted particular attention to American success, pointing to the money contributed by private citizens and foundations specifically.[124] The final report, released in 1935, drew on information provided by universities, industry, the dominions, and elsewhere. The report mentioned an 'urgent' need to take similar action in the Empire, affirming that other

[118] Ibid.
[119] Ibid.
[120] Overseas students, education and training in the U.K., 8 May 1933, DO 35 325/6, NAUK.
[121] Letter to R.A. Wiseman, 17 April 1933, DO 35 325/6, NAUK.
[122] Report of the Committee on the Education and Training of Students from Overseas, 24 Jan. 1935, DO 35 325/6, NAUK, p. 1.
[123] Ibid., pp. 2, 3.
[124] Ibid., p 2.

countries had gained influence, and that immediate steps needed to be taken to spread British influence abroad and attract students to Britain.[125]

In making its case, the Overseas Trade Development Council of the Department of Overseas Trade, while primarily concerned with increasing British exports, reflected earlier efforts to use students to promote cultural internationalism between Britain and its settler colonies. It argued '…that to encourage the flow of students between this and other countries was one of the best methods of promoting and maintaining friendly international and inter-imperial relations'.[126] It was hoped that foreign study could promote international peace. Overall, the report supported the creation of additional opportunities to encourage students to go to the UK, though it was equivocal at times and was conservative in its prescription. It emphasised 'suitable students', and there was scepticism about students from less developed countries.[127]

Despite focus on the dominions, and uncertainty about students from less developed countries, the report was sanguine about Chinese students as well. The report asserted that trade with China would benefit by educating Chinese students to 'British methods and products'.[128] It praised Chinese students and highlighted the country's potential, thereby making the opportunity of attracting Chinese students a matter of 'great importance'.[129] The Overseas Trade Development Council of the Department of Overseas Trade was not alone in its interest in Chinese students. Again, increased competition from the U.S. fuelled attention. In 1909, Washington diverted money from the Boxer Indemnity Fund, war reparations China owed after the Boxer Rebellion of 1899-1901, to

[125] Ibid.
[126] Ibid., pp. 14-15.
[127] Ibid., p 3.
[128] Ibid., p 2.
[129] Ibid., p 4.

promote Chinese students to attend American universities, as well as helping to found Beijing's now prestigious Tsinghua University. In 1910, seventy Chinese students were sent to the U.S.[130] One historian has called the endeavour 'the most consequential and successful in the entire foreign-study movement of twentieth-century China', even if it has been acknowledged as promoting reform in China specifically along American lines.[131] None other than Lord Lugard raised the point that business contracts that could otherwise have gone to British firms would instead be awarded to U.S. companies, based on contacts formed during the time Chinese students were there.[132]

The more limited British institutional presence in China and the lack of any broad-based nationalist movement in Britain's East Asian colonies made the question of Chinese students in the UK relatively less important from a political and security standpoint than their South Asian counterparts. The question of British educational influence in East Asia was nevertheless something that preoccupied Lugard. When he was Governor of Hong Kong (1907-12), he helped found the University of Hong Kong, a project that remained dear to his heart long after he left Asia, and he represented the Island as a member of the UBBE.[133] Lugard's period as Governor overlapped with the fall of the Qing Dynasty and the dissolution of central authority on the Chinese mainland. The university was established in the backdrop of a number of other educational institutions being founded by Britain's rivals, including the U.S. and Germany. Lugard's stated objectives for the university reflected both the idealistic and practical hopes that

[130] Ye, Weili, *Seeking Modernity in China's Name: Chinese Students in the United States, 1900-1927* (Stanford, 2001), p. 1.
[131] Ye, pp. 10-11.
[132] Lugard to secretary of Federation of British Industries, 24 may 1935, Hong Kong University: Strickland Investigation, 1934-37, Lugard Papers, 94/8, Commonwealth and African Studies Library [CAS].
[133] Lugard to [unknown], 30 May 1932, Hong Kong University: finance 1929-33, Lugard Papers, 94/7, CAS. He also represented Malta.

remained at the heart of many British proponents who advocated providing British education to colonial students. The founding of the university, he claimed in 1932, had two primary motivations:

> The training of men without denationalisng them, who might take part in the rebuilding of China on British ideals, and, b). The promotion of British economic interests by training engineers and other technicians who would be familiar with English terms and standards and look to England for materials.[134]

Five years later, Lugard reaffirmed and clarified his hope that a few highly talented Chinese youths would accept and uphold the 'British tradition of civic responsibility' while continuing to nurture native traditions in art, history, literature and customs such as filial piety.[135] With their characters already developed, students might proceed for postgraduate study at Oxford or Cambridge.[136]

The presence of Chinese students in the UK garnered less interest at first. When a professor of Chinese at Oxford made a case that each College should accept one Chinese student, he was rebuffed. He was told that his claim that Britain would be flooded with applicants after the political turmoil that followed the 1911 Revolution stabilised was premature. The delegates also affirmed that China should not be treated differently than other countries, aside from ones in the (formal) empire, which deserved precedence.[137] At the time, there were one hundred and fifteen Indians studying at Oxford, and two

[134] Lugard to [unknown], 30 May 1932, Hong Kong University: finance 1929-33, Lugard Papers, 94/7, CAS.
[135] Lugard to Keigwin, 10 March 1937, Hong Kong University: Strickland Investigation, 1934-37, Lugard Papers, 94/8, CAS.
[136] Ibid.
[137] '18th Meeting of the Delegates for Oriental Students', 10 June 1921, Minutes, Delegates for Oriental Students, DC 39/1, Oxford University Archives.

Chinese.[138] By 1927, there were comparable numbers of Chinese in British universities as there were West Indians, despite the vast demographic imbalances of the two regions.[139]

As early as 1910, concern of commercial disadvantage with the U.S. motivated one former M.P. to suggest Britain divert some of its Boxer Indemnity surplus towards attracting Chinese students.[140] Yet Britain did not act until the mid-nineteen thirties, when a similar plan to the U.S. one was adopted, with funds being used to develop the China Institute, a meeting point and club house for Chinese students in London, as well as fund twenty scholarships annually for Chinese students to study in Britain.[141] As with Indian students, the motivations were multi-layered. While security and political collaboration were not factors, economic self-interest and disquiet over foreign competition were. Moreover, the Chinese case illustrated how the language of cultural internationalism, which stressed promoting peace and reducing nationalist tensions, could be co-opted for other reasons, in this instance the promotion of British culture abroad.

A 'narrowly nationalistic approach'

Just as those concerned with imperial stability, future trade relations and the extension of British thought and culture incorporated aspects of cultural internationalism in their approaches to overseas study, colonial nationalists also embraced similar thinking as they assessed the opportunities that student mobility presented. For Indian anti-colonial nationalist leaders, the presence of Indian elites in British universities meant that the stakes of foreign study could be even higher. As early as 1905, the nationalist

[138] Ibid.
[139] 'University of London: Students from overseas in the universities of Great Britain and Ireland, 1927-28', WBP, 5/29, LSE.
[140] A.D. Provand, 'Disposal of the Boxer Indemnity', 1910 [n.d.], T1/11190/4377, NAUK.
[141] 'British Boxer Indemnity Scholarships', *The Straits Times*, 4 June 1936, p. 18; See also International Institute of Intellectual Cooperation, 'China Sub-Committee', ED 25/62, NAUK.

Shyamji Krishnavarma founded India House (*Bharat Bhavan*) in Highgate and inaugurated several travelling scholarships for Indians, so long as they did not take positions in the colonial administration following graduation.[142] Himself educated at Balliol College, Oxford in the 1880s before becoming a revolutionary activist, Krishnavarma promoted the House along with V.D. Savarkar (who had received one of the scholarships to study at Gray's Inn). The House boasted visits from several other Indian nationalists, including Lala Lajpat Rai and Mohandas K. Gandhi. India House had a short life, eventually being shut down in 1910 after Madan Lal Dhingra, a student who had spent time at India House, assassinated Sir Curzon Wyllie.

To be sure, the issue of British education, in India and in the UK, posed as significant challenges to nationalist leaders as it did to their imperial overlords. This was especially true during Gandhi's first call to non-cooperation in 1920, when some nationalists advocated a boycott of British educational institutions in India. Gandhi stressed that the education system that Macaulay promoted forged clerks, not the qualities of self-respect or self-reliance that were required for leadership, hence the urgent need for national schools capable of producing leaders. Nationalist leaders thus faced a dilemma, namely how to address the conflict between benefitting from British education in the present on the one hand and aspiring towards longer-term independence from British institutions on the other.

Renuka Ray (née Mukherjee), who worked with Gandhi prior to studying at LSE in the 1920s, provides an example. Parents often hoped further education in England would lead to prestige and a successful career, perhaps in the ICS. When Ray's mother

[142] A. Tickell, 'Scholarship Terrorists: The India House Hostel and the "Student Problem" in Edwardian London,' in S. Mukherjee and R. Ahmed (eds.), *South Asian Resistances in Britain 1858-1947* (London, 2012), pp. 2-4.

and father decided that she would pursue her higher education in England, they discussed the choice with Gandhi beforehand. Ray claimed she 'protested vehemently', preferring to stay in India; seemingly inconsistent with his boycott in India, Gandhi made the case for her to travel to England.

> Education in England is education in a free atmosphere. I have myself had the advantage of this. You do not have to read and learn by heart as a Bible such books as *England's Work in India* nor the distorted history of India as taught in books published under government aegis in our country. I trust, in a free atmosphere without becoming an anglicized girl you will take full advantage of the education can come back well equipped to serve your country with courage and an independent outlook![143]

Gandhi's views on foreign study were typically ambiguous, reflecting the contradictions of his own background as well as the conflict of interests inherent to his supporting British institutions while leading the non-cooperation movement. He had attended University College London in the 1890s before practising law in South Africa. In making his case to Ray and her family, Gandhi emphasised not only the quality of British education but also the benefit of pursuing her training in a less restricted environment.[144] This was particularly true before World War I, when the number of Indian students in the UK was smaller and Indian nationalism not yet a mass movement; even as British intelligence monitored students more closely during the interwar era, students were freer than they were in India.[145] Still, it was a fine line to walk. Gandhi desired that Ray embrace the opportunities of advanced education while avoiding temptations.

---

[143] Quoted from R. Ray, *My Reminiscences* (New Delhi, 1982), p. 31. See also Oral History Transcript, Renuka Ray, p. 7, NMML.
[144] Ibid.
[145] S. Lahiri, pp. 52-3.

Higher education could promote a nation's interests, while also exposing it to unwanted influence. Gandhi's local concerns of cultural assimilation were similar to what Lugard referred to as denationalisation regarding Chinese students. Stephen Duggan expressed the same concerns about Americans studying abroad, using the same language to emphasise that he did not want U.S. citizens to become 'denationalized'. He specifically wanted Americans to have a bachelor's degree before going abroad, for instance, thereby reducing the chances they would come under undue foreign influence.[146] Like the students themselves, nationalist anxiety over the potential corrosiveness of overseas study crossed borders as well. India's dependence on British education, however, made the question more vexing for Gandhi.

Despite concerns of cultural contamination, he nevertheless affirmed that England provided a familiar environment, and one that could deliver significant benefits. Part of the familiarity, and solution to the problem of anchorless students alone in Britain, depended on personal networks. Many Indians had contacts in Britain, who could help ease the transition. Ray resisted family pressure to attend Cambridge, where her brother studied, preferring a non 'aristocratic' university like LSE.[147] This was made easier because Ray's family knew Eileen Power, the economic historian who had started lecturing at LSE in 1921. Power agreed to act as Ray's guardian during her time at LSE.[148]

Harold Laski's interest in Indian independence and in mentoring Indian students provoked Indian nationalists to see Laski as a guide to young students. Ray and several other students formed close personal and intellectual attachments to him, which will be

[146] S. Duggan, *A Professor at Large*, p. 49.
[147] R. Ray, *My Reminiscences*, p. 33.
[148] Ibid.

further explored in chapters four and five. In addition to Ray, another student who set this precedent was V.K. Krishna Menon, a pupil of Laski's in the late 1920s. Menon remained in London following graduation, eventually leading an anti-colonial group, the India League. Through Menon and his activism, Laski extended his contacts with Gandhi and Nehru. By the 1930s, Indian nationalists considered him a valuable guide to young students.[149]

Writing to his friend H.S.L. Polak in 1936, Gandhi suggested Laski might guide a new student.

> This will be presented to you by Kamalnayan Bajaj, the eldest son of Jamnalalji. However much we may fight Great Britain, London is increasingly becoming our Mecca or Kashi. Kamalnayan is no exception. I have advised him to take up a course in the London School of Economics. Perhaps you will put him in touch with prof. Laski who may not mind guiding young Bajaj.[150]

As Gandhi had advised to Ray, he warned Kamalnayan there would be endless temptation in England and he encouraged him to read the *Bhagavad Gita*, part of the Hindu epic the *Mahabharat*, every day.[151] This did not diminish Gandhi's enthusiasm for education in Britain, but the excursion was understood as being less dangerous when trustworthy guides were available. In Kamalnayan's case, Gandhi recommended his friend and fellow pacifist, Horace Alexander, in addition to Laski and others.[152]

---

[149] K.R. Narayanan later recalled how Laski's letter impressed Nehru upon returning to India. 'When I finished with LSE, Laski, on his own, gave me a letter of introduction for Panditji [Nehru]. So on reaching Delhi I sought an appointment with the P.M.' After some small talk, Narayanan sensed it was time for him to leave and handed Nehru the letter while walking away. 'When I was half way round, I heard the sound of someone clapping from the direction I had just come. I turned to see Panditji beckoning me to come back. He had opened the letter as I left his room and read it. "Why didn't you give this to me earlier?"' After some follow up questions, Narayanan found himself entering the Foreign Service. For more, see G. Gandhi, 'A Remarkable Life Story', *Frontline*, 22, no 24, (2 Dec., 2005).
[150] M Gandhi to H.S.L. Polak, 6 July 1936, *CWMG*, vol. 63, p. 122.
[151] M. Gandhi to K. Bajaj, 6 July 1936, *CWMG*, Vol. 63, p. 122.
[152] M. Gandhi to H. Alexander, 6 July 1936, CWMG, Vol. 63, p. 122.

In the end, Gandhi felt British education could help fashion Ray, Kamalnayan and others into more productive members of society, better able to contribute to India. If Gandhi's hope for India's future, with its focus on the village unit, was at odds with the embrace of Western notions of modernity that prompted Meiji and Qing Dynasty reformers to send students to the West in their own self-strengthening efforts, it was the flip side to the same coin which sought to use foreign study as a means to address the power imbalance that had emerged with the West since the early nineteenth century. While India's subject position in the British Empire deprived it of the flexibility to send students as Japan and China did, the privately funded Tata Scholarship is an example of a similar effort, one that further highlights the ambiguities of India's version of self-strengthening.

Since its establishment in 1892 by the founder of Tata Group, Jamsetji Tata, the Scholarship has provided loans to post-graduates and mid-career professionals who require further training abroad. One went to K.R. Narayanan [President of India, 1997-2002]. Born as a member of the Scheduled Castes to an impoverished family in the Princely State of Travancore, he secured scholarships to attain an education at Travancore University, where he studied British and Indian history, logic and English literature, focusing in nineteenth century Romanticism. Narayanan then received a Tata Scholarship for study in England.[153] Before leaving, a Tata employee told Narayanan his clothing would not do, and took him shopping to buy new suits.[154] Attaining the Scholarship financed his studies and helped convince LSE to grant the future President

[153] K.R. Narayanan, student dossier, LSE.
[154] K.R. Narayanan, 'The Tata Scholarship Shaped my Personal and Professional Life', accessed 2 July 2011 at http://www.tata.com/aboutus/articlesinside/The-Tata-scholarship-shaped-my-personal-and-professional-life

admission in 1945.[155] To be sure, Tata founded the Scholarship not to subvert British authority but to strengthen the position of Indians within its governing apparatus, providing a means to facilitate entry into bodies like the ICS.[156]

Jawaharlal Nehru's position on study in England was at the same time more overtly nationalist, while also evoking strong internationalist undertones. Nehru attended Harrow before graduating from Trinity College, Cambridge in 1910 with a degree in natural science, finally obtaining a law degree at Inner Temple in 1912. He expressed ambiguity about Indian students coming to Britain as early as his time in Cambridge, when he mused that restrictions on the number of Indians allowed to study in Cambridge might prompt more interest in attending universities on the continent or elsewhere.[157] Were this to occur, he believed it would have been a positive development. 'They will then be more fit for doing something than if they had been to Oxford or Cambridge'.[158]

In 1928, Nehru wrote that if a student wished to enter the ICS, the medical services or the bar, he must make the familiar pilgrimage to Britain. If, however,

> he desires to do any kind of creative or useful work and not be a mere hanger-on to the British Government or a member of an overcrowded and parasitic profession, then it is folly for him to go to England. He will get the best of training – scientific, technical, medical, surgical and cultural – elsewhere and will be treated with far greater courtesy and consideration.[159]

There are several relevant parts to this quote. Firstly, there is the irony that Nehru, a product of Harrow and Cambridge and himself a member of the 'parasitic profession', began adopting a more radical stance against imperialism while in England, where he

[155] K.R. Narayanan, student dossier, LSE.
[156] 'Enabling a dream', accessed 2 July 2011 at http://www.tata.com/sustainability/articlesinside/ReI18gUGuYU=/TLYVr3YPkMU
[157] J. Nehru to M. Nehru, 18 March 1909, from *SWJN*1 (ed.) S. Gopal, S., vol. 1 (New Delhi, 1972), p. 66.
[158] Ibid.
[159] J. Nehru, 'India and the need for international contacts', 13 May 1928, from *SWJN*1, vol. 3, p. 385.

developed his leadership skills, confirming the fear of Linlithgow and others that Britain produced nationalists.[160] Secondly, the desire for 'useful' work was emphasised again. Distinguishing the so-called 'useful' student from the one training to become a Government of India apparatchik indicated the nationalist component in Nehru's thinking about overseas study as a tool to educate future leaders. Thirdly, the complexity of the issue was illustrated not only by Nehru's own past but by the future of his daughter, Indira, who would attend Oxford in the 1930s, despite Nehru's scepticism of education in Britain. Language and quality of educational institutions meant that Britain remained the primary option, even for suspicious nationalists.

If Nehru was exaggerating when he claimed that Indians could receive superior training elsewhere, his hope that students would attend universities abroad outside Britain was genuine. Students, he asserted, should make an effort to learn another language, which would enable them to go to other countries.[161] This was partly motivated by a reaction against racial biases Indians faced in Britain, which as we shall see in the succeeding chapter could become more severe when nationalism in India became a potent political force in the 1920s. But there were wider considerations as well.

Indeed, Nehru's concerns reflected the role of foreign education in his thinking on nationalism as well as his developing views on internationalism. For Nehru, like Roy, nationalist liberation and internationalism was a unified project.[162] As early as 1928, Nehru claimed that while nationalism was still dominant, internationalism was becoming a more palpable reality in world affairs, due to changes in technology and transportation, and the fact that modern wars could rarely be localised. Nehru acknowledged the

[160] Lahiri, pp. 180-83.
[161] J. Nehru, 'India and the need for international contacts', 13 May 1928, from *SWJN*1, vol. 3, p. 385.
[162] Manjapra, p. 44.

difficulty in thinking beyond nationalism in India, given the country's subject status. Yet imperialism was one of the great problems of the time, a fact that connected India to world history. Indian freedom was not only important for South Asia, but an 'essential condition for world freedom'.[163]

Nehru maintained that international contacts were important even when achieving national political ends.[164] India, he claimed, stagnated in isolation, culturally, politically and economically, and therefore must engage with the world. He emphasised the malleability and interconnectedness of the concepts of nationalism and internationalism. 'We must', he claimed, 'in addition to our nationalism develop an internationalism which is prepared to profit by the good things of other countries, and to cooperate with the progressive forces of the world'.[165] In this, he was echoing Rabindranath Tagore, whose patriotism shunned a more parochial nationalism.[166] The Bengali poet co-authored a book with Gilbert Murray in 1935, published by the IIIC, which affirmed his enduring hope for increased understanding between civilisations.[167] As he articulated years before, this involved India learning from the outside world (including but not exclusively the West): 'That our forefathers, three thousand years ago, had finished extracting all that was of value from the universe, is not a worthy thought'.[168]

For Nehru, overseas study was one of the means available to India to learn from the world and form contacts beyond England, and he denounced seeing the world though English eyes only.[169] He spoke of the example of Afghanistan, whose students, he

[163] J. Nehru, 'India and the need for international contacts', 13 May 1928, from *SWJN*1, vol. 3, p. 379.
[164] Ibid., 380.
[165] Ibid., 381.
[166] R. Guha (ed.), *Makers of Modern India* (New Delhi, 2010), p. 186.
[167] G. Murray and R. Tagore, *East and West* (Paris, 1935).
[168] R. Tagore, *India and the West* in R. Guha (ed.), *Makers of Modern India* (New Delhi, 2010), p. 188.
[169] J. Nehru, 'India and the need for international contacts', 13 May 1928, from *SWJN*1, vol. 3, p. 382.

claimed, were studying all over Europe, not just England, but in Paris and Berlin and Turkey and Russia.[170] Even before immediate independence was a foreseeable goal, Nehru connected what he believed to be colonial India's need for international contacts with larger political ends. 'We would also gradually build up a trained body of experts in international matters from whom we will develop our diplomatic corps of the future'.[171] His last point was an important one. As we will see, those with experience abroad, including students, provided much needed building materials for the creation of India's Foreign Service upon independence in 1947.

Conclusion

For Nehru, and the many other leading figures who devoted thought to foreign students, the interwar period ushered in a new and unprecedented interest in the advantages and perils of overseas study. Lord Curzon, Gandhi and Mary Trevelyan all described Great Britain as a 'Mecca' for international students, with the latter two singling out London in particular. The presence of overseas students provided several new opportunities. As internationalists, imperialists and anti-colonial nationalists grappled with the legacy of war and new challenges to empire, they were encouraged to view higher education from strategic perspectives. Imperialists sought to use foreign study to encourage collaboration in the colonial empire and promote the bonds of the dominion. After World War I, they increasingly adopted the language and aspirations of post-war internationalism, which itself developed different strands, from socialist internationalism to a focus on diminishing the nationalism that was seen to have uncorked the unchecked passions that led to World War I.

[170] Ibid.
[171] Ibid., p. 384.

Perhaps most interesting was the overlap and ambiguities between the apparently starkly different views. As Gandhi's equivocal stance on Ray's education indicated, taking advantage of British education in the midst of a campaign for independence from Britain proved to be an unavoidable paradox. Internationalists like Trevelyan, moreover, promoted national interests and imperial stability seamlessly with their higher international ideals, while imperial institutions such as the Indian Students' Department and the UBBE embraced the language and objectives of interwar internationalism.

These developments played an important part in shaping the future architecture of international study. Both Student Movement House and International House persist to the time of writing, as does Goodenough's London House. The latter, now Goodenough College, eventually became a residential centre open to all students, not only white males from the dominions, as its founder had hoped. The evolving framework of overseas study suggests the interwar period was fundamental to the further expansion of the phenomenon following World War II, while also highlighting that its origins consisted of a complex brew of worldviews. The following chapter will examine one of those views, internationalism, in greater detail, particularly how LSE students embraced varieties of cosmopolitanism and internationalism as a result of their experience of overseas study.

2

Cosmopolitanism and the Rise of Anti-Colonial Internationalism, 1919-1939

Reflecting on his experience as a student in the 1930s, the Indian diplomat T.N Kaul declared that his time studying in London transformed him from a nationalist into an internationalist.[1] At least in a general sense, this would have been music to the ears of institutions such as the ICIC, as well as interwar internationalists like Mary Trevelyan and Rockefeller, who understood overseas study as promoting tolerance and diminishing the power of nationalism they deemed responsible for the slaughter of World War I. To be sure, what Kaul meant by the term internationalist, and the nature of its relationship to nationalism, is unclear. Yet the connection he drew between study in London and the development of his internationalism may nonetheless be significant. In particular, Kaul's student experience, and that of the many other colonial elites who stepped out of British classrooms to assume political positions in countries emerging from imperial rule, may offer fresh insights into the emergence and character of cosmopolitanism and internationalism among colonial nationalists during the end of empire and decolonisation.

Metropolitan centres have been noted for serving as zones of global cultural contact, providing opportunities for anti-colonial activists to meet, coordinate activities and form what have been referred to as transnational advocacy networks.[2] Interwar and early post-war Paris and London, for instance, have been portrayed as witnessing a moment in which opposition to racial bias and empire spawned new unities amongst

---

[1] T.N. Kaul, *Reminiscences, discrete and indiscrete* (New Delhi, 1982), p. 36. Mukherjee also notes Kaul's statement, and points out that Indians increased their ability to contextualise themselves and their country internationally. See S. Mukherjee, *The Experience of the England-Returned,* pp. 128, 217.

[2] See, for instance, M. Makalani, *In the Cause of Freedom;* K. Manjapra, *M.N. Roy: Marxism and Colonial Cosmopolitanism*; M. Matera, *Black Internationalism and African and Caribbean Intellectuals in London, 1919-1950*; B.H. Edwards, 'The Shadow of Shadows', pp. 11-49. For more on advocacy networks, see M. Keck and K. Sikkink, *Activists Beyond Borders: Advocacy Networks in International Politics* (Ithica, NY., 1998).

colonial activists. This view has built on earlier arguments that depicted London in particular as an imperial 'junction box', where Africans and people of African descent in particular congregated and cooperated to fight a common enemy.[3]

Further scrutiny has cast doubt on the depth of inter-colonial relationships and highlighted the often superficial nature of expressions of solidarity beyond the regional level.[4] There was nevertheless something inherently international in the nationalist project, with Howe going so far as to say that 'international joint action by groups pursuing anticolonial ends' was a necessity.[5] Through classes, student clubs and other organisations, colonial students met and associated with Britons and peers from other colonies. Interactions raised fears both of Anglicisation and Westernisation on the one hand, as well as the development of political radicalisation through the emergence of networks of anti-colonial activists on the other.[6] Despite the inherent transnational quality of their activity, however, overseas students have received little attention in historical literature on the development of cosmopolitanism and internationalism amongst colonial nationalists. To be sure, universities were, and remain, cosmopolitan microcosms, concentrating people from different countries and creating opportunities for the creation of intellectual networks and transnational alliances.

Through the lens of LSE's colonial students, this chapter assesses the development of two major and often intertwined varieties of rooted cosmopolitanism, in which colonial students' nationalism was complemented by a deepening attachment to

---

[3] I. Duffield, 'Black People in Britain: History and the Historians', *History Today*, 31, no. 9 (Sept. 1981), pp. 35.

[4] See: N. Owen, 'Critics of Empire', in Judith Brown and Wm. Roger Lewis (eds.), *The Oxford history of the British Empire, Volume IV: The Twentieth Century* (Oxford, 1999); N. Owen, *The British Left and India: Metropolitan Anti-Imperialism, 1885-1947* (Oxford, 2007), esp. pp. 23, 197.

[5] Howe, p. 2.

[6] For fears of the influence of Western culture in India, see Mukherjee, 2007, pp. 184-5, 206.

Britain's culture and people, as well as growing identification with peers from other colonies.[7] It furthermore suggests that their experience in London prompted many students to embrace an 'anti-colonial' internationalism as an alternative version of internationalism based on colonial solidarity. I begin by assessing the impact of experiences in classrooms and student organisations that were facilitated by LSE's location in London. I then examine cooperation between students from different colonies under the aegis of the India League, an anti-colonial group led by LSE graduate V.K. Krishna Menon, to protest a series of international crises in the 1930s: the Second Italo-Abyssinian War [1935-36], the Spanish Civil War [1936-39] and the Second Sino-Japanese War [1937-45]. These events complemented university experiences and provided anti-colonial activists with greater organisational opportunities. I conclude by noting that collaboration was uneven and subject to limitations; indeed, cooperation also exposed serious divisions between colonial groups and failed to distil any permanent institutional apparatus for cooperation.

Cosmopolitan Experiences

Upon hearing that her nephew might attend LSE, a Canadian student's aunt vividly inquired, 'So you're enrolling at this famous school filled with black men and red women?'[8] The nephew, and future Prime Minister, Pierre Trudeau, did not hesitate to confirm his decision and the description of LSE's diversity. As indicated in the introduction, by the interwar period the School's growing reputation based on its focus on the emerging social sciences and respected young academics drew students from all over

[7] I draw from Kwame Anthony Appiah's understanding of rooted cosmopolitanism, which suggests that a rooted cosmopolitan is 'attached to a home of one's own, with its own cultural particularities', but also takes pleasure 'from the presence of other, different places that are home to other, different people.' K.A. Appiah, 'Cosmopolitan Patriots', *Critical Inquiry* 23, no. 3 (Spring, 1997), p. 618.
[8] P.E. Trudeau, *Memoirs* (Toronto, 1993), pp. 45-46.

the world, with its foreign student population consistently remaining around twenty per cent throughout the interwar period.[9] Trudeau, an LSE student in the 1940s, would have in fact experienced similar diversity had he attended the School ten or twenty years earlier.

The School's location contributed significantly to the opportunities students had to engage with each other inside and outside the university. LSE is situated in central London, along Houghton Street, on the corner of Kingsway, above the Strand. It was within walking distance to several student hostels, clubs and organisations, both nationalist and internationalist, scattered throughout the city. Mary Trevelyan's Student Movement House on Russell Square was a fifteen-minute walk for members like Jomo Kenyatta. The nationalist India League, which as we shall see, was a centre for Indian nationalism as well as cooperation between students from other colonies, was situated on 146 Strand, just south of the School.

Other fixtures in the lives of colonial students, such as the Indian Students' Union and Hostel, where South Asians could stay before obtaining permanent accommodations, as well as eat, socialise and listen to lectures, was also close by.[10] Its original location, the so-called 'Shakespeare Hut' on the corner of Keppel and Gower streets, was where Renuka Ray first met the revolutionary Subhas Chandra Bose, who was studying at Cambridge; in 1923, it moved further down Gower Street, still only a twenty-minute walk in the direction of Euston Square.[11]

---

[9] Dahrendorf, p. 173.
[10] Indian Students' Union and Hostel, *Lectures, Group Conferences, Study Circles, Visits, Plays and Concerts, 1920-1924*, (London, 1925).
[11] R. Ray, *My Reminiscences*, p. 40; Indian Students' Union and Hostel, *Lectures, Group Conferences, Study Circles, Visits, Plays and Concerts, 1920-1924*, (London, 1925).

After spending time in the relative warmth and tranquillity of Cambridge, one Jamaican student, Gladstone Mills, called LSE impersonal, and expressed 'more than a tinge of regret' electing to study there.[12] Indeed, LSE's confinement in central London was a sharp contrast. Although the ancient university provided a warmer environment, LSE's location in London nevertheless provided unique networking opportunities. At Nutford House, situated between Marble Arch and Edgware Road, Mills observed what he referred to as West Indian camaraderie. As with the Indian Students' Hostel, Nutford House provided a space for students from the same region to come together. Mills recalled it as a 'warm cocoon of comfort' where students 'provided psychological support and protection for each other in the face of a cold, unfriendly and hostile society outside'.[13] It catered primarily to West Indians, including LSE students Gladstone Mills and Lloyd Braithwaite, both from Jamaica.[14] But there were also many Africans there - Mills noted that his 'company included Veerasamy Ringadoo', the first President of Mauritius [1992] – as well as Ceylonese students.[15]

If Beveridge's 'empire of concrete', as the *New Statesman* editor Kingsley Martin referred to LSE, was colder than idyllic Cambridge, the School boasted redeeming qualities.[16] Its location and diversity, as well as the concentration of students in London generally, created numerous opportunities for colonial students to interact with both locals and other foreigners in a variety of spaces, from classes to university clubs and student organisations, in LSE and throughout the easily accessible metropolitan area.

[12] G. Mills, *Grist for the Mills*, p. 85.
[13] Ibid.
[14] L. Braithwaite, student dossier, LSE; Gladstone Mills, student dossier, LSE; Braithwaite, p. viii.
[15] G. Mills, *Grist for the Mills*, p. 86. See also, Veerasamy Ringadoo, student dossier, LSE.; Braithwaite, p. viii.
[16] Dahrendorf, p. 142.

Indeed, it was not uncommon for colonial students to befriend British and other white students. Studying at LSE in the 1920s, the future diplomat Gaganvihari Lallubhai Mehta[17] forged a close bond with a fellow student of Harold Laski and future LSE professor, Lionel Robbins. The two studied together at summer school in Vienna and engaged in regular discussions in the in the common room or the tea shops on Portugal Street and Clare Market, sometimes with Sydney Caine (future Director of LSE, 1957-67) and Arnold Plant, who had obtained a B.Com in 1922, a BSc in 1923 and would also become an economics professor at LSE. They maintained contact thereafter and met frequently on Mehta's trips to London following graduation.[18]

Overseas study also led to intermarriages between colonials and Britons.[19] The British socialist Doreen Wickremasinghe, née Young, studied at LSE and became Secretary of the Student Union, while also working with South Asians at the India League.[20] She associated with Colvin R. de Silva, who earned his PhD at King's College London, later published as *Ceylon Under the British Occupation* (1941), and N.M. Perera, who worked with Harold Laski researching a PhD about the Weimar constitution.[21] She also met and married S.A. Wickramasinghe, founder of the Communist Party of Ceylon,

[17] Henceforth referred to as G.L. Mehta. Not be confused with Gokal Lal Mehta, mentioned in chapter one.
[18] L. Robbins, *Autobiography of an Economist* (London, 1971), p. 91; A. Basu, *G.L. Mehta: A Many Splendoured Man* (New Delhi, 2001), p. 59. See also L. Robbins to G.L. Mehta, n.d., correspondences, GLMP, NMML.
[19] Marriages between colonial students and British citizens were rare, but not unprecedented. Harold Moody, founder of the League of Coloured Peoples, came from Jamaica to study medicine at King's College London in 1904 and married a white British woman in 1913. See D. Killingray, '"To Do Something for the Race": Harold Moody and the League of Coloured People', in *West Indian Intellectuals in Britain* (ed.) Bill Schwarz (New York, 2013), p. 52. One of the most famous couples was Joseph Appiah and Peggy Cripps, Sir Stafford Cripps' daughter. In most cases, so long as a marriage did not interfere with British policy, officials did not intervene. For more, see A.J. Stockwell, 'Leaders, Dissidents and the Disappointed: Colonial Students in Britain as Empire Ended', *The Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History*, 36, no. 3 (2008), p. 492.
[20] K. Jayawardena, *The White Woman's Other Burden: Western Women and South Asia During British Colonial Rule* (London, 1995), p. 246.
[21] N.M. Perera, student dossier, LSE.

herself going on to become a member of parliament in Ceylon for the Communist Party in 1952.[22]

For many nationalists, their connections and experiences formed while studying abroad strengthened their attachment to Britain and embrace of Western culture. A committed anti-colonial nationalist, the Nigerian student H.O. Davies, like many colonial pupils, enjoyed his time in Britain and the opportunities that life in London offered.[23] In addition to becoming close friends with a student from Derbyshire, Davies also travelled in England, particularly enjoying fell walking in the Lake District. He subsequently returned frequently and vacationed there after returning to Nigeria.[24] These experiences did not weaken students' nationalism. They did, however, give shape to a generation of postcolonial leaders who were culturally and intellectually influenced significantly by Britain.

Like Davies, the LSE student and strident Indian nationalist V.K. Krishna Menon had experiences that separated him from the vast majority of his countrymen. The London-based Indian author Mulk Raj Anand, himself a graduate of University College London and Cambridge, recalled Menon being disinclined to sit on the ground, as was often customary in India. 'I have become an Englishman and can't squat anymore', Menon confessed'.[25] As we shall see, his capacity to criticise British imperial policies,

[22] K. Jayawardena, *The White Woman's Other Burden: Western Women and South Asia During British Colonial Rule* (London, 1995). Rozina Visram also mentions some good relations and 'many examples of mixed marriages' between Britons and South Asians, though, as she wrote, the existence of some negative reactions to those marriages also served to unmask racism. R. Visram, *Asians in Britain: 400 Years of History* (London, 2002), p. 265

[23] H.O. Davies later wrote, 'My student days, at the London School of Economics, were perhaps some of the happiest in my life. My relationship with the students was of the most cordial character'. H.O. Davies, *Memoirs*, p. 64.

[24] Davies, *Memoirs*, pp. 66, 72.

[25] M.R. Anand, *Conversations in Bloomsbury* (Delhi, 1995), p. 438

moreover, depended heavily on networks he formed with like-minded Britons, including Harold Laski.

Even before coming to LSE, colonial elites were already closely connected to Britain and British culture through language, education, religion and career goals. Davies' family was Christian, and he attended a Wesleyan school in Lagos, Nigeria, a legacy of the religious influence in colonial African education in a country nearly equally divided between Christian and Islamic influence. He recalled that in his elementary school, all 'children eagerly awaited the celebration of Empire Day', which sought to celebrate imperial ties and culture.[26] Across the Indian Ocean in Madras, Menon was affiliated with the British theosophist Annie Besant and went to London to study law. Like Jawaharlal Nehru, who attended Harrow and Cambridge before World War I, he became more comfortable in English than any Indian language. Menon was atypical, remaining in Britain for decades following his graduation, yet as with many other students, his time in Britain deepened his cultural attachment, creating new networks of friendships and political alliances, as well as training in British law and history.

Intellectually, the diversity encountered at LSE could be immensely influential, in particular prompting students to look inwards and reassess the customs and history of their own countries. Due to his status as a Scheduled Caste, B.R. Ambedkar endured typical discrimination during his schooling in India, including being forced to sit at the back of his class, segregated from other students, and requiring someone else to touch the water tap if he desired a drink.[27] This and other indignities Ambedkar faced in his youth contrasted to the openness and relative freedom he experienced in New York and

[26] H.O. Davies, memoirs pp. 4-27.
[27] B.R. Ambedkar, 'Waiting for a Visa', in V. Moon (ed.), *Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar, Writings and Speeches* vol. 12 (Bombay, 1993), p. 670.

London, where he attended Columbia University and LSE respectively. 'My five years of staying in Europe and America', Ambedkar explained, 'had completely wiped out of my mind any consciousness that I was an untouchable, and that an untouchable wherever he went in India was a problem to himself and to others'.[28] Ambedkar's later advocacy for Scheduled Castes was motivated by the prejudice he experienced and that he understood was endemic to caste relations based in Hinduism, a worldview shaped by the different customs he witnessed while studying abroad.

Ambedkar's experience was not confined to lower caste colonial students, a small fraction of the total number studying abroad. Writing as a Brahmin, B.K. Nehru claims to have been moved towards a 'total opposition to hereditary privilege'.[29] If Ambedkar was influenced by Columbia and LSE, Nehru believed there was something distinct about the School that encouraged his evolution. 'I came from a country and an atmosphere', he wrote, 'highly stratified by caste and class to another which was perhaps even more so…But the transformation in my thinking which would then at least not have taken place in Oxford or Cambridge…was due to the LSE and was permanent'.[30] Nehru was not alone in recognising similarities between South Asia's caste system and Britain's inequities that reflected its own rigid class distinctions. He nevertheless commented that a newer institution like LSE, less bound by tradition than Oxbridge, stimulated a freer environment. At least in this regard, the openness and diversity he experienced contrasted starkly to what he had witnessed in India. 'It would', he believed, 'probably have taken longer at the older universities, with their more restrictive and protective

[28] Ambedkar, 'Waiting for a Visa', p. 673.
[29] B.K. Nehru in J. Abse, *My LSE* (London, 1977), p. 26-7.
[30] Ibid.

rules, to break through my sheltered cocoon'.[31] For many, a mixture of class, ethnicity and ideas at LSE provoked reflection, encouraging students to challenge preconceived ideas.[32]

Overseas study in Britain could strengthen one's attachment to British culture and intellectual embrace of Western norms while also reinforcing other identities and affiliations. Despite many close relationships, experiences between colonials and locals could often be fraught and complex. Some noticed cleavages as early as the boat ride to England. K.L. Mehta, who arrived in 1932 and enrolled at Lincoln's Inn in addition to LSE, immediately noticed contradictions. Born in Rajasthan, Mehta later claimed the trip to London was the first occasion in his life that he experienced colour prejudice.[33] He recalled witnessing limited contact between British and Indian passengers. While the occasional Maharaja might mingle in British circles, students tended to be excluded from such inter-racial interactions.[34] Once in Britain, most non-white colonial students would inevitably experience racism, often, for instance, having difficulties securing accommodations from biased landlords.[35]

---

[31] Ibid., p. 26.

[32] Judith Listowel expresses the same sentiment. Born in the Austro-Hungarian Empire in 1903, she won a scholarship to study at LSE in 1926, where she met and later married Billy Hare, later the Earl of Listowel. Though Listowel's memoir verges on idealising her time in London, she identifies the same sense of freedom and shares the belief expressed by colonial students about its impact: 'I began to make out another world. In some way it linked up with the things I had seen in Sweden; in other ways it was much, much bigger.' Listowel particularly emphasises the mixing of the sexes. 'It was a world in which men and women did not belong to classes, but were individuals, and succeeded each according to his merit. Eileen Power [the economic historian] herself exemplified for me the possibilities open to women, for entirely on her own, she had not only taken a brilliant degree, but had made a position for herself as a ranking historian'. See: J. Listowel, *This I Have Seen* (London, 1943) p. 48. Renuka Ray also comments on Power, noting her criticism of the British Empire in her lectures. See R. Ray, *My Reminiscences*, p. 34.

[33] K.L. Mehta, *In Different Worlds: From Haveli to Head Hunters of Tuesang* (New Delhi, 1985), p. 70. Mehta is likely overlooking colour prejudice amongst South Asians generally, and rather focusing on Western prejudice towards Indians.

[34] Ibid., p. 71.

[35] See, for instance, B. Ingham and P. Mosely, *Sir Arthur Lewis: A Biography* (London, 2013), p. 43.

Relations between students in particular were subject to developments abroad. B.K. Nehru pointed to a psychological barrier on account of the rise of nationalism in India.[36] This was not always the case. Renuka Ray recalled how Laski pitted G.L. Mehta against Lionel Robbins in a debate about British imperialism, yet the two became close friends.[37] Political obstacles were nevertheless palpable. Nehru mainly associated with Indians, as well as several Jews, claiming 'a natural tendency for one set of oppressed people to befriend and come closer to the other'.[38] In 1930, he met a Jewish student by the name Magdolna Friedman. The two first spoke at the library and were married five years later. Friedman was a Hungarian Jew, and although Nehru credited the cultural similarity of being outside the mainstream for bringing him closer to non-Britons, their cultural difference alarmed both families. Eventually, Nehru's parents were satisfied after a trip to meet her family in Hungary.[39] After moving to India, Shobha [also Fori] Nehru, as she became known, worked to help victims of Partition, and when her husband became India's Ambassador to the United States [1961-68], would later go on to socialise with the family of John F. Kennedy, as well as Henry Kissinger.[40]

Nehru was far from alone in seeking out the company of other outsiders. Lloyd Braithwaite, originally from Trinidad and Tobago, was a sociology student in the 1940s conducting research on West Indian students in Britain.[41] His study, later published as a

[36] B.K. Nehru, *Nice Guys Finish Second* (New Delhi, 1977), p. 99.
[37] R. Ray, *My Reminiscences*, p. 35. Mehta and Robins remained in contact after graduating, and later corresponded about Laski.
[38] B.K. Nehru, *Nice Guys,* p. 100.
[39] J. Nehru to M. Nehru, 25 July 1933, *SWJN*1, vol. 5, pp. 490-2.
[40] Fori Nehru's cultural assimilation appears to have been so complete that at least one weary traveller to India assumed she was a local until she disclosed her history. The traveller was a young historian, Martin Gilbert, who upon request subsequently wrote a series of letters to her outlining a Jewish history she confessed to be ignorant of. See M. Gilbert, *Letters to Auntie Fori: 5000 years of Jewish History* (London, 2002).
[41] Lloyd Braithwaite, student dossier, LSE.

book, refers to several students who, unable to befriend Britons, sought out the company of other foreigners. This included a Chinese student who, provoked by concerns over how loneliness might affect his mental health, sought out West Indians for companionship.[42] Another Chinese student from Malaya, in explaining his reasons for approaching a group of West Indians at a hostel, affirmed that he 'wanted to be with his own people'.[43]

While these students were drawn to people with a similar experience of being isolated from mainstream British culture, many colonial students were especially attracted to their peers from other colonies. By exposing their similarities and differences, interactions often produced reflections about the imperialism that united them. H.O. Davies enrolled at LSE in 1934 for a BSc (Econ), after which he pursued a B.Com degree until 1937.[44] The future statesman and lawyer later claimed that the college societies he participated in provided a more valuable experience than his degrees.[45] Two of these societies were the Student Christian Movement [SCM] and the West African Students Union [WASU].

SCM was a broad-based Christian organisation for students in the UK that promoted proselytisation and missionary work while also providing succour to needy students. Davies joined the LSE branch of SCM, where he spoke with Arthur Lewis, a student from St. Lucia who would become a founding figure in development economics.[46] Following a camp at which the students were introduced as 'British West Indian' and 'British West African,' the two discussed their mutual resentment at being

[42] L. Braithwaite, *Colonial West Indian Students in Britain* (London, 2001). p. 29.
[43] Ibid., 30.
[44] H.O. Davies, student dossier, LSE.
[45] Ibid.
[46] H.O. Davies, *Memoirs,* p. 66.

referred to as 'British commodities'.[47] The subtle reminder of their required submission incited their antipathy, and through it, an ironic sense of solidarity. It promoted the self-consciousness of being different, as well as desiring others to see them as being distinct, from Britain and from each other. Indeed, it prompted an awareness of sharing identities as being British subjects and black, as well as Christian, itself a legacy of European colonialism.[48]

One of Davies' other organisations actively encouraged solidarity between students from particular backgrounds. WASU was founded in 1925 to enable more organised protest against racism and colonialism in addition to promoting a de-territorialised movement promoting solidarity, or pan-Africanism.[49] It brought together students from West Africa, as well as the West Indies and other regions in Africa, including LSE students Jomo Kenyatta, Kwame Nkrumah and Arthur Lewis, who first met in Britain after going there to study. Davies, who returned to London in 1944 to study law, registered at Middle Temple. He also became Secretary General of WASU and Warden of a WASU Hostel.[50] It was then that he met and discussed West African politics with Kwame Nkrumah.[51] Along with other representatives from WASU, Davies attended the fifth Pan-African Congress the following year in Manchester, in which Africans and West Indians united to demand an end to colonialism. Davies claimed that 'The Pan-African Conference equipped the participants with the will to go back to their countries

[47] Ibid., p. 67.
[48] Barbara Bush argues that more explicitly racist encounters could also have profound effects on self-consciousness. The racism blacks experienced increased their black consciousness, 'and, in terms of "mental liberation" from white patronage and practical organisational activities, quantum leaps were made.' See B. Bush, *Imperialism, Race and Resistance: Africa and Britain*, (London, 1999), p. 226.
[49] Cooper, *Colonialism in Question*, p. 11.
[50] H.O. Davies, *Memoirs*, p. 115.
[51] H.O. Davies, *Memoirs*, p. 115.

and press for self-government'.[52] For his part, Lewis later became a senior economic advisor to Nkrumah following Ghana's independence in 1957.

As the experiences of Davies and Menon illustrate, fears of either Anglicisation or radicalisation obscure the complexity of actual student realties. Both embraced aspects of English culture, while simultaneously deepening their commitment to local identities. As Davies' time in Britain further suggests, attachments to English culture and participation in pan-African activities did not preclude him from embracing a still wider form of internationalism. While SCM and WASU fostered specific varieties of solidarity based on religion and race respectively, other experiences promoted a broader awareness and embrace of different cultures as well as larger international agendas.

While at LSE, Davies also joined a group specifically designed to promote cosmopolitanism and internationalist sentiments. The LSE Cosmopolitan Club sought to advance international amity and the discussion of racial and national problems.[53] As Glenda Sluga has noted, a number of pre-war student organisations celebrated race-mixing in line with the ambitions of the Universal Races Congress, itself held at the University of London in 1911 to promote improved race relations.[54] In 1909 in New York, a similar but grander venture resulted in a Cosmopolitan Club for students from around the world that included subsidised room and board.[55] The organiser, Harry Edmunds, later convinced John D. Rockefeller Jr. to help fund the first International House.

---

[52] Ibid., p. 124.
[53] M. Bennett to B. Malinowski, 19 June 1933, BMP, 29/3, letters B, LSE.
[54] G. Sluga, *Internationalism in the Age of Nationalism*, p. 44.
[55] 'Alien Students Live Under One Club Roof', 14 October 1912, *NY Sun*, from the Historical Subject Files, Series III: Alumni, Series XIX: Student Life, Bok 392, Columbia University Archives.

Though only one of three West Africans at LSE at the time, Davies actively engaged in university life, and became president of LSE's Cosmopolitan Club in 1935.[56] Referring to the organisation, he later exclaimed that, 'it was the most important multi-racial platform we had at the London School of Economics, in those days. Prominent citizens accepted our invitations to give lectures, and we organized debates on matters of contemporary importance'.[57] LSE faculty also spoke at the club, including Malinowski and LSE Director William Beveridge. It helped expose Davies to the international debates of the time. His most vivid recollection of his involvement was of arranging discussions between Arab and Jewish students, a year before the 1936-1939 Arab Revolt against Jewish migration into Palestine.[58] Other members attended the meetings of Indian nationalist groups in London.[59] Meanwhile, other students experienced internationalism through the British League of Nations Society, designed to promote the mission of the League of Nations. M.R. (Minoo) Masani, later a politician in India and a liberal critic of Nehru's socialism, became the society's treasurer while attending LSE. This position took Masani to Geneva for the Finance Commission of the international Universities' League of Nations Federation.[60] On 26 September 1926, Masani witnessed the opening session of the League of Nations Assembly, which two days later would in favour of Germany's admission.[61]

Internationalism in the Classroom

[56] 'Overseas Students, 1935-6', Small LSE deposits 117/2, LSE. In his memoirs, Davies claims he was the only West African, but according to the LSE Archives there were three. He may have been referring to the fact that he was the only West African registered in the B.Com. program (one was doing a Ph.D. and another was taking the Colonial Social Science Certificate).
[57] H.O. Davies, *Memoirs*, pp. 77-8.
[58] H.O. Davies, student dossier, C/34/27, LSE.
[59] Extract from New Scotland Yard Report, 6 May 1936, no. 63, L/PJ/12/450.
[60] Masani, *Bliss*, p. 26.
[61] Ibid., p. 27.

While Davies and Masani were exposed to internationalism through the organisations they joined, other students listened to internationalist sentiments in their classes or through their relationship with Harold Laski. Laski's political views, which included fierce anti-colonialism and active support for Indian independence, famously attracted students from throughout the colonial world. In his classes, writings and public lectures, Laski championed internationalism. In 1932, he highlighted what he understood as the dangers of complete sovereignty being invested in the state. In a classically Leninist refrain, Laski positioned nationalism in its historical context, as he saw it, suggesting that governments were propelled to intervene abroad because sovereignty was invested in the state, and because economic interests controlled the state.[62] Nationalism in Asia was a reaction against the West, and Laski went so far as to suggest that Africa could be the next stage on which this historical drama would unfold.[63] A world of competing nation states was unsustainable, and internationalism therefore was necessary.[64]

> We cannot, I myself believe, keep India or China in perpetuity in semi-subjugation. Yet how precisely we are to assist them to win their independence and integration when the latter spell the ending of imperialism is not, I think, clear. Once Asia is fully self-conscious and fully organized, it will end Western control. But if the road to that ending lies through the kind of vehement economic nationalism we ourselves know today in Western Europe, it is difficult not to feel that the outcome is dark indeed.[65]

[62] H. Laski, *Nationalism and the Future of Civilization* (London, 1932), pp. 34-5, 47.
[63] Ibid., pp. 40-1, 20.
[64] Ibid., p. 42.
[65] Ibid., pp. 41-2.

Laski called for international law to eventually supersede local law, as well as 'effective and equal social conditions' to mitigate the conditions that lead to nationalism and imperialism.[66]

South Asian students could listen to Laski on a variety of platforms, including the Indian Students' Union and Hostel, which offered talks and literature, including its own periodical, *Indus*, about a range of international subjects, such as Zionism and the League of Nations.[67] Laski's emphasis, albeit rather vague, on international socialism as an antidote to the capitalism and nationalism that he believed drove imperial expansion, appealed to students who were reacting against Western colonialism. His warning to Asian nations to avoid economic nationalism reflected a larger message that aimed to remind Indians in particular that they were one of many colonised nations.

Anti-colonial Internationalism

The stress Laski placed on identification with other colonial subjects was important. For many colonial students, broad pleas for international organisations like the League of Nations or international socialism, while appealing in theory, could in practice be less convincing to colonial students than an alternative, narrower internationalism that emphasised solidarity amongst colonial peoples. It is indeed striking how many students recalled their time studying abroad as being seminal in encouraging a more international worldview, with particular emphasis on embracing similarities with other colonial groups. One of Laski's admiring Indian students from the 1920s, Renuka Ray, highlighted how attending LSE impacted her:

---

[66] Ibid., 43, 46.
[67] Indian Students' Union and Hostel, *Lectures, Group Conferences, Study Circles, Visits, Plays and Concerts, 1920-1924*, (London, 1925).

> I had gained a wider perspective on human affairs and an insight into the problems of other peoples, especially of those whose conditions were similar to our own. At the time the London School of Economics held a unique position. It facilitated free flow and interchange of ideas.[68]

Ray's memoir details her involvement in efforts to promote Indian nationalism in London, yet also emphasises that the cross-fertilisation of people and ideas she experienced at LSE, especially 'from all parts of Asia and Africa', provoked identification beyond the nation and particularly with groups from parts of the world that had experienced imperialism.[69]

Ray was far from alone in drawing this conclusion. Eslanda Robeson (née Cardozo Goode) was an African American student whose own diverse ancestry included a Sephardic Jew and South Carolina's first black State Treasurer, Francis Lewis Cardozo. In 1921, she married Paul Robeson, the American entertainer, and later graduated from Columbia University with a degree in chemistry. Indicative of the black internationalism of the period, she travelled extensively, between Harlem, France, Africa and London. Having settled in the latter by the early 1930s, she read about Africa at the libraries of the House of Commons, the University of London and the British Museum. Robeson affirmed that this led her to anthropology at LSE, where she graduated in 1937.[70] 'The reading and the questions landed me right in the middle of anthropology (a subject I had only vaguely known existed) at the London School of Economics'.[71] She claimed that this enabled her to develop a new understanding of her personal history. 'At last I began

[68] R. Ray in J. Abse (ed.), *My LSE* (London, 1977), p. 44.
[69] R. Ray, *My Reminiscences* (New Delhi, 1982), pp. 33-4.
[70] Robeson later earned a PhD in Anthropology in the United States.
[71] E. Robeson. *African Journey* (London, 1946), p. 11.

to find out something about my "old country", my background, my people, and thus about myself".[72]

Robeson had conversations with South African and East African students in her anthropology classes and interviewed Mohandas K. Gandhi in 1931.[73] Robeson's biographer suggests that her experiences in London, as well as later on in Africa, were critical in shaping her perspective on the world. In her memoir, published in 1946, Robeson wrote,

> I came to realize that the Negro problem was not even limited to the problem of the 173 million black people in Africa, America and the West Indies, but actually included (and does now especially include) the problem of the 390 million Indians in India, the problem of the 450 million Chinese in China, as well as the problem of all the minorities everywhere.[74]

Robeson's initial view of herself and the challenges facing other black Americans were rooted in her country's unique history of slavery and racial discrimination. Her experiences abroad prompted her to expand her understanding of the immediate group she identified with to include other peoples facing oppression. She thus not only cast the history of black people in America in the same light as the very different experience of those living in Africa and the West Indies, but in the even more distinct historical trajectories of India and China.

The India League, Krishna Menon and International Collaboration

For Robeson, as with Ray and Davies, these experiences included attending specific classes at LSE, forming new contacts, travelling and joining political or religious organisations. To be sure, by the late 1920s there emerged broad-based attempts to

[72] Ibid.
[73] B. Ransby, *Eslanda: The Large and Unconventional Life of Mrs. Paul Robeson* (New Haven, 2013), pp. 81, 85.
[74] Robeson, *African Journey*, p. 10.

harness such mutual identification between anti-colonial activists in an effort to promote transnational alliances between individuals and organisations opposed to empire. One of the earliest efforts to produce an organised transnational anti-colonial group protesting imperialism originated with the 1927 Congress of Oppressed Nationalities in Brussels.[75]

The effort involved several prominent anti-colonial activists, including Jawaharlal Nehru, who was on the executive committee, along with the Berlin-based activist Virendranath Chattopadhyaya. Others in attendance included the Senegalese activist Lamine Senghor, Bertrand Russell and Shapurji Saklatvala, as well as an assortment of British communists, Fabians and Independent Labour Party [ILP] members, including James Maxton, Ben Bradley, Reginald Bridgeman, Fenner Brockway and Clemens Palme Dutt. There was significant representation from outside the West, including from students studying abroad. China boasted twenty-eight attendees, including three from the central federation of Chinese students in Europe and one from the Chinese students union of Lyon.[76] There was one student each representing the Oxford Hindoo Union, the Cambridge Hindoo union, the London Hindoo Union, the Edinburgh Students union and the Hindoo students federation of Paris.[77] In an address to the diverse crowd, Nehru declared India's struggle to be of world-historical significance. 'The problem of Indian freedom is for us a vital and urgently essential one; but at the same time it is not merely a purely national problem. India is a world problem' that, he claimed, would affect 'other countries and peoples' including in Africa and China.[78]

---

[75] V. Prashad, *The Darker Nations: A People's History of the Third World* (New York, 2007), p. 16
[76] 'Brussels Conference 1927', Jawaharlal Nehru Papers, Part II, Subject File 123, NMML.
[77] Ibid.
[78] J. Nehru, Remarks at Congress of Oppressed Nationalities, 9 February 1927 in Dorothy Norman (ed.), *Nehru: The First Sixty Years* vol. 1, (New York, 1965), pp. 121-2.

The most practical result of the Conference was the creation of the League Against Imperialism [LAI]. The organisation, a direct challenge to the League of Nations and its mandate system, provided an arena for colonial groups and individuals to assemble and denounce imperialism and specific colonial policies.[79] Although primarily planned through Comintern efforts, in particular the communist organiser Willi Münzenberg, colonial groups also helped fund the organisation - the Indian National Congress, for instance, contributed one hundred Pounds Sterling in 1927 and 1928 respectively.[80] Non-communist pacifists, including Albert Einstein, also supported the initiative behind the LAI. Several students in Britain became members, including the Bengali writer Bhabani Bhattacharya, a King's College student who attended Harold Laski's lectures at LSE.[81] By 1930, the LSE alone boasted thirty LAI members.[82]

New Scotland Yard took the LAI's potential imperial and international politics seriously. When the Central Association of Indian Students (Abroad) discussed associating with the League in Berlin, for instance, British intelligence, which monitored the student group, expressed alarm. A proposed joint venture with the League envisioned forming an 'Anti-Imperialist Students' Group', in which Indian, Japanese and Chinese students were invited to become members.[83] There is no record of such a group having been formed and the unlikelihood of Chinese and Japanese members cooperating would have been a serious impediment. Yet the earnestness with which New Scotland Yard took

---

[79] Prashad, p. 21.
[80] J. Nehru to James Maxton, 14 May 1928, *SWJN*1, vol. 3, p. 131.
[81] S. Mukherjee, 2007, p. 298.
[82] In addition to her membership in various nationalist organisations, including her role in helping to found the LSE Indian Students Society, Renuka Ray claims to have been involved, but must have confused it with another organisation, as she returned to India in 1925, two years before it was founded.[82] [She also refers to it as the 'League Against British Imperialism,' in Oral History Transcript, 'Mrs. Renuka Ray', accession no. 68, p. 7, NMML.] Ray likely confused it with the League of Nations Society.
[83] 'Extract from New Scotland Yard Report', 30 March 1932, Central Association of Indian Students (Abroad), L/PJ/12/406, BL.

the threat attests to the concern it placed on the potential destabilising effects of a union between colonial students and an international anti-colonial communist-affiliated group.[84]

The LAI's relationship with the Comintern and its promotion of inter-colonial solidarity against empire represented themes that would manifest themselves throughout the 1930s. As the mid-1930s gave birth to a series of international crises, colonial students in metropolitan centres like London had other opportunities for collaboration. Combined with the sense derived from teachers, student clubs and organisations, these developments helped suggest that local struggles were linked to broader historical developments. This was particularly true during the wars in Spain, Abyssinia and China, as students were prompted to see connections between the events of the mid-1930 and the violence and moral implications of imperialism in Asia and Africa. As with earlier forms of transnational cooperation and international movements, including anarchism and communism, anti-colonial solidarity emerged as a protest against world order.[85]

As noted at the outset of this chapter, T.N. Kaul's time in London produced an ideological transformation. Kaul was a committed Indian nationalist by the time he enrolled at King's College London in the 1930s.[86] In many ways, his experience was similar to Ray's or Robeson's. 'My three years in London', Kaul affirmed, 'had been useful in broadening my outlook and widening my horizons. I had met and made friends with people from Europe, Asia and Africa, mainly students at King's, L.S.E., U.C., SOAS and also in the International Union of Students'.[87] Yet he also noted several other elements. On a trip to Europe, he recognised a changing political landscape. He avoided

[84] 'Extract from New Scotland Yard Report,' 30 March 1932, Central Association of Indian Students (Abroad), L/PJ/12/406, BL.
[85] K. Manjapra, p. xx.
[86] T.N. Kaul, *Reminiscences*, p. 32.
[87] T.N. Kaul, *My Years through Raj to Swaraj* (New Delhi, 1995), p. 36.

Italy due to its invasion of Abyssinia, but travelled to Germany, which was not yet 'completely under the heels of Hitler', though replete with signs forbidding Jews outside restaurants.[88] In London, Kaul lived in an International Guest House at Tavistock Square in the city centre for two guineas a week.

> The other inmates were a young Indian student who had returned from the Spanish Civil War, two Jewish refugees from Germany, a young Nazi, who spied on them, and a young Jewish girl, who wanted to go to Israel [*sic* – Palestine]. There was also a young Quaker woman (an Oxford graduate) and one belonging to the British Home Service. It was a mixed group. We often discussed political and economic questions over a cup of coffee, in my room after dinner.[89] The discussion would often go on past midnight.[90]

Kaul's internationalism was inspired by a combination of experiences, some directly related to student life, others a product of overseas study giving him the opportunity to be in London at a crucial time in the 1930s.

His reference to Abyssinia and Spain are particularly important. In 1935, the Italian dictator Benito Mussolini invaded Abyssinia. Mussolini's power play further undermined the League of Nations, which condemned Rome's belligerence without effect, as a source of legitimacy in international affairs. London's response was equivocal, including the much-derided and eventually abandoned Hoare-Laval Pact to partition the country, and it acquiesced to Rome's demands. The timing was significant, as the mid-1930s marked a point between the failure of interwar internationalism and the creation of a post World War II international architecture that included the creation of the United Nations. With two pillars of the international system, European imperialism and the League of Nations, delegitimised by colonial nationalism and fascism respectively,

[88] T.N. Kaul, *Reminiscences*, p. 37.
[89] Ibid., 36.
[90] Ibid.

colonial students and activists in London began forging new alliances to advance their demands for a new international order.

As the last independent state in Africa, the aggression against Abyssinia provoked a strong emotional response and vociferous condemnation. For many, the attack was just the latest manifestation of European imperialism, and the British stance was further testament to the contradictions of democracy at home and empire abroad. Reflecting on his learning of the invasion, LSE student Kwame Nkrumah remarked that it so incited his nationalism that it was 'as if the whole of London had suddenly declared war on me personally'.[91] Another LSE student, Jomo Kenyatta, was similarly incensed. Kenyatta, who studied anthropology under Malinowski, was politically active throughout his time in London, and in 1937 joined fellow black activists George Padmore, Wallace Johnson Amy Ashwood Garvey and T. Ras Makonnen to become a founding member of the International African Service Bureau [IASB]. The group protested Italian aggression in Africa while also seeking to highlight abuses suffered by African peoples internationally.

On behalf of the IASB, Kenyatta, along with Padmore, Makonnen and Johnson, addressed Abyssinia in an article in the *Manchester Guardian*. The authors advocated for better rights for Abyssinian refugees in Kenya, and linked the crisis to a general criticism of British foreign policy. They promoted an understanding of the particular crisis that included local, pan-African and wider colonial interests. After addressing the specific case of refugees, they drew on the rhetoric of empire-wide anti-colonial morality. 'Coloured peoples of the Empire', they wrote, 'watched with shame the Government's

[91] K. Nkrumah, *The Autobiography of Kwame Nkrumah* (New York, 1957), p. 29.

weak-kneed foreign policy in Manchuria, Abyssinia, Spain, and now China…'[92] In a plea to discontinue the repatriation of Abyssinian refugees in Kenya, the authors appealed to '…all fair-minded and democratic people, all anti-fascists and anti-imperialists…' linking the issues and using contemporary European ideological and political struggles to empower their rhetoric as war between Europe's democratic powers and Hitler was becoming increasable possible.[93] In another article, Kenyatta directly accused the British people of bearing responsibility for the deplorable conditions that imperial subjects faced, from Africa to the West Indies and India, again linking issues from across the colonies and using them to attack the idea of empire generally.[94]

The Abyssinian crisis led to the formation of multiple groups in London, including the International African Friends of Ethiopia (which the IASB emerged from), created in 1935 by the Trinidadian historian C.L.R James, as well as other black activists such as LSE students Arthur Lewis and Jomo Kenyatta.[95] Groups like this helped foster connections between elites from the African diaspora in London, as well as West Indians. Individuals were likewise motivated. H.O. Davies was stirred by Abyssinian Emperor Haile Selassie's presence in London, where he had fled in exile. When it was announced that Selassie would be holding a press conference, Davies was so keen to meet him that he applied to the Nigerian Daily Times [now the Daily Times Nigeria], one of the earliest

[92] G. Padmore and W. Johnson and J. Kenyatta and T.R. Makonnen, 'Abyssinians in Kenya', *Manchester Guardian*, 24 November 1937, p. 18.
[93] Ibid.
[94] J. Kenyatta, 'Native Conditions in Africa', *Manchester Guardian*, 29 April 1938, letter to the editor, p. 20.
[95] Matera, p. 113.

newspapers published in Africa, to be accredited as their correspondent.[96] His plan worked and Davies was rewarded with the opportunity to interview him. [97]

Abyssinia also provided an opportunity for cooperation between Africans and Asians. The Trinidadian socialist and pan-Africanist George Padmore wrote several articles in the *Congress Socialist*, a journal launched by the Congress Socialist Party [CSP] in India in 1934 to move Congress to the left.[98] In one article, Padmore promoted solidarity between East Indians and blacks during West Indian labour strikes as an inspiration for the world working class movement. He also reiterated how Indians, Africans and West Indians were all equally exploited by British imperialism.[99] In other articles, he asserted the unjustness of General Francisco Franco's efforts to use Moroccan troops when fighting the Republicans, and discussed the exploitation of labour in West Africa. The former claim was reminiscent of Indian protests over the British use of Indian troops outside the subcontinent, while the latter reflected a more general Marxist critique of labour exploitation under empire.[100]

For Indians, Abyssinia provided an opportunity to reflect on the wider effects of imperialism and their country's similarity to other colonies. While the early development of an Indian foreign policy is usually attached to Nehru, Maria Framke has highlighted the outpouring of sympathy in India regarding Abyssinia and development of ideas of

[96] H.O. Davies, *Memoirs*, 70.
[97] Davies was by no means alone. The Jamaican writer Una Marson, also in London at the time, was inspired by the League of Nations and pan-Africanism to seek out Selassie, eventually becoming his personal secretary. See A. Donnell, 'Una Marson', in Bill Schwarz (ed.), *West Indian Intellectuals in Britain* (New York, 2003), pp. 117-8.
[98] M.R. Masani to J. Nehru, 19 December 1933, M.R. Masani Papers, serial no. 112, file 3, NAI.
[99] G. Padmore, 'General Strike in West Indies' *Congress Socialist* 2, no. 30, (31 July 1937), pp. 7-8.
[100] See: G. Padmore, *Congress Socialist*, 2, no. 12m (27 March 1937), pp. 11-12; G. Padmore, 'Three Million Africans in Action', 3, no. 6, *Congress Socialist* (5 February 1938).

future Afro-Asian international cooperation.[101] This was intensified in London, where there were immediate opportunities for cooperation between the African and Asian diasporas. It was especially evident under the auspices of a particular group, the India League, and its leader, V.K. Krishna Menon, who became the centre of a network of students, activists and political interests that encouraged cooperation between different ethnic groups in London that were protesting Italy's invasion, and other international crises.

The India League was a nationalist organisation that developed from the Home Rule for India League, established by the theosophist Annie Besant in 1916. By the early 1930s, V.K. Krishna Menon became its leading proponent, advocating for *purna swaraj*, or complete self-rule for India. Menon came to England in 1924 with Besant's support. In London, he studied law, as well as politics at LSE under Harold Laski, graduating from the School with an MSc in Political Science in 1934. He had been involved in student politics at LSE and was a co-founder of the National Union of Indian Students (Abroad), which included the future journalists Frank Moreas (at the time President of the Oxford Majlis debating society) and LSE student K.S. Shelvankar. Menon maintained specific ties to LSE through his mentor Laski, who served as President of the India League (1930-49).

P.N. Haksar, who later became Indira Gandhi's principal secretary [1967-73], was one of several LSE students who joined the India League. He later recalled his first meeting with Menon, during a lunch break in November 1937. 'I was stepping out of the London School of Economics. Next door to it, on Houghton Street where the school was

[101] M. Framke, 'Political Humanitarianism in the 1930s: Indian Aid for Republican Spain', *European Review of History* 23, no. 1-2 (2016), pp. 40-44, 47.

situated, was a small café run by a cheerful Italian. I often went there to have my lunch. As I was turning towards it, I met Feroze Gandhi'.[102] Gandhi asked him to walk over to the India League. Haksar had heard of it but never attended a meeting. 'Feroze and I walked into Aldwych past a group of buildings called Bush House, then on to the Strand, up a flight of dark stairs, we entered a room'.[103] Menon was inside, bearing a sharp nose, flashing teeth and a shock of hair.[104] According to Haksar, he possessed a 'severely controlled sensuousness of his lips would attract any great sculptor working in granite or in bronze, but not in marble'.[105] In another portrayal, a lover (the actress, artist and friend to the Nehru family, Marie Seton) further described Menon, expressing her difficulty in deciding if 'he was a very handsome man in a hacked out sculptural manner, or if he was distinctly devilish to look at…'[106]

Menon aroused strong emotions in many people, not least because of his impassioned advocacy for independence through the India League. Yet his nationalism, like Nehru's, embraced aspects of internationalism, while drawing on a network of students and activists in London that encouraged colonial solidarity. At one India League meeting in which Menon and Kenyatta both spoke, the British Empire as a whole was referred to as 'the biggest buccaneering enterprise in living history'.[107] Seventy people attended, mostly Indian.[108] Another activist in London, the Guyanese born pan-Africanist

[102] R.N. Kiran and Kuttan Mahadevan, (eds.), *V.K. Krishna Menon: Man of the Century*. (New Delhi, 2000), p. 103.
[103] Ibid.
[104] Ibid.
[105] Ibid., p. 104.
[106] M. Seton, quoted from S. Khilnani, 'Nehru's Evil Genius', *Outlook* 19 March 2007.
[107] 'Extract from New Scotland Yard report', no. 118, 15 June 1938, L/PJ/12/451, BL. According to British intelligence, Kenyatta was also known to associate with Saklatvala. See letter from an Inspector, Scotland Yard (name illegible) to private secretary to the governor of Kenya Colony, 19 June 1929, CO 533/384/9, NAUK.
[108] 'Extract from New Scotland Yard report', no. 118, 15 June 1938, L/PJ/12/451, BL.

T. Ras Makonnen, recalled being invited to the India League, and getting to know Jawaharlal Nehru.[109] By the 1930s, the India League's central concern with nationalism was increasingly buttressed by anti-imperial rhetoric that linked India's struggle to that of other colonial subjects, as Kenyatta did in regards to the Abyssinian War. In September 1937, Menon spoke at the conference on Abyssinia and Justice. The event was organised by the suffragette Sylvia Pankhurst, who had become an important supporter of Abyssinia and Selassie, eventually moving to Addis Ababa in the 1950s. At the conference, Menon called for the League of Nations to launch an inquiry into Italian massacres throughout Abyssinia.[110] A Kenyan, likely Kenyatta, who also attended the conference, spoke about the plight of Abyssinian refugees in his country.[111] As with the India League meeting that featured both Menon and Kenyatta, occasions like this highlighted the extent to which questions of national interest were becoming intertwined with an emergent anti-colonial internationalism as well as how colonial activists could use the existing architecture of international institutions in their anti-imperial rhetoric.

In addition to facilitating Afro-Asian cooperation in denouncing British imperialism, Menon also represented a more general strain of Indian internationalism in London that combined elements of support for liberal democracy with international socialism. This was most evident in Menon's involvement with protests of the Spanish Civil War. International histories of the conflict, as well as the international brigades that drew thousands of volunteers from abroad, focus overwhelmingly on Western

[109] R. Makonnen, *Pan-Africanism From Within* (New York, 1973), pp. 191, 192.
[110] 'Abyssinia For Justice', *Manchester Guardian*, September 10 1937, p. 4.
[111] Ibid.

interventions and the broader implications for European politics.[112] Yet colonial nationalists also became involved. Jawaharlal Nehru argued that Spain's fight for freedom from fascism echoed India's struggle against British imperialism.[113] As T.N. Kaul suggested, the conflict's allure extended to many colonial students and activists who were based in Britain. Their presence provided the opportunity to attend rallies, join campaigns and raise money, while also putting them in closer proximity to travel to Spain.

The India League acted as a critical facilitator for this trend. Menon's work as a recent graduate with strong ties to LSE and Nehru provided a precedent for other students to become involved in the Spanish cause. Feroze Gandhi, for instance, became more intimately tied to Menon in the late 1930s.[114] Gandhi emerged as the organising secretary of the Indian Committee for Food for Spain, which raised funds for the Loyalists. Indira Gandhi gave her maiden speech near King's Cross Station at a rally organised by Menon about the Spanish Civil War.[115] She wrote to her father in 1937 about the war and in one case Nehru quoted his daughter's description of a Spanish Professor speaking at Oxford about the suffering of children in a letter written in Allahabad and later published in the Indian press in March.[116]

Indian students' involvement in the Spanish conflict highlighted two overlapping features of anti-colonial solidarity and anti-colonial internationalism during the years leading up to World War II. Firstly, General Francisco Franco's coup in 1936

[112] See, for instance, M. Alpert, *A New International History of the Spanish Civil War* (Basingstoke, 1994); for India's role, see M. Framke, 'Political Humanitarianism in the 1930s: Indian Aid for Republican Spain', *European Review of History* 23, no. 1-2 (2016), pp. 63-81.
[113] J. Nehru, 'Food for Spain', 20 February 1937, *SWJN*1, vol. 8, pp. 701-2.
[114] Secret Letter to Mr. Silver, 27 September 1940, L/PJ/12/42, BL. The intelligence report labels Gandhi as a 'satellite' of Menon.
[115] T.N. Kaul, *Reminiscences, discrete and indiscrete*, p. 36.
[116] J. Nehru, 'A Letter on Spain,' *SWJN*1, vol. 9, pp. 703-5.

exemplified for many the primacy of might over democratic rights. Spain resonated not only with Westerners who believed it represented a crucial battle in a quickly erupting ideological war, but similarly for Indians who perceived a violent attack on a democratically elected government that reminded them of the suppression of nationalism under the boot of imperialism in their country.

Closely associated was the support and encouragement students and other activists received from the far left. Having shifted to a policy of Popular Front in 1934 following the election of Adolph Hitler, the Comintern and the CPGB mobilised activists and students to support the Spanish Loyalists. Menon's own Marxist beliefs, encouraged by Laski at LSE, coupled with financial strain in the late 1930s, moved the India League closer to the communists. One benefit was to buttress numbers at their events. India League rallies, such as its Indian National Independence Day, were advertised in periodicals like the communist *Daily Worker*, which promoted it under a Popular Front slogan as 'demonstrating solidarity with the Indian, Chinese and Spanish People'. [117] The actual event contained flags of the Spanish Republic and the Congress, along with portraits of nationalist figures such as Subhas Chandra Bose, Nehru, Mahatma Gandhi, Rabindranath Tagore, Selassie, Chaing Kai-shek, and the Spanish Republican revolutionary and communist known as 'La Passionaria'. [118] Unsurprisingly, many

[117] Extract from New Scotland Yard Report, 9 February 1938, 'India League – Indian Independence Day Celebrations', no. 109, L/PJ/12/451, BL.
[118] Extract from New Scotland Yard Report, 9 February 1938, 'India League – Indian Independence Day Celebrations', no. 109, L/PJ/12/451, BL. See also, R. Ahmed, 'Networks of Resistance: Krishna Menon and Working Class South Asians in Inter-War Britain', in S. Mukherjee and R. Ahmed (eds.), *South Asian Resistances in Britain 1858-1947* (London, 2012), p. 74.

Communist Party branch banners were included. The event reached a high point in Trafalgar Square, with three thousand people in attendance.[119]

This influenced the type of internationalism students embraced, as support for the victims of European fascism echoed Marxist dogma about capitalism as the engine of empire. LAI pamphlets, for instance, provided caustic, Marxist critiques of empire that depicted international relations as being driven by competing, hostile and hypocritical capitalist empires.[120] Pamphlets like these argued that there were fundamental unities amongst 'oppressed people'.[121] They were sent to anti-colonial groups, where members had access to them.

To be sure, Spain underscored how students could be attracted to larger communist orbits, establishing organisational links with the CPGB, while also developing a distinct ideology of anti-colonial internationalism that encouraged solidarity amongst various nationalist groups. In addition to his support for Abyssinia and the Spanish Loyalists, Menon also contributed to the effort to evacuate some Jews fleeing Nazi Germany to India, which eventually helped bring one thousand refugees to South Asia. As Nicholas Owen notes, there was limited support in India for Spain and passive resistance to accepting Jewish refugees.[122] Jawaharlal Nehru wrote to Menon, affirming that although some Jews would be taken in some Indian states, large scale immigration was likely futile.[123] Yet Menon corresponded with refugee organisations, including the

[119] Extract from new Scotland Yard Report, 9 February 1938, 'India League – Indian Independence Day Celebrations', no. 109, L/PJ/12/451, BL.
[120] International Secretariat of the League Against Imperialism and for Independence, *The War Danger Over Abyssinia* (London, 1935).
[121] International Secretariat of the League Against Imperialism and for Independence, *The War Danger Over Abyssinia* (London, 1935).
[122] Owen, *The British Left and India*, p. 249.
[123] J. Nehru to V.K. Krishna Menon, 8 December 1938, V.K. Krishna Menon, Documents Related to the India League, Centre of South Asian Studies, Cambridge.

Quakers' Germany Emergency Committee and the British Committee for Refugees from Czecho-slovakia to facilitate evacuation.[124] Menon's involvement was consistent with his wider concerns that went beyond India's immediate struggle for independence. Even after the Comintern abandoned the Abyssinian cause, much to the chagrin of black activists, Menon still supported its case.[125] In a 1943 pamphlet, Menon traced the adoption of *purna swaraj* in 1929 to a growing awareness of being connected to a larger movement.[126]

The breadth of this movement included the struggles in Abyssinia and Spain, as well as China.[127] In 1926, LSE student Minoo Masani organised a talk at the Indian Students' Union and Hostel that had Cecil L'Estrange Malone, who was later to be elected to the House of Commons [1928-31] as a communist, discuss China. According to Scotland Yard, Masani felt the meeting was not sufficiently inflammatory, the reason being a fear – a correct one, evidently – of spies.[128] Indian students' interest in China expanded in the 1930s following Japan's invasion. As with Spain, the India League was the galvanising force, and became the site of cooperation between Menon and the London-based China Campaign Committee [CCC].[129] The CCC strove to shed light on events in China, raise money for war victims and their medical needs and encourage a

[124] V.K. Krishna Menon Papers [KMP], box 5, file 14/L, NMML.
[125] Cross Reference, A Meeting of the Hampstead Peace Council, Durrant's Press Cuttings, Hamstead & Highgate Express, 3 May 1940, KV2/2509, NAUK. For more on Black activists, Abyssinia and the Comintern, see Makalani, *In the cause of Freedom,* p. 219.
[126] K. Menon, 'Independence,' India League Pamphlet, January, 1943. KMP, box 5, file 16/16, NMML.
[127] Ibid. Although international interest was not as strong as it was for the Spanish Civil War, writers such as Christopher Isherwood and W.H. Auden, who both travelled to China in 1938, represented an interest amongst British intellectuals in the struggle against Japan.
[128] Extract from New Scotland Yard Report, 1 December 1926, 'Indian Hostel, Gower Street, W.C.', L/PJ/12/42, BL.
[129] The organisation grew out of several left-wing groups, including the anti-colonial League Against Imperialism as well as the Friends of the Chinese People, the Union of Democratic Control and the Left Book Club A. Clegg, *Aid China 1937-1947: A Memoir of a Forgotten Campaign* (Beijing, 2003), pp. 5, 6.

boycott of Japanese goods. Britain had an embargo on arms shipments to Spain, but not to Japan, which angered both the Spanish loyalists and supporters of China.

One of the central figures in the movement was Arthur Clegg, himself an LSE graduate. Clegg maintained contact with LSE's Chinese students through various contacts.[130] Most were in the Chinese Students' Union, but were not forthcoming in their support of the CCC, which Clegg, perhaps exaggerating, attributed to fear of the Kuomintang Secret Police.[131] Laski, who was involved with the India League, also spoke for the CCC's first meeting in September.[132] In October 1937, Menon appeared on a platform with a number of other speakers, including Laski, held under the auspices of the CCC in connection with the war against Japan.[133] The full attendance of about twelve hundred people included approximately two hundred Chinese and fifty other Asians, most of the latter described as being 'of the student type'.[134]

Menon seems to have been introduced to Clegg by Paul Robeson, the American entertainer, who also travelled to Spain[135] in support of the International Brigades and spoke at conferences with Jawaharlal Nehru and Laski.[136] Robeson also employed his baritone voice for CCC events.[137] The China-India Committee, a satellite of Menon's India League, had organised an Indian dance performance, whose guests included LSE professors Malinowski and Eileen Power as well as John Maynard Keynes and Robeson. [138] Clegg came to see Menon in particular as a valuable contact and a loyal supporter of

[130] Ibid., p. 17. These included Huang Shao-koo and the Friends of the Chinese People.
[131] Ibid.
[132] Ibid.
[133] Extract from New Scotland Yard Report, 6 October 1937, Menon File, no. 100, L/PJ/12/323, BL.
[134] Ibid.
[135] 'Paul Robeson in Spain', *Manchester Guardian*, 15 February 1938, p. 8.
[136] 'India's Struggle for Freedom', *Manchester Guardian*, 28 June 1938, p. 6.
[137] Robeson sang 'Song of Freedom' from his 1936 film of the same name.
[138] A. Clegg, *Aid China*, p. 21.

the CCC who spoke for the organisation on several occasions.[139] Before the war in Europe broke out, Menon facilitated a meeting between Nehru and Clegg upon the latter's request in late 1938.[140] He also helped broker peace between communists and non-communist factions in the CCC during a dispute in 1941, which saw three senior officials threaten resignation due to communist control of the organisation.[141] Menon's participation with the CCC extended to speaking at their campaign events, where he affirmed that China was presently undergoing the same fate India had been subjected to, if by a different imperial master.[142]

Menon also led an effort in London to extend medical aid to China.[143] He worked to raise funds by drawing on Nehru's support in India and cooperating with London-based Indians, including LSE students and India League members Feroze Gandhi and Jyoti Basu, who was then Secretary of the London Majlis.[144] Various student organisations, including the LSE India Society, returned small donations.[145] This included funds for a hospital in Wutaishan, where the Canadian physician Norman Bethune worked, as well as limited funding for an Indian doctor, Madan Mohanlal Atal. Having served eleven months in Spain, Atal was subsequently sent to lead the five-person Indian Medical Unit in China.[146] Menon cooperated with the CCC and raised additional

[139] Ibid. Menon continued his involvement during wartime. See p. 127.
[140] Ibid., p. 83.
[141] Extract from New Scotland Yard Report, 2 April 1941, no. 190, India League, L/PJ/12/453, BL.
[142] Extract from new Scotland Yard report, 4 May 1938, 'India League and V.K. Krishna Menon', no. 115, L/PJ/12/451, BL.
[143] Menon to the Manager, Westminster Bank ltd, 12 July 1938. box 4, file 4/1, KMP, NMML. Atal's trajectory was indeed similar to Norman Bethune's, the Canadian socialist and doctor without borders, who had also been to Spain before going on to China.
[144] 'Jawaharlal Nehru's Urgent Appeal to You,' n.d., KMP, box 4, file 4/1, NMML.
[145] Menon to Secretary of LSE India Society, 19 July 1938, KMP, box 4, file 4/1, NMML.
[146] 'Jawaharlal Nehru's Urgent Appeal to You', n.d., KMP, box 4, file 4/1, NMML.

money from meetings in London hosted by the India League.[147] None other than Mao Zedong wrote to Menon, thanking him for his role in the effort.[148]

Once again, the India League's cooperation with the CCC highlighted the intersection of two different interests that contributed to the growth of anti-colonial internationalism. Firstly, Menon's increasing internationalism ran parallel with Nehru's, who maintained a particular fascination with China. At the Brussels conference, Nehru highlighted the use of British Indian troops in China during the Kuomintang's struggle with the Communists. Indian troops had been used in China throughout the nineteenth century, including in the Opium Wars and the Boxer Rebellion, facts that underscored the role of British imperialism in the long historical connection between India and China. In fact, Nehru, building on Tagore, identified the two countries as the world's oldest civilisations in 1927, and later affirmed that together their friendship and cooperation would be necessary for international peace and freedom.[149] Through his efforts at the India League, Menon buttressed Nehru's own internationalism in London. Secondly, the India League's and CCC's close ties with the CPGB also highlighted the importance of the Comintern and international socialism in shaping the character of anti-colonial internationalism.

The Limits of Solidarity

[147] See KMP, box 3, file 7, NMML. See also A. Clegg, *Aid China*, p. 59.
[148] Mao-Tse Tung to Menon, 24 May 1939. 'It has been our pleasure to hear from our common friend Dr. Atal about the splendid work you have done for Spain and China. Then Indian medical unit, which you have been instrumental in sending, has arrived with us in Yenan and have begun their work very energetically and have been warmly received by all the members of the 8th Route Army. In the name of the members of the 8th Route Army, we wish to thank you for your help and hope that you will continue your good work and constantly help us in all ways possible so as to help in driving out the Japanese imperialists from China.' Quoted from J. Ram, *V.K. Krishna Menon: A Personal Memoir* (Delhi, 1997), pp. 65-66.
[149] 'Brussels Conference 1927', part II, subject File 123, J. Nehru Papers, NMML; 'Message to China', *The Leader*, 27 June 1945, *SWJN*1, vol. 14, p. 437.

When, decades later, China and India went to war in 1962, Menon had moved on from his days of London-based activism to become Defence Minister, and he drew significant blame for the unprepared state of India's defences, while Nehru's fascination with China, in hindsight, has been heavily criticised as a reason for India's unpreparedness. Their failure to identify China as a potential foe underscores the limits of efforts towards colonial solidarity. As we have seen, increased contact with other colonial groups combined with exposure to international developments encouraged frequent and significant transnational alliances. Two decades before the Bandung Conference, colonial elites from Asia, Africa and the West Indies assembled in London and voiced a critique of empire that overlooked particular historical differences and approached a universal condemnation of the imperial idea. There is strong evidence that students were indeed moved to expand their understanding of who the victims of empire were, adding cases that reminded them of their own context, or in the case of Spain oppression more generally. However, student interactions could also serve to highlight the limits to internationalism and anti-colonial solidarity.

Ironically, division could be most apparent in events that were intended to demonstrate unity. The Conference on Peace and Empire was held in London at Albert Hall under the auspices of the India League on 15-16 July 1938.[150] Convened just months before the Munich Agreement, parallels were drawn between peace and independence, fascism and imperialism, and democracy's ultimate incompatibility with empire.[151] In many ways, it once again demonstrated how common complaints against colonial

[150] KMP, box 1, file 5/2, NMML. Various organisations, including the Federation of Indian Student Societies in Great Britain and Ireland, asked Menon for tickets (seven, in this case). See KMP, box 1, file 5/2 Peace Conference 1938, NMML.
[151] 'A Conference on Peace and Empire', KMP, box 3, file 7/2 c, NMML.

exploitation encouraged dialogue between disparate colonial groups. Jawaharlal Nehru addressed the conference, affirming the 'growing solidarity of the various peoples, their feeling of international fellowship and comradeship because of this crisis'.[152] He criticised the Mandate System in Africa, referring to it as imperialism in different garb.[153] Africa, he continued, was sometimes forgotten amidst the attention received by countries such as India and China. Yet as India became stronger it could, Nehru suggested, albeit vaguely, offer help to Africa.[154] Foreshadowing Bandung, there were discussions on forming a popular front among colonial peoples to protest both fascism and imperialism as a step in the direction of agitating for independence.[155] Menon insisted that colonial peoples would resist oppression from any government.[156]

The impassioned rhetoric nevertheless failed to camouflage serious divisions. By the twentieth century, the British Empire, forged in part through divide and conquer tactics, increasingly drew students from the colonies to the UK, which ironically contributed to the spawning of anti-colonial alliances. Yet colonial activists were by no means immune to embracing the same racial and paternalistic biases as their British overlords. Addressing the Conference, Labour politician Sir Stafford Cripps exposed a significant discrepancy between two colonial camps when he argued that while India could hope to obtain freedom in the near future, Africa might have to endure a period of

[152] J. Nehru, *Peace and India*, (London, 1938), p. 9.
[153] Ibid., p. 8.
[154] Ibid., p. 13.
[155] 'Memoranda on India League Conference on Peace and Empire 19 July 1938', Cross Reference, KV2/2509, NAUK.
[156] 'Memoranda on India League Conference on Peace and Empire 19 July 1938', Cross Reference, KV2/2509, NAUK.

trusteeship.[157] Dependence on alliances with the British left, which was much less sanguine about independence for the African colonies than for India, could highlight differences in how colonial subjects were viewed, both by British allies and each other. Despite Nehru's affirmation of solidarity and goodwill, Africans responded angrily to the notion of being lower in the imperial hierarchy and thus further from independence. C.L.R. James criticised the idea that while India's freedom was deemed imminent, Africa needed 'trusteeship'.[158] T. Ras Makonnen denounced the notion that there could be peace and empire, insisting on the primacy of freedom over peace, and claimed that Indians were disgruntled over his radical positions.[159]

Like British officials who saw India as having a distinct trajectory in the empire, one that would obtain freedom before other colonies, some Indians embraced their apparent position in the imperial hierarchy. This could highlight the cultural overlap and shared political biases between British ruling elites and highly educated Indians. Referring to the plight of Indians in Africa, Menon affirmed that Indians looked on with interest regarding the 'uplift' of colonials.[160] Whether or not he was conscious of using British imperial discourse, which emphasised its 'civilising' mission and, increasingly in the 1930s, colonial development, Menon did admit that many Africans believed that Indians treated them in a like manner as white Britons.[161] He expressed concern that a leader such as George Padmore would complain to Nehru, during one of the latter's trips

[157] C.L.R. James, 'Sir Stafford Cripps and "Trusteeship"', *International African Opinion* 1, no. 3, (September, 1938), accessed October 2015 at <https://www.marxists.org/archive/james-clr/works/1938/stafford-cripps.htm>
[158] Ibid.
[159] Makonnen, p. 157.
[160] 'Cross Reference', 11 July 1939, KV2/2509, NAUK.
[161] Telephone check, Conversation between V.K. Krishna Menon and B. Bradley, 12 May 1938, KV2/2509, NAUK.

to London, about mistreatment.[162] It is possible, though unclear, that this concern, recorded two months before the Conference on Peace and Empire, prompted Nehru's outreach to Africans quoted above.

To be sure, Nehru's own nationalist goals and the growing divisions within the international left complicated his otherwise strong enthusiasm for anti-colonial cooperation. Even immediately after the Brussels meeting that founded the LAI, he confessed to Gandhi that his main ambition for attending was to gain contacts and learn from others more about world politics and that, like the Mahatma, he did not expect many practical results of the LAI.[163] It is not entirely clear if he was being completely genuine or merely appeasing Gandhi's skepticism, yet his words proved prophetic. Closely associated with the Comintern from its inception, the LAI became increasingly dependent on communist support. Nehru was expelled in 1931 during the period of communist attack on those it deemed to be left deviationists. The Nazis ejected the LAI from its Berlin headquarters soon after coming to power in 1933 and it was forced to resettle in London on Gray's Inn Road.

Proclamations of internationalism could furthermore belie more practical considerations. When Nehru returned to the Subcontinent from Europe in 1938 he met with representatives of commercial associations and public bodies to discuss the Spanish question on 19 November 1938.[164] Interestingly, Nehru connected Spain to India's larger strategic goals. At the meeting, Nehru emphasised how important the Spanish Civil War was for freedom in every country, 'not only for humanitarian reasons and for the larger

---

[162] Ibid.
[163] J. Nehru to M. Gandhi, 23 April 1927, *Nehru: The First Sixty Years*, pp. 127-8.
[164] General Secretary, Bombay Presidency Congress Committee, to President and Secretaries, [blank] Association, Bombay, 17 November 1938, subject file no. 134 A, J. Nehru Papers, NMML.

interests of human freedom but also to increase the international standing and prestige of India as one of the nations standing for democracy and freedom it was highly desirable…should send as much help in the shape of food as possible'.[165] Here, Nehru demonstrated how the Spanish war, in addition to being a compelling issue for socialists and internationalists, also provided India with an opportunity to prepare for future foreign relations, enhance its prestige, and broaden its narrower version of pure nationalism.[166] He reiterated that India was developing a keener interest in world affairs, mixing an idealist position on Spain with a more strategic desire to provide still colonial India with a voice in world affairs.[167] Gandhi wrote that Nehru's 'nationalism is equal to internationalism'.[168] Rather, the two were linked and informed each other.

Along with the complex relationship between nationalism and internationalism, cultural differences could further limit cooperation. As the LSE student Lloyd Braithwaite has written, there were also occasionally difficulties between Indians and West Indians. Braithwaite's research in sociology at LSE eventually produced a book that examined colonial West Indian students in Britain.[169] Examining the question of identity and sense of belonging, he pointed out that West Indians of South Asian origin often had difficulty connecting with Indians who, he claimed, looked down on them because of how different their culture had become and due to the system of indentured labour that facilitated their emigration.[170] Some felt they had more in common with Indians from

[165] General Secretary, Bombay Presidency Congress Committee, 19 November 1938, Subject File No. 134 A, J. Nehru Papers, NMML.
[166] J. Nehru, *An Autobiography* (London, 1936), p. 601.
[167] J. Nehru, 'On Spain and Britain', *SWJN*1, vol. 9, p. 18.
[168] P. Chacko, 'The Internationalist nationalist: Pursuing an ethical modernity with Jawaharlal Nehru', in Robbie Shilliam (ed.), *International Relations and Non-Western Thought: Imperialism, Colonialism and Investigations of Global Modernity* (Abingdon, 2011), p. 178
[169] Lloyd Braithwaite, student dossier, LSE.
[170] Braithwaite, p. 50

Mauritius than from the Subcontinent.[171] There were, moreover, tensions between continental Africans and West Indians of African descent, who were often accused of seeing themselves as being more educated and modern than those born and raised in Africa; the latter, in turn, were accused of viewing West Indians as having colonial attitudes.[172] Racial divisions not only divided colonial students from white Britons, but could also cause tension between them.

Despite originating from a cosmopolitan region, Lee Kuan Yew was unprepared for at least one aspect of the diversity he encountered. Upon disembarking in England, Lee, who was to later study at Cambridge but began his British sojourn at LSE, obtained accommodations at Nutford House.[173] On the one hand, Lee reflected the widespread anti-imperial colonial solidarity of the time, affirming that he 'made no distinction between different races and peoples.' 'We were part of the British Empire,' he noted, 'and I believed the British lived well at the expense of all their subjects.'[174] On the other hand, he was less enthralled with the diversity he witnessed at Nutford House than Mills was. The future Singaporean leader was provided a bunk and found himself with around twenty African and West Indian students. Recalling the experience in his memoirs with at least a tinge of seemingly unconscious racism, Lee wrote 'I had never seen Africans before in real life, only in photographs. I was unprepared for their strange body odours, quite unlike those of the racial groups we had in Singapore. I did not sleep well that night'.[175]

---

[171] Ibid.
[172] Ibid., p. 30.
[173] Lee Kuan Yew, *The Singapore Story: Memoirs of Lee Kuan Yew* (Singapore, 1998), p. 100. Lee wrote that he stayed at the Victoria League Hostel, but likely meant Nutford House, which was run by the Victoria League for colonial students.
[174] Ibid., p. 105.
[175] Ibid., p. 100.

To be sure, disagreements within nationalist organisations were often the most bitter, sparked by jealousy and internal competition.[176] If Menon facilitated many interactions between colonial groups, he was also one of the most divisive figures operating in British anti-colonial politics. While both studying at LSE, Menon seems to have derailed Minoo Masani's attempt to become president of the LSE Students' Union. One afternoon, the Tory leader at LSE called out to Masani during lunch in the refectory, 'I say, Masani, aren't you an Indian?' Confused, Masani confirmed that he was, prompting the retort 'Well, well, well, you know, there are grave doubts being cast on the subject'.[177] Apparently, Menon was telling Indians not to vote for Masani because he was actually Persian by origin.[178]

More seriously, Menon was infamously determined to be Congress' sole representative in London. This nourished several disagreements, including with Sehri Saklatvala, over the latter's role in the Spain-India Committee.[179] Saklatvala, daughter of the communist Shapurji Saklatvala, accused Menon of being a careless organiser.[180] Again, practical considerations and personality conflicts underscored the limitations of inter-colonial internationalism, as well as its theoretically simpler root, anti-colonial nationalism. Menon also expressed jealousy over an LSE student, K.S. Shelvankar. Like Menon, Shelvankar was from South India and had connections to Annie Besant (he had attended her theosophical school in Madras). By World War II, Shelvankar was more

[176] In Paris, black radical groups also splintered (see Makalani, p. 19). George Padmore was critical of Marcus Garvey and Harold Moody. He referred to Moody and his followers as 'bootlickers of the white imperialists' (Padmore, quoted from L. James, p. 80). 'They are too goddam respectable to fight for their rights and try to mislead the workers in the belief that the British imperialists will give them freedom by sending petitions to the king' (Padmore, quoted from L. James, p. 80).
[177] M. Masani, *Bliss,* p. 25.
[178] Ibid. Masani was a Parsee by origin.
[179] Sehri Saklawala to Menon, 21 May 1937. KMP, box 9, file 4/1, NMML.
[180] Ibid.

deeply involved in the India League and spoke at many of its events. His influence was particularly strong in Edinburgh. Although earlier encouraging of him, Menon became displeased that Shelvankar showed independence from him, desirous of maintaining control over Indian activity in London.[181] For this reason, Menon was further angered by a communist idea to form an 'Indian Students Secret Communist Group'. Despite having a practical alliance with the CPGB, Menon feared anything that could weaken his power, in this case over students.[182]

Conclusion

Rivalries, along with cultural and political tensions within and between colonial groups and the pre-eminence of nationalism proved to be significant challenges to anti-colonial solidarity and internationalism. These limitations prevented any broad based institutional apparatus from surviving the interwar period and set the stage for future disputes and failures. Yet directly and indirectly, overseas study promoted cooperation between colonial subjects and encouraged the flowering of cosmopolitan and internationalist sentiments. Before the failure of pan-Africanism and the Sino-Indian border war of 1962, there was the hope of the Bandung generation, which promoted conceptions of Asian and Afro-Asian solidarity as a bulwark against Western power and colonialism. Yet before Bandung, there were the meandering students in interwar London, meeting in classes, apartments and rallying against the imperialism that united many of them and was in some cases responsible for their sojourn abroad to begin with. Student writings, activities and memoirs suggest the development of strong affinities with Britain and to other colonial groups as well as wider expressions of internationalism.

[181] The India League and Other Indian Activities in the United Kingdom, 10 March 1942, L/PJ/12/454. See also, 'Indian Notes', 13 April 1943, L/PJ/12/455.
[182] 'Indian Notes', 13 April 1943, L/PJ/12/455.

Spurred on by overlapping interests with communists, students from different colonies were encouraged to adopt similar moral and rhetorical approaches to attacking imperialism, which in turn promoted inter-colonial engagement and a deeper sense of fellowship.

To say that students became internationalist, as T.N. Kaul has written of himself, or that they did not, belies the complexity and richness of sources stimulating new common bonds in this period. Encouraged by developments back home and the activism they engaged in abroad, students like Kaul and Menon could become more committed nationalists while also embracing cosmopolitan attitudes and engaging in internationalist cooperation. The developing attitudes suggest an emerging post-imperial worldview, built on the legacy of empire, colonial nationalism and interwar internationalism. Like most mass political movements, a mixture of idealism and practical alliances fuelled the emergence of these versions of cosmopolitanism and efforts toward building colonial solidarity. Interaction and cooperation advanced a common set of core beliefs that challenged the existing world order.

Between the collapsing faith in the League of Nations in the mid 1930s and creation of the United Nations, which gave renewed hope to internationalists, anti-colonial activists searched for a new international order defined as much by what it was against, namely empire, then by what it was for. Attempts at affiliation nevertheless foreshadowed developments in the postcolonial era. On a subsequent trip to England on her way as a delegate for independent India to the UN, Renuka Ray recalled her old Professor, Harold Laski, telling her, ‘Thus we expect great things from India, and you must see that justice is meted out to West Africa whose case is coming up for

consideration in the ensuing session of the U.N.'[183] Another Laski student, Krishna Menon, continued arguments begun in London on the world stage at the United Nations as India's representative to the UN [1952-62]. Former students of British universities, including Menon and Nkrumah, would also engage with each other at Bandung.[184]

In creating opportunities to cooperate transnationally, the crises of the 1930s in particular provided valuable experience for students who would eventually create and implement the foreign policies of post-colonial states. It is striking that many of the students who became actively involved in protesting the Spanish war, from Menon to Kaul and Indira Gandhi, became prominent figures in independent India's future foreign relations. For many, their first experience speaking at and organising transnational events with an internationalist agenda was afforded by the crises of the 1930s while they were students or recent graduates living in Britain. Future diplomats were shaped by student experiences in Britain, exposing the legacy of imperial circulation and pre-independence British education on careers in the international affairs of postcolonial countries.

[183] Ray, 36.
[184] Other attendees formerly at British universities included: Kojo Botsio (Braesnoes College, Oxford 1945, treasurer and acting warden of WASU, who served as foreign minister of Ghana twice); Jawaharlal Nehru, Indira Gandhi, John Kotelawala (future Prime Minister of Ceylon, Christ's College, Cambridge (probably 1910s) and the Thai diplomat Wan Waithayakon (Oxford and Sciences Po, France (before 1920)).

3

Malinowski, Lewis and the Rise of Colonial Studies, 1932-1944

The first two chapters of this thesis have assessed the role of internationalism in conceptions of overseas study and the actual colonial student experience at LSE. Chapter two in particular addressed the importance of outside political events in complementing experiences inside LSE to galvanise students from different colonies to cooperate and develop an ideology of anti-colonial internationalism. The following three chapters will now shift focus to LSE classes and faculty that were especially relevant to colonial students and the emerging political and intellectual positions held by post-colonial leaders. This chapter explores courses at LSE between the 1930s and the end of World War II, in particular classes in anthropology, colonial administration and colonial economics that aspired to shape imperial policy. It does so through the lens of two LSE lecturers, Bronislaw Malinowski and William Arthur Lewis.

British universities, particularly Oxford and Cambridge, have deep roots as central institutions in the imperial project. Historians who have directly explored the connections between British universities and empire have focused primarily on the University of Oxford.[1] For Darwin, the Empire 'contributed to Oxford's evolution into a university of the modern international type. Geography, forestry, agriculture, oriental studies, modern history, economics, politics and law, among others, benefitted from the demand for specialized teaching in what were originally classified as colonial aspects of

[1] R. Symonds, 'Oxford and the Empire', in Brock, M.G. and M.C. Curthoys, eds. *The History of the University of Oxford: Nineteenth Century Oxford, Party 2*. Vol VII. (Oxford: 2000), pp. 692. See also, J. Brown, *Windows into the Past: Life Histories and the Historian of South Asia*. (Notre Dame: 2009), pp. 11. Brown examines the period of the competitive entry ICS exam, 1853-1947. Balliol housed and educated twice as many ICS probationers as Cambridge and all other Oxford colleges put together (Brown, 13); J. Darwin, 'A World University', in Brian Harrison (ed.) *The History of the University of Oxford: Volume VIII: The Twentieth Century* (Oxford, 1994).

the subject'.[2] Colonial studies helped advance 'the modern conception of the University as a research institute for government-funded research programmes and as a training ground for practical skills of a highly specialized kind'.[3]

Scholars who have examined the relationship between the academy and Empire more generally have recently focused attention on what Joseph Morgan Hodge has called the 'triumph of the expert' – a phenomenon which saw the Colonial Office tap into the emerging social sciences in order to educate its administrators in the arts of agriculture, hygiene and anthropology.[4] Yet neither he nor Helen Tilley, whose research has focused on the tendency of colonial administrators, scientists and social scientists to see Africa in particular as a 'living laboratory', have explored the significance of students in the relationship between colonial studies and colonial administration.[5] To be sure, Marc Matera has noted the contribution black scholars made to the development of colonial studies in Britain, singling out LSE students Jomo Kenyatta, as well as Eric Williams, who obtained a D.Phil in history at Oxford in 1938 before later becoming Prime Minister of Trinidad and Tobago [1962-81]. Matera rightly observes that while the writings of black students in Britain are often evaluated for their political content, they in fact contributed to the development of colonial studies in Britain in the 1930s and 1940s.[6] From the opposite angle, regarding the creation of new courses on colonial administration in particular, Véronique Dimier has suggested that competition between the University of

[2] J. Darwin, 'A World University', p. 618.
[3] J. Darwin, 'A World University', p. 618.
[4] J.M. Hodge, *Triumph of the Expert: Agrarian Doctrines of Development and the Legacies of British Colonialism.* (Athens, Ohio: 2007). For a more general account, see also, B. M. Bennett and Hodge (eds.), *Science and Empire: Knowledge and Networks of Science Across the British Empire, 1800-1970.* (New York: 2011).
[5] H Tilley, *Africa as a Living Laboratory: Empire, Development, and the Problem of Scientific Knowledge, 1870-1950*. (Chicago: 2011). See chapter 6 especially.
[6] M. Matera, *Black Internationalism and African and Caribbean Intellectuals in London,* pp. 388-89.

London, Oxford and Cambridge played a role in the development of colonial studies in the 1930s and 1940s.[7] The existing literature on the changing nature of colonial administration and the development of new disciplines reflecting it nevertheless under-explores the question of how these changes related to older traditions, such as that of the imperial civilising mission, yet at the same time was representative of a new trend that saw the rise of colonial experts who sought to replace European administrators.

Focusing on Malinowski and Lewis, this chapter offers two primary arguments. It begins by exploring the efforts of Malinowski to position anthropology and LSE at the centre of a project to develop new courses in colonial studies that would be useful to colonial administrators. While Malinowski suggested that what he offered was innovative, it was in fact rooted in earlier notions of the imperial civilising mission that sought to justify empire as a means to spread progress. What did constitute a new dynamic in the nexus between universities and imperialism was less the courses themselves than the students who took them, including Kenyatta and others, who used their personal background and teachings to claim expert knowledge of their societies. This did not, as some supposed, lead to a Westernised elite; rather, it fostered colonial leaders who embraced expertise but recognised and shunned the paternalism with which it was conveyed. I further argue that the most innovative development in colonial studies at the time centred around another colonial student, William Arthur Lewis, who drew from his experience in London to begin formulating the early foundation of development

[7] V. Dimier, 'Three Universities and the British Elite: A Science of Colonial Administration in the UK', *Public Administration* 84, no. 2 (2006), pp. 337-66; for more on inter-departmental competition between Oxford and LSE after World War II, see D. Mills, 'British Anthropology at the End of Empire: The Rise and Fall of the Colonial Social Science Research Council, 1944-62', *Revue d'Histoire des Sciences Humaines* 1, no. 6 (2002), pp. 176-7; See also, Kirk-Green, *On Crown Service: A History of HM Colonial and Overseas Civil Services, 1837-1997* (London, 1999), pp. 27-8.

economics in his teaching and involvement with the Colonial Office. With Kenyatta, and particularly with Lewis, whose work and personal papers have garnered less attention, the Empire came full circle: courses originally designed by and for white Europeans became taught and designed by a colonial student claiming the expertise to advance the development of his own society, drawing on a mix of Western ideas and his own experience and learning.

Malinowski and Practical Anthropology

Bronislaw Malinowski was born in 1884 to a family of noble descent in Kraków, Poland, then part of the Austro-Hungarian Empire. He studied the sciences and anthropology in Kraków and Leipzig before obtaining a doctorate from LSE in 1922 under the tutelage of Charles Seligman, the School's first lecturer in ethnology, whose other famous students included E.E. Evans Prichard, later Professor of Social Anthropology at Oxford [1946-70]. Malinowski accepted a lectureship in Social Anthropology from LSE the following year. Along with his mentor, Seligman, and students Raymond Firth and Lucy Mair, who both became LSE colleagues, Malinowski helped build LSE into one of the premier centres in the world for the teaching and research of social anthropology.

The same year Malinowski received his doctorate, he also published his pioneering work, *Argonauts of the Western Pacific*, in which he contrasted two possible approaches to understanding indigenous peoples.[8] The white residents he encountered while undertaking his field work in the Trobriand Islands exemplified the biases one would expect, he suggested, of missionaries or colonial administrators, which were 'so

[8] B. Malinowski, *Argonauts of the Western Pacific: An Account of Native Enterprise and Adventure in the Archipelagos of Melanesian New Guinea*, (London, 1922), p. 5.

strongly repulsive to a mind striving after the objective, scientific view of things'.[9] Malinowski argued that the wise administrator, on the other hand, would govern through the chief of his subjects, keeping in line with tradition, and work to maintain all that is considered to make life worth living.[10] Injecting one's vices into the bloodstream of another society was easy, Malinowski asserted, the real challenge was to 'impart as keen a [*sic*] interest in the sports and amusements of other people'.[11] What was required – and lacking – was an expert administrator who understood and respected his subjects' traditions and preoccupations.

In effect, Malinowski embraced the policy advocated in another book published in 1922, *The Dual Mandate*, in which Lord Lugard outlined the policy of indirect rule through traditional African leaders.[12] Throughout the 1920s, Malinowski continued advocating for the increased use of anthropology in colonial administration and LSE's potential contribution.[13] Yet it was not until the late 1920s that Malinowski clarified these views in the Journal of the International Institute of African Languages and Cultures [IIALC] (later the International Africa Institute). In two articles, Malinowski further explored the possibility of creating a useful dialogue between the anthropologist and the administrator. He began with the administrator's inevitable objection that his domain of expertise was being interfered with by an outsider.[14] This problem could be solved, however, if anthropologists focused on the 'study of the facts and processes which bear upon the practical problems and leaving to statesmen (and journalists) the final decision

[9] Ibid.
[10] Ibid.
[11] Ibid, p. 481.
[12] F. Lugard, *The Dual Mandate in British Tropical Africa* (Edinburgh, 1922).
[13] Malinowski, 'Races of the Empire: Useful and Useless Anthropology', letter submitted to *The Times*, 1925 (no further information), BMP, 9/3, LSE.
[14] Malinowski, 'Practical Anthropology', p. 23.

of how to apply the results'.[15] The anthropologist's role was to educate the administrator.

To do this, Malinowski advocated focusing on demographics, the study of the social organisations, especially family, marriage, and educational agencies, law, economics, politics and sociological or cultural linguistics.[16] He believed that the Lugardian policy of indirect rule should be expanded to encompass every aspect of culture.[17] Building off an argument Lugard had made regarding legal systems, Malinowski gave an example of what he meant in practice. A European lawyer, he suggested,

> is likely to distort native conditions by forcing them into terminology borrowed from European law. The untrained European, on the other hand, uses such words as "communism", "individualism", "private property", "tribal property" and what not, without giving them the slightest intelligible meaning, or understanding himself what he is talking about. It is only that anthropologist, who specializes in the study of primitive legal ideas and economic conditions, who is competent to deal with this question.[18]

The statesman, he asserted, could only benefit from possessing accurate knowledge of those that he governed. 'The greater his capacity to foresee the course of events and frame the policies accordingly', Malinowski suggested, 'the better he will acquit himself of his task'.[19] Knowledge, and research were the handmaidens of statesmanship, '…and they ought to be made to collaborate. The anthropologist, provided that he is interested in present-day conditions and in the changing native, can be made useful in an advisory capacity'.[20] The 'trained anthropologist', Malinowski affirmed, 'has developed devices and methods which allow him to observe, to write down his observations and to

[15] Ibid.
[16] Ibid., p. 37.
[17] Ibid., p. 24.
[18] Malinowski, 'Practical Anthropology', p. 31.
[19] Malinowski, 'The Rationalization of Anthropology and Administration', *Africa: Journal of the International Africa Institute* 3, no. 4, (Oct., 1930), pp. 423-4.
[20] Ibid.

formulate them much more rapidly than a layman can do'.[21] With the new insights that anthropology could provide, through fieldwork and detached, scientific observation, the administrator had new responsibilities, and new duties that he ought not shirk.[22] Malinowski attempted to draw a blueprint for how the colonial administrator ought to be trained in light of the knowledge at his disposal, thanks to the methods of anthropology, including field-research and the collection of facts. It was a programme well suited for the University of London, and especially LSE.

LSE and Colonial Administration

The University of London promoted the practical applicability of anthropology for colonial administrators as early as 1925. 'The study of ethnology' in particular, a University memorandum read, 'has a very important bearing on practical politics. There is abundant evidence that the administration of an alien people which is based on sympathy is the best from every point of view, and it is cheapest in the long run; but sympathy is based on knowledge. The business of ethnology is to provide this knowledge for the administrator'.[23] The hope that the University of London, and LSE specifically, could become a third centre for colonial probationers along with Oxford and Cambridge was expressed repeatedly in the 1920s and 1930s.[24] Malinowski once wrote to a student confiding in him, perhaps with a dose of anti-Oxbridge hostility, that students who came

[21] Malinowski, 'Practical Anthropology', p. 25.
[22] Malinowski, 'The Rationalization of Anthropology and Administration', pp. 423-4.
[23] 'Memorandum on the Teaching of Anthropology and Especially of Ethnology in the University of London', 8 March 1925, Teaching of Anthropology at other Colleges, 1914-1936, 520/A, LSE.
[24] Various sources discuss the possibility of LSE assuming a greater role, and even potentially training colonial probationers. See, for example: 'Informal Dinner at the London School of Economics, 18 March 1930, MSS Lugard Papers, box 149, file 1, Commissions & Committees, CAS. It stated that LSE's strength in social science fields such as social anthropology, as well as that of other University of London members, including the School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine and School of Oriental Studies, puts London in a position to potentially take on colonial civil service probationers before departing for their missions. See also, 'Memorandum Prepared for visit of U.G. Chee', 12 March 1934, 'Scheme of Colonial Studies, 1928-1941', 288/1, LSE.

to London had a chance of learning something, unlike the ones who went to Oxbridge, who would be wasting their time.[25] The University of London and LSE administration, in short, was attempting to gain a greater voice in the administration of the Empire by asserting that the distinctive strengths of their institutions better catered to the needs of Empire than the older universities.

By 1928, LSE was exploring the question of establishing a department of colonial studies.[26] School officials approached the Colonial Office in 1930, raising the potential of them training officers for the colonial services before they left for their appointments. The plan included a proposal that would have recognised London as the third centre to train colonial probationers, but this was rejected, purportedly due to budgetary constraints resulting from the Great Depression.[27] Nevertheless, LSE persisted, and by the 1932-33 Lent Term, the School began a course on colonial administration, with the inaugural lecture delivered by Lord Lugard.[28]

To be sure, LSE's new course was rooted in older classes on the anthropological, historical, legal and economic dimensions of colonialism.[29] The Colonial Office had established ethnology courses for recruits to its African Administrative Services in London since 1909, as well as several other classes, including on languages, criminal law and surveying, international law, hygiene and economics.[30] Under the leadership of Ralph Furse, Director of Recruitment in the Colonial Service [1930-1948], the Colonial Services expanded after World War I, with new courses being offered at Oxford and

[25] Malinowski to W. Stevenson, Esquire, 28 May 1939, BMP, 36/30, LSE.
[26] 'Memorandum Prepared for visit of U.G. Chee', 12 March 1934, 'Scheme of Colonial Studies, 1928-1941', 288/1, LSE.
[27] 'Memorandum Prepared for visit of U.G. Chee', LSE.
[28] Lugard to Beveridge, 1 March 1933, 'Scheme of Colonial Studies, 1928-1941', 288/1, LSE.
[29] 'Memorandum Prepared for visit of U.G. Chee', LSE.
[30] A. Kirk-Greene, *On Crown Service*, p. 17.

Cambridge for Colonial Service training in the mould of the prestigious one year ICS probationers would spend at Oxford, Cambridge or Trinity College Dublin. Oxford and Cambridge began a Tropical African Services class in 1926.[31] Indeed, the period witnessed an increasingly systematic approach to colonial administration developed in Britain under Furse, including the creation of a unified Colonial Service in 1930 and the development of Tropical African Service courses at Oxford, Cambridge and LSE, also advanced by the historian of Africa Marjory Perham.[32] As Darwin has observed, by the late 1930s, colonial studies was becoming one of the most important factors in expanding Oxford's research interests in both the arts as well as the social studies. 'As early as 1925 the idea had been canvassed of Oxford's becoming a training ground for colonial civil servants (as it already was for probationers entering the Indian civil service) to take advantage of, among other things, the collection of books soon to be placed in Rhodes House'.[33] From the 1930s, Perham helped make Oxford into the centre for study on colonial administration.[34]

In seeking to exert their own influence in the colonies, LSE faculty and University of London administration needed to make changes to their own curriculum. Like Oxford before it, London's institutions of higher education were indeed also shaped by their engagement with Empire. The new scheme included a series of short and long lecture courses, including comparative colonial policy, in which different imperial powers were studied regarding their approaches to development, including land distribution and

[31] A. Kirk-Greene, *On Crown Service*, p. 27.
[32] Matera, *Black Internationalism and African and Caribbean Intellectuals in London,* p. 391.
[33] J. Darwin, 'A World University', p. 617.
[34] Ibid.

education.[35] Reflecting the increasing overlap between empire and internationalism that characterised the interwar period, there were also classes offered on the mandatory system in the Pacific, Africa and the Middle East, and how they, along with the League of Nations, affected colonial policy.[36] The anthropological emphasis on comparison also resulted in a course on the history of the British and French colonial offices.[37] Social anthropology and discussions on the application of anthropology to specific problems of administration rounded it out.[38] The program, originally under the direction of John Coatman, Professor of Imperial Economic Relations, was taken over by Malinowski in 1935. In 1934, the Anthropology department was re-constituted as a "Department of Anthropology and Colonial Administration."[39] In responding to the perceived needs of Empire, LSE had in turn been shaped by it.

In part, there is a practical answer to what motivated LSE and Malinowski to develop the new course. Since the early 1920s, LSE had benefitted handsomely from the patronage of the Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial Fund [RMF] in New York. Rockefeller's interest in practical anthropology helped advance the development of the discipline in Britain. In 1922, Beardsley Ruml, then merely twenty-eight years old, was appointed director of the RMF.[40] Ruml believed strongly in the emerging social sciences, and saw LSE as an institution in which the study of current political and economic problems helped bridge a gap between the academic and the practical.[41] During his six

[35] 'Memorandum Prepared for visit of U.G. Chee', 288/1, LSE.
[36] Ibid.
[37] 'Draft note on Colonial Administration for Colonial Office, 1935,' Scheme of Colonial Studies, 1928-1941, 288/1, LSE.
[38] Ibid.
[39] 'Draft Leaflet on Colonial Social Studies…1943-51,' 288/7 F, LSE.
[40] Dahrendorf, *LSE: A History of the London School of Economics and Political Science, 1895-1995*. (New York, 1995), p. 160.
[41] Dahrendorf, p. 162.

years as director, more than fifty per cent of the 21 million USD budget was awarded to seven universities that specialised in the social sciences, including LSE.[42] Malinowski was given advice on how to obtain funding, which included emphasising big projects, particularly the practical uses of anthropology, and to name drop Lord Lugard, and the British classist and internationalist Gilbert Murray.[43] In a 1930 memo to the Foundation, Malinowski bluntly stated that anthropology had 'completely failed to establish itself as a pursuit of practical importance'.[44] In order to improve anthropology's standing for the better, he suggested, 'it would be necessary to develop such anthropology as would clearly establish the practical value of the science for colonial work, whether missionary or administrative or industrial'.[45] This would have to be done mostly from some centre in the British Empire, he suggested, 'which at present controls a great many subject races'.[46]

Malinowski's interest in 'practical anthropology' reflected both change and continuity in academia's relationship with empire. The increasing importance of American funding in social science, both in the U.S. and abroad, signalled an emerging fusion between conceptions of internationalism, American foundations like Rockefeller's, the academy and a new science of imperialism that found its expression in projects like practical anthropology. Malinowski saw both an opportunity to obtain research funding and the means to advance his ideas. Yet his papers also express a sense of duty to use his

[42] Dahrendorf, pp. 160-1. LSE was the only non-American institution. The others were Chicago, Harvard, Columbia, Vanderbilt and Iowa State. For secondary literature regarding the development and implementation of American funding of academic research, see: Liping Bu, 'Education and International Cultural Understanding: The American Elite Approach, 1920-1937', in R. Garlitz and L. Jarvinen (eds.), *Teaching America to the World and the World to America: Education and Foreign Relations Since 1870* (New York, 2012).
[43] Letter [n.n.] to Malinowski, 19 July 1928, box 8, file 3, 'Rockefeller Papers 1925-30', BMP, LSE.
[44] Malinowski to Rockefeller Foundation (by request) 2 June 1930 'Report on the State of Anthropology and the Possibility of its Development in England' box 149, file 1, 'Commissions & Committees', Lugard Papers, CAS.
[45] Ibid.
[46] Malinowski to Rockefeller Foundation, 2 June 1930 'Report on the State of Anthropology and the Possibility of its Development in England', Lugard Papers, CAS.

discipline in order to empower a colonial administrator with knowledge that is suggestive of older traditions in the relationship between the academy and empire. Charles Seligman, Malinowski's mentor and, following 1923, colleague, also argued that in the twentieth century, 'the harm that is being done is not entirely through lack of good intention but mainly through lack of knowledge'.[47] He urged that it was 'time that the people of this country should realise that Anthropology does not consist in recording curious and bizarre customs and constructing interesting theories of origins, but is a practical study of all branches of the life of a people'.[48] Mass killings of Tasmanian Aborigines, for example, were inconceivable in the 1920s.[49] The ill-effects of colonialism in the twentieth century were based on ignorance, and the social sciences could mitigate this.

Malinowski expanded on this theme. Ignorance was the root of many colonial problems, he affirmed.

> In the matter of land tenure, for instance, do we know this subject in a satisfactory manner in any part of Africa? Why is it that such serious blunders in the framing of policy have been made as the individualizing of land tenure in Uganda, which avowedly led to the greatest difficulties; or the haphazard methods of dealing with this question in West Africa, which brought into being committee sand commissions, the results of which could not even be published? Was the question of land tenure studied in South Africa and a wise policy laid down by the practical men who were settling and organizing that country?[50]

[47] 'Anthropology and the Empire,' Lectures 1914-1930, Charles Seligman Papers 7/5, LSE. The theme of curtailing ignorance was repeatedly emphasised. In preparation for a meeting at LSE, which included Beveridge, Sydney Webb (by then Lord Passfield, Secretary of State for Dominion Affairs) and representatives from the University of London and the IIALC, emphasis was placed on the potential of more students being taught in colonial affairs. Many missionaries and other practical people, the memo argued, go out into the field now very ignorant. See 'Informal Dinner at the London School of Economics, 18 March 1930,' Lugard Papers, CAS.
[48] 'Anthropology and the Empire,' Lectures 1914-1930, Charles Seligman Papers, 7/5, LSE.
[49] Ibid.
[50] B. Malinowski, 'The Rationalization of Anthropology and Administration', pp. 414.

The difference between this line of thinking and older approaches to duty and empire is both striking and at the same time suggestive of continuity. LSE's desire to play a role in informing colonial administration reflected similar hopes expressed by Oxford in the nineteenth century. Benjamin Jowett, reformer and Master of Balliol College, took pains with ICS probationers, nearly half of whom in the early 1880s studied at his college, holding the belief that the Empire was a place for Oxford students to do good.[51] In 1854 during debates over reforms to the selection of Civil Servants in India, Jowett wrote to then Chancellor of the Exchequer, William Gladstone: 'I cannot conceive a greater boon which could be conferred on the University than a share in the Indian appointments'.[52] Fuelled by the growing interest in science that followed the publication of Charles Darwin's *On the Origin of Species* in 1859, a group following the British jurist Henry Maine sought the establishment of 'scientist administrators' that could apply scientific principles to government in India.[53]

Rooted in a liberal imperial tradition that saw science as the key to good government in the colonies, Malinowski saw practical anthropology as a means to facilitate a more knowledge-based colonial administration. To be sure, Malinowski's was not the voice of Benjamin Jowett. There was little notion of using the Empire as a force for good in Malinowski's approach. What was evident was a focus on observation, on collecting facts and the duty to impart those facts to those who wielded the levers of power in the colonies. In many ways, it was a distinctly LSE approach. The Webbs, as we have seen, insisted that their university was conceived to advance facts, not a particular

[51] Symonds, 'Oxford and the Empire', pp. 692.
[52] Quoted from C. Dewey, 'The Education of a Ruling Caste: The Indian Civil Service in the Era of Competitive Examination', *English Historical Review* 88, no. 347 (April, 1973), p. 264.
[53] Dewey, 'Education of a Ruling Caste', p. 277.

political position per se. The Fabian approach to empire built on this. The colonies, indeed, could be subject to the same expert administration that was in Britain's best interest. As Director, William Beveridge echoed the emphasis on fact-based observation. Speaking to the LSE Cosmopolitan Club in 1934, Beveridge unveiled his vision of utopia and, in the process, provided much insight into his understanding of the ideal ethos of LSE. Waking up in the distant future, he envisioned the world as peaceful and prosperous, ruled not by benevolent despots or angels or parliaments, but by what LSE's Director likened to 'doctors.' [54]

> You will have noticed that throughout I have spoken of administration, not government. The term 'government' has become rather unpopular in Utopia, having indicated in the past people who thought themselves entitled to more respect than others, like demi-gods and heroes authorised to use citizens to serve ends of the government apart from those citizens themselves. Parliamentary democracy and dictatorship were equally out of fashion. The place of these has been taken by a profession of administrators, or as they call themselves adjustors.[55]

Malinowski's view on colonial administration built on the same idea of the expert adjustor. The development of the social sciences was promoting a new type of duty to domestic and colonial government alike, which the administrator was supposed to cultivate. The age of calculators had replaced the age misbegotten chivalry, yet the intent, while distinct, bore strong similarities to the nineteenth century emphasis on science and indeed the paternalism of the civilising mission. Whereas Malinowski's anthropological approach and embrace of indirect rule signalled his desire that government be based on understanding and cooperating with colonial subjects, his view echoed an old tune: Western science and knowledge would be used to improve native lives.

---

[54] W. Beveridge, 'My Utopia', speech to Cosmopolitan Club, LSE, November 23, 1934. WBP, 9B/21/3, LSE.
[55] Ibid.

A seminar on colonial administration held at LSE in 1933 indicated the increased communication between the School and the Colonial Office, and reflection on the practical scope, limits and purpose of the social sciences in the colonial arena. Those present included Malinowski, Firth, Lugard and J.H. Oldham, a former missionary in India who became an advisor in the Colonial Office, and supported the founding of the IIALC.[56] In the seminar, Malinowski asserted the complexity of the tasks facing practical anthropologists and once again attempted to find the middle ground between the social scientist and the administrator. 'It is a sign of mental laziness if the man of science pretends he can keep away from ethical questions or that he should not state it when his scientific outlook contributes to real welfare of humanity. The question is usually put in the form of what is "political" – the Africa Institute definitely bars out discussion of political problems'.[57]

> But it would be imbecile to pretend that we can completely stand aside from affecting the policies. If we study problems e.g. of hygiene, or of the biological welfare of the population, or other problems, and come to the conclusion and present our facts showing that the government regulations are disastrous, it is our duty to present these facts.[58]

Refining his views later on, Malinowski would state that the greatest need in modern social science was the linking of theory and observation, in the development of direct methods of study on living humanity.[59]

Malinowski's Students

LSE's new course was designed to carry out this objective. In pursuing this end, the School advertised it with enthusiasm. Pamphlets were distributed to the Colonial

[56] 'Colonial Administration Seminar,' 23 May 1933, BMP, 6/7, LSE.
[57] 'Colonial Administration Class: Discussion on Miss Perham's Paper', 9 May 1933, BMP, 6/7, LSE.
[58] Ibid.
[59] Malinowski, 'Memorandum on the Place of Anthropology in the Organisation and Work of L.S.E.,' 4 Nov. 1937, 'Teaching of Anthropology, 1931-1940', 520/2, LSE.

Office, the League of Nations, the various governments in the British Empire and newspapers throughout Britain and the Dominions.[60] Beveridge personally contacted the Colonial Office, asking them to consider sending administrators to study anthropology.[61] The Colonial Office sent officers.[62] In addition, civil servants, missionaries and research students also attended.[63] The course was taught in the lent and summer terms to enable colonial officers who were just in London briefly to take the courses.[64] Students included colonial service officers and others from Kenya, Tanganyika, Northern and Southern Rhodesia, Ceylon and the West Indies.[65] Approximately twenty-five to thirty postgraduate students also attended.[66]

The LSE Archives have maintained some of the correspondences between professors and their students after the latter assumed positions in the colonies. One pupil, W. Stevenson, took part in the course before being stationed as a colonial administrator in Sinlumkaba, Bhamo District, Burma, and wrote to Malinowski indicating that he was planning on returning to finish the class.[67]

> I think I have at last put Anthropology on the Burma map, though I'm not yet quite certain whether this is due to my seniors appreciating my increased efficiency or to their fear of the strange jargon with which I confuse their poor intellects. Seriously though, my few months with you has made the devil of a

[60] 'Note on Institutions to which leaflets on Colonial Administration should be sent', Scheme of Colonial Studies, 1928-1941, 288/1, LSE. There is no date on this document, though it is likely that it was typed and sent sometime in 1933. By December of that year, at least once dominion government, New Zealand, acknowledged receipt. See: Chief Clerk, New Zealand Government Offices, to William Beveridge, 1 Dec. 1933, Scheme of Colonial Studies, 1928-1941, 288/1, LSE.
[61] Beveridge to Sir J. Masterton-Smith, Colonial Office, 18 Dec. 1934, Teaching of Anthropology at other Colleges, 1914-1936, 520/A, LSE.
[62] Letter to Beveridge, 7 Feb. 1934, [n.n] Scheme of Colonial Studies, 1928-1941, 288/1, LSE.
[63] Memorandum on Courses of Instruction for Education Officers, [n.d.], Scheme of Colonial Studies, 1928-1941, 288/1, LSE.
[64] 'Scheme of Colonial Studies, 1928-1941', 288/1, LSE.
[65] Memorandum Prepared for visit of U.G. Chee, 12 March 1934, Scheme of Colonial Studies, 1928-1941, 288/1, LSE.
[66] Malinowski and Firth, Memorandum on the Teaching of Anthropology in the London School of Economics, 8 July 1933, Teaching of Anthropology, 1931-1940, 520/2, LSE.
[67] Stevenson to Malinowski, [n.d.], BMP, 36/30, LSE.

> difference to my usefulness, and I would like you to know that I am very grateful for the help you gave me.[68]

All of the younger people in his service, he indicated, were also planning on taking courses in anthropology.[69] 'I am doing my best to guide the nimbler wits to London' he assured Malinowski.[70] Here we see new assumptions developing about the place of an administrator, and a new way to ground authority, based on anthropological expertise.

In a correspondence with Gerald Wormol, who was working for the Colonial Official and stationed in the Southern Provinces, Enugu, Nigeria, we get a clearer picture of an enduring relationship and the type of practical advice Malinowski gave to his students even when on assignment.[71] Wormol was first sent to Onitsha Province, then Local Authority in Onitsha for a few weeks, before taking over the Political Schedule in the Secretariat.[72] Malinowski advised him to do as much as possible of the 'anthropology of the secretariat', writing that this was 'an important part of our knowledge in Colonial Administration and practical anthropology'.[73] 'What I mean', he continued, 'is that in your present position you have placed before you a number of problems which come from the provinces and districts. If you could collect and classify the type of problem which reaches the Secretariat and the manner in which you have to deal with it, this in itself would supply important material'.[74] Again, there is a lack of any sense of moral duty; rather, the emphasis is on collection and observation, improving government by eliminating ignorance of the colonial condition.

The 'full confidence of a trained Western scholar'

[68] Ibid.
[69] Ibid.
[70] Ibid.
[71] Malinowski to Wormol, 16 Jan. 1939, BMP, 36/30, LSE.
[72] Wormol to Malinowski, 3 Dec. 1938, BMP, 36/30, LSE.
[73] Malinowski to Wormol.
[74] Ibid.

At the same time that Wormol and Stevenson assumed positions in the colonial service, students of non-European descent increasingly began taking the same courses in anthropology. As early as 1929, a Chinese correspondent, who was engaged in archaeology in China, wrote to Seligman speaking of great enthusiasm in art, archaeology and anthropology in China and the need for more 'expert training' in that country.[75] Though the Chinese student was not advanced enough, the correspondent argued, to value anthropology for its own sake, Seligman's lectures served to initiate Chinese students into that field.[76] This may have been little more than the customary respect paid in a hierarchical relationship, but it nevertheless underscored that the presence of LSE's anthropologists was widely felt.

Malinowski, moreover, taught and thought highly of P.N. Haksar, later Prime Minister Indira Gandhi's principal secretary [1967-73], as well as Fei Hsiao-Tung, later a prominent Chinese sociologist and anthropologist who Malinowski had supervised.[77] Fei studied sociology at Tsinghua from 1933-35. He began under Firth and switched to Malinowski. His thesis was entitled 'Kaihsionkung: Economic Life in a Chinese Village'.[78] He was later offered a staff appointment at LSE in 1948 teaching far eastern social studies, which he declined on account of not wanting to leave China and Tsinghua (where he was teaching) in the midst of Civil War. [79]

Malinowski had a strong, often explosive personality that can make him difficult to assess. Speaking of his students on one occasion, he expressed the hope for 'not a Jew,

[75] Chi hi to Seligman, 14 July 1929, Seligman Papers, 6/4, LSE.
[76] Ibid.
[77] Malinowski to P.N. Haksar, 11 June 1938, 'Malinowski Students letters,' BMP 7/5; L.G. Robinson, Dean of Postgraduate Studies, University of London, to Malinowski, 10 March 1938, BMP 7/26; Malinowski to Robinson, 19 March 1938, BMP, 7/26, LSE.
[78] Fei Hsiao-Tung, student dossier, LSE.
[79] Fei Hsiao-Tung, student dossier, LSE.

Dago, Pole or any of these exotic products', but rather someone who could become a leader in British anthropology.[80] Although it is evident he was looking for a less 'foreign' student to carry on his academic reputation in Britain, Malinowski nevertheless believed in teaching foreign students. Indeed, his most important relationship with a foreign student was with Jomo Kenyatta, the future independence leader and first President of Kenya. Malinowski had been interested in Kenya for some time prior to advising Kenyatta. On a return trip to London from South Africa in 1934, he spent a brief interlude researching the Kikuyu, Kenya's largest ethnic group, which Kenyatta was a member of.[81] As Bruce Berman has affirmed, the possibility of working with Kenyatta hence served the interests of both. Kenyatta did a master's degree under Malinowski, beginning to sit in classes in 1934.

For Kenyatta, working as a Western anthropologist was the best way he could engage with the Kikuyu in Britain and maintain respect in British academic circles.[82] In the preface to *Facing Mount Kenya*, Kenyatta writes that he decided he needed training in comparative social anthropology to help him 'set about finding ways and means to acquire the necessary technical knowledge for recording the information scientifically. It was my friend and teacher, Professor Malinowski, who made this possible for me through the International Institute of African Languages and Culture'.[83] For Malinowski, he was able to engage with his interest in Kenya while working with someone who he recognised as having 'a great deal of influence among the educated Africans here and in Africa'.[84]

---

[80] G. Stocking, *After Tylor: British Social Anthropology 1888-1951* (Madison, 1995), p. 409.
[81] B. Berman and J.M. Lonsdale, 'The Labours of "Muigwithania:" Jomo Kenyatta as Author', *Research in African Literatures* 29, 1 (Spring, 1998), p. 29.
[82] B. Berman, "Ethnography as Politics, Politics as Ethnography: Kenyatta, Malinowski and the Making of Facing Mount Kenya," *Canadian Journal of African Studies* 30 (3) 1996, p. 322.
[83] J. Kenyatta, *Facing Mount Kenya: The Tribal Life of Gikuyu* (London, 1938), pp. xvi-xvii.
[84] Malinowski to W.C. Dickinson, 21 June 1935, 'Malinowski students letters' BMP, 7/5, LSE.

He regarded his work with Kenyatta as being very important, and helped secure him a grant at the IIALC, despite Lugard's scepticism about Kenyatta's links to communists, in part due to his time at KUTV in the Soviet Union.[85]

The policy of indirect rule, as we have seen, tended to shun educated Africans like Kenyatta. In his introduction to *Facing Mount Kenya*, Malinowski nevertheless praises his former student for helping to bridge the gap between Western social science and Africans. 'For several years past Mr. Kenyatta has been a member of my discussion class at the London School of Economics. He was thus associated in research and discussion, in original contribution and extempore critical activity with a number of brilliant, experienced and highly competent young scholars…'[86] Continuing, Malinowski asserted that in this group of people, Kenyatta 'was able to play an active, indeed creative part, giving us illuminating sidelights, inspired by the inside knowledge of an African, but formulated with the full competence of a trained Western scholar'.[87]

Kenyatta's fierce anti-colonialism, coupled with his openness to the techniques of a discipline that had deep roots in imperialism, is indicative of how the colonial embrace of social science could lead to unexpected results and how attempts to strengthen colonial legitimacy could also ultimately empower anti-colonial ideas. As we saw in the previous chapter, Malinowski's anthropology classes helped teach Eslanda Robeson about her own racial background. Yet if her anthropology classes shaped her intellectual engagement with broader cultural and historical categories in a positive sense, they also promoted her

[85] 'International Institute of African Languages and Cultures Minutes of the Sixteenth Meeting of the Executive Council', 12, 13 October 1937, IAI/1/23, LSE. To be sure, the IIALC was particularly encouraging of black scholarship. Zachariah Keodirelang Matthews, a black South African, earned a studentship from the IIALC tenable for one year to study anthropology at LSE. See Zachariah Keodirelang Matthews, student dossier, LSE. Matthews also received a scholarship from the Phelps-Stokes fund, an American non-profit focusing on Native Americans and Africa.
[86] B. Malinowski, introduction to *Facing Mount Kenyatta* by J. Kenyatta, p. viii.
[87] Ibid.

to seek out people of African descent in a negative way as well. She objected to the way some white students and teachers (she does not name who) treated her. Robeson claimed that they insisted she was European based on her education, whereas she increasingly identified with a pan-African identity. She further maintained that these students and teachers distinguished her from 'primitives', who for their lack of education to understand the types of concepts she learned at LSE. One needed to study the primitive mind, they argued, to see how it worked. This motivated her to seek out blacks, throughout the UK, in universities as well as at docks and in slums, as well as across the Channel in France. She found she identified with them culturally, exhibiting the same ambitions, humour and values.[88]

If Robeson had a mixed experience, Malinowski and his seminar were highly recommended at the West African Students' Union, which advised members that it was highly pertinent to anyone 'interested in colonial studies and anthropology'.[89] It went on to praise LSE for its 'sympathy, humanitarianism and internationalism' and Malinowski in particular, whom the student group claimed influenced its members.[90] 'From our own personal experience the course under Prof. Malinowski is very well taught. Students under him are made to do field work (practical Anthropology) and so they get to know and understand the mentality of the people of the place concerned. The Professor very often interviews African students about problems in connection with his work…'[91] Malinowski taught students how to acquire practical knowledge and treated them with respect in the process.

[88] E. Robeson, *African Journey,* p. 11.
[89] Quoted from Matera, *Black Internationalism and African and Caribbean Intellectuals in London,* p. 399.
[90] Ibid.
[91] Ibid.

For all his support, however, Malinowski's view of British Africa and its future was fundamentally at odds with Kenyatta's. His personal background may have helped him identify with his colonial students, with one major exception. A 'savage' Eastern European, Malinowski joked, bore some relation to a 'savage' from Africa.[92] Yet a product of the multicultural Austro-Hungarian Empire, Malinowski envisioned cultural autonomy for British Africa within an imperial structure.[93] As we have seen in the previous chapter, Kenyatta spent much of his time outside class engaged in political activity and often speaking out against European imperialism. In his book, he affirmed that he looked forward to outright independence.[94] Malinowski viewed Kenyatta as a bridge between Western science and rationalism on the one hand and African subjects on the other. In his embrace of Western-educated African elites, he moved away from a longstanding policy of favouring traditional rulers. Yet while Kenyatta, and Robeson, were eager to acquire the latest analytical tools with which to better understand their societies, they were much more than bridges in the sense Malinowski meant. In fact, they were bridges in a transition between a colonial and post-imperial world. Malinowski's approach to colonial studies, as cutting edge as it may have been in an academic sense, was consistent with nineteenth century ideas of scientific progress and Jowett's belief that the university had a duty to empire, though one stripped of the moral imperative to uplift but rather focused on spinning expert social scientists capable of advising administrators about how to understand their subjects and avoid harming them.

William Arthur Lewis

[92] B. Malinowski, quoted from G. Stocking, 'Maclay, Kubary, Malinowski: Archetypes from the Dreamtime of Anthropology', in G. Stocking (ed.), *Colonial Situations: Essays on the Contextualization of Ethnographic Knowledge* (Madison, 1991), *Colonial Situations*, p. 59.
[93] Ibid., p. 60.
[94] J. Kenyatta, *Facing Mount Kenya*, p. 318.

To be sure, if Malinowski's aspirations for practical anthropology were rooted in older ideas of applying scientific knowledge to colonial administration, his embrace of Kenyatta, who sought knowledge and legitimacy to advance the cause of independence, signalled something new. Students such as the future Kenyan president represented one change in the rise of a class of colonial leaders. They were bridges between the university and empire, between colonialism and the foundation of a world less shaped by empire, if not post-imperial. Of these bridge figures, another LSE student, William Arthur Lewis, was one of the most unique and significant.

Lewis was born in 1915 in St. Lucia to parents who were schoolteachers. An apt pupil, in 1932 he won the Government Scholarship to attend a British University.[95] The number of West Indians at LSE and in Britain at the time was small. As noted in the opening chapter, there were a limited number of scholarships for colonial students to study abroad, particularly outside India. The number of West Indian students rose substantially after World War II, spurred by the Colonial Development and Welfare Act [CDWA] of 1945, which provided money for new scholarships (their numbers increased from 166 to 1114 between 1939 and 1950).[96] Lewis' career path was both constrained and propelled by harsh colonial realities. The colour bar limited career options for ambitious and talented black subjects; the few who were fortunate enough to win Government Scholarships to study in Britain tended to go into medicine or law, where they could earn a good living that did not relay on government support.[97] Lewis wanted to study engineering instead, but felt compelled to dismiss the idea as neither the

[95] 'Extension of Scholarship, W.A. Lewis,' CO/321/362/3, NAUK.
[96] Matera, *Black Internationalism and African and Caribbean Intellectuals in London,* p. 393.
[97] W.A. Lewis Nobel prize website, accessed 18 Feb., 2015 at http://www.nobelprize.org/nobel_prizes/economic-sciences/laureates/1979/lewis-bio.html

government nor the local firms would hire a black engineer.[98] He decided on business administration instead, hoping to acquire a job in the municipal service or in private trade.[99]

At LSE, Lewis worked under Professor of Commerce Arnold Plant [1930-65]. He later wrote of Plant that although 'he was a *laissez-faire* liberal and I a social democrat', he was indebted to him for his 'no-nonsense criticism'.[100] Plant had earlier completed the B.Sc. (Econ.) and B.Com. degrees at the School himself, and specialised in teaching the "Industry and Trade" class in the B.Com. as well as Business Administration.[101] In 1933, Lewis enrolled in the B.Com., a degree created after World War I that taught economic history and theory, as well as statistics, geography, accounting and commercial law.[102] In addition to Plant, he also learnt from others at LSE, including classical economists Hayek and Robbins.

Lewis claimed that when he began his degree, he had no understanding of what economics was.[103] Perhaps he was being unduly humble; regardless, he rapidly gained expertise in the subject and owed his path breaking achievements at LSE to a stellar career as a student. In 1936, he wrote a history essay, 'The Evolution of the Peasantry in the British West Indies', which won the 'Director's Prize' for best undergraduate essay.[104] Lewis wrote the essay in the context of labour unrest in the West Indies that had broken out in 1934. The Depression had intensified the region's already stark poverty and

[98] W.A. Lewis, Autobiographical sketch, p. 2.
[99] Ibid.
[100] W.A. Lewis, Autobiographical sketch, p. 2.
[101] R.H. Coase, *Essays on Economics and Economists* (Chicago, 1994), p. 179.
[102] LSE website, accessed 18 Feb., 2015 at http://blogs.lse.ac.uk/lsehistory/2015/01/23/arthur-lewis-at-lse-one-of-our-best-teachers/
[103] W.A. Lewis Nobel prize website, accessed 18 Feb., 2015 at http://www.nobelprize.org/nobel_prizes/economic-sciences/laureates/1979/lewis-bio.html
[104] W.A. Lewis, 'The Evolution of the Peasantry in the British West Indies', 1936, Box 37, folder 3, ALP, SGML; R. Tignor, *W. Arthur Lewis and the Birth of Development Economics* (Princeton, 2005). p. 17.

highlighted its dependence on agricultural exports, which were less in demand after 1929. In his essay, he directly challenged the power of white planters to address the region's lack of development, signalling an early commitment to an active state in advancing colonial development.

> There is, of course, yet another way in which the state may come to be more active in promoting the development of the peasantry. If the state ceases to be dominated by the plantocracy, if, for instance, a change in the franchise brings political power within the range of labourers and peasants, the prospects of the peasantry will become much brighter.[105]

Lewis' early success led him to go on to do a PhD at LSE entitled, 'The Economics of Loyalty Contracts', which he submitted in 1940.[106] Remarkably for the time, he was offered a one-year lectureship while still writing his thesis in 1938, which was turned into a four-year position as an Assistant Lecturer the following year.[107] In so doing, Lewis became the first black lecturer at LSE.

As the LSE staff files indicate, although he was well liked and supported, there was some hesitation about the appointment. In a letter to the board of governors' committee, it was confirmed that he would lecture and take classes, but not do any advising. Alexander Carr-Saunders, Beveridge's successor as LSE Director [1937-57], also added, 'He [Lewis] would therefore not see students individually but only in groups'.[108] The appointment committee, Carr-Saunders asserted, 'is…quite unanimous but recognize that the appointment of a coloured man may possibly be open to some

---

[105] W.A. Lewis, 'The Evolution of the Peasantry in the British West Indies', 1936, Box 37, folder 3, ALP, SGML.
[106] W.A. Lewis, 'The Economics of Loyalty Contracts', (University of London PhD thesis, 1940), box 37, folder 4, ALP, SGML.
[107] W.A. Lewis, Autobiographical sketch, p. 2.
[108] Carr-Saunders to Lord Stamp, quoted from Tignor, *W. Arthur Lewis and the Birth of Development Economics*, p. 21. I was unable to locate Lewis' student and staff files. LSE archivist Sue Donnelley informed me that they have been misplaced. As a result, I am relying on Tignor's prior use of them in his biography of Lewis.

criticism. Normally, such appointments do not require confirmation of the Governors but on this occasion I said that I should before taking action submit the matter to you'.[109] Stamp agreed, writing, 'it is just the kind of experimental and terminable appointment that is so valuable in a case like this'.[110] Like other colonial students, Lewis faced racism, including having trouble securing accommodation in London.[111]

The indignities nonetheless did little to impede his momentum. Initially, Lewis just taught on transportation, yet he was soon also given the responsibility to teach the introduction to economics and business economics. On the advice of Hayek, he also began teaching interwar economics of Europe and North America. Hayek praised him to Carr-Saunders, saying Lewis was one of the School's 'best teachers'.[112] According to the 1942-43 LSE Calendar, he lectured on the economics of transport, international trade, and banking.[113] In 1943-44 he gave a course on colonial economics, the first such course to appear on the LSE calendar.[114]

Lewis' course on colonial economics itself was not unprecedented. Lillian Knowles began lecturing on economic history at LSE at the turn of the century and became Professor of Economic History at LSE in 1921. She taught a course on economic development in the Empire, which the University of London made part of the B.Com. degree, and wrote a book on the subject, in part because there was so few existing

[109] Ibid.
[110] Stamp reply, quoted from R. Tignor, *W. Arthur Lewis and the Birth of Development Economics*, p. 21 (Arthur Lewis Staff File).
[111] B. Ingham and P. Mosely, '"Marvellous Intellectual Feasts": Arthur Lewis at the London School of Economics, 1933-48', *History of Political Economy* 45, no. 2 (Summer, 2013), p. 43.
[112] F.A. Hayek, quoted in Tignor, *W. Arthur Lewis and the Birth of Development Economics*, p. 22 (Arthur Lewis Staff File).
[113] LSE, Calendar, 1942-43.
[114] LSE, Calendar, 1943-44.

secondary sources she could provide her students with.[115] The book assumes a comparative approach to colonial problems, focusing on India, with sections on sanitation, education and the protection of natives.[116] In 1930, she published the second volume, focusing on the dominions.[117]

In addition to Knowles' course, Vera Anstey also taught on colonial development. After graduating from LSE herself in 1913, Anstey moved to Bombay with her husband, who had been appointed Principal of the Sydenham College of Commerce and Economics in Bombay. While there, she became Examiner in Economic Theory for the B.Com. degree. Being in India afforded Anstey time to amass a large amount of statistical data that became a foundation for her later writings on Indian economics.[118] Following her husband's death, Anstey joined the LSE faculty. In 1923, she assumed the teaching of "The Trade of India" and "Indian Production". Courses on Indian economics had been conducted at LSE since 1903-4; in 1910-11, John Maynard Keynes presented six lectures on "Trade and Finance in India." In 1932-3 Anstey began a seminar "Problems of Indian Economic Development". Aside from a 5-year break during WWII, this seminar was offered every year until 1965 and was well attended by South Asian economics students.[119] She also lectured on commerce and industry in India and Africa (as well as Europe, North America, South America and Australasia in "The Organisation of Commerce and Industry".[120] She was often a source of advice and what has been described as 'motherly' support for young South Asian students.[121]

---

[115] L. Knowles, *The Economic Development of the British Overseas Empire* (London, 1924), p. ix.
[116] Ibid.
[117] L. Knowles, *The Economic Development of the British Overseas Empire* vol. 2 (London, 1930).
[118] See: Vera Anstey, *The Economic Development of India*.
[119] LSE Archives, Vera Anstey Small LSE Deposits 25.
[120] LSE Calendar, 1942-43.
[121] K.S. Aiyar to Anstey, 26 Sept 1921, Vera Anstey Small LSE Deposits 25, LSE. Aiyar wrote that a letter

Yet Lewis' course nevertheless reflected something distinctly new, namely a course on the problems of development in the colonies taught by a colonial graduate of LSE who advocated for greater colonial political autonomy in his essays and in his political engagement outside LSE. Indeed, in addition to his teaching, Lewis was a member of the Fabian Society and wrote pamphlets for both the Fabian Society and its Fabian Colonial Bureau, created in 1940 to advance research on the colonies. He published on a wide array of topics, including the need for nationalisations in the colonies and greater emphasis on industrialisation as opposed to the existing stress on agricultural exports.[122] Lewis also began working for the Colonial Office in 1938, researching the financing of industrial colonial development. In 1943, he moreover became Secretary to the Colonial Economic Advisory Committee, which was tasked with exploring questions related to colonial economic development. In this capacity, Lewis was often at odds with other members, including Carr-Saunders' successor as LSE Director Sydney Caine [1957-67], for not giving the state a large enough role to advance development.[123]

Lewis was ambiguous about how his government experience shaped him and his teaching. He was often frustrated over poor funding and half-hearted implementation of policy recommendations. He could also be publicly critical of its approach. In a 1941 conference attended by Kenyatta as well as Menon, Lewis attacked the Colonial Office and colonial governors. According to the intelligence report on the conference, he said that 'Colonial officials…did not take their duties seriously and it was only when trouble broke out in the colonies endangering British capitalist interests – such as the 1935 strikes

---

would be delivered by son of a leading Indian industrialist, Lalubhai Samaldas, a friend of Percy Anstey. The son received a BA in Bombay and was now studying for B.Sc at LSE. Aiyar hoped that the boy would receive guidance from Anstey; B.K. Nehru in Joan Abse (ed.), *My LSE* (London, 1977), p. 17

[122] See, for instance, A. Lewis, *Monopoly in British Industry* (London, 1945).

[123] Lewis to Caine, 22 November 1943, CO 852/510/30

in the West Indies – that they attempted to tackle the hob of administration'.[124] Despite his outspokenness, Lewis' time advising the Colonial Office played an important role in advancing his career as a development economist. The Colonial Office stimulated his thinking about development and, perhaps crucially, gave him access to information. His time at the Colonial Office Library in the 1930s familiarised him with reports from the different colonies on issues including agriculture, mining and currency problems.[125] Along with his personal experience of growing up in St. Lucia and his increasing expertise in economics, this helped Lewis became adept enough to begin teaching colonial economics. He later acknowledged that from the mid 1940s, he spent time in the Colonial Office library, 'reading reports from the colonial territories on agricultural problems, mining, currency questions and the like' and that comparing these different territories he learnt something about the 'efficacy of different policies'.[126] Lewis also noted that, although it was not until 1950 when he had moved to Manchester that he began lecturing systematically about development economics, he did begin implementing his experiences from the Colonial Office to the colonial students who took his LSE classes.[127] Unfortunately, there is little record of his students and how they reacted to his classes. Although he never commented on it directly, Lewis must have had some sense of excitement at the prospect of teaching colonial students like himself who could eventually implement his thinking. Edward Shils, a colleague at the LSE, recalled Lewis

[124] Metropolitan Police Report, 20 Feb. 1941, KV2 2509, NAUK.
[125] W.A. Lewis, Autobiographical sketch, p. 3.
[126] Ibid.
[127] Ibid.

saying that, 'However much we criticize the School, it must be remembered that it is the most important educational institution in Asia and Africa'.[128]

Lewis offered something distinct from what Knowles and Anstey taught, an economics class directly about the colonies presented by LSE's first black lecturer. Perhaps Lewis' novelty can be best understood through a review he wrote of Margery Perham's book, *Africans and British Rule*, published in 1941, in which Lewis lambasted the Oxford historian's approach to Africa. The language in Lewis' published work and correspondences was generally moderate, yet Perham's book provoked a highly caustic response. In it, he imagines what an African must think of British rule. An African boy considering this question would notice the disparity between his own dilapidated school and a superior one reserved for his white settler peers. As he grew up, finding a menial job, perhaps in a mine, he would realise that regardless of his talents, a colour bar existed that would prevent him from acquiring skilled employment.[129] Should he protest his lot, he could be imprisoned.[130] In his imagined scenario, Lewis may have been thinking of his own experience and home, having been rejected after applying for a post as a colonial administrator in Port of Spain in 1937, likely on account of his colour.[131]

Lewis continued by arguing that Perham's approach to addressing African advancement was highly paternalistic, written by an apologist for empire 'from the heights of her civilized eminence to the depths of our [black] savagery'.[132] Although Perham grappled with the exploitation of Africans by white settlers and capitalists, the

[128] E. Shils and J. Epstein (eds.) *Portraits: A Gallery of Intellectuals* (Chicago, 1997), p. 181.
[129] A. Lewis, *Newsletter* (September, 1941).
[130] Ibid.
[131] B. Ingham and P. Mosely, '"Marvellous Intellectual Feasts": Arthur Lewis at the London School of Economics, 1933-48', *History of Political Economy* 45, no. 2 (Summer, 2013), p. 198.

[132] A. Lewis, *Newsletter* (September, 1941).

African subject still required protection. For Perham, according to Lewis, this exploitation was the inevitable corollary to 'the effort to civilize him'.[133] Lewis's attack on Perham again highlights the significance of his role as a transitional figure. It would be of interest to know more of what Lewis thought of Malinowski and Lucy Mair, given that their efforts to advance the science of colonial administration ran parallel to Perham's at Oxford. Tignor indicates Lewis' interest in their courses while a student in the mid-1930s, but there is little record of how he viewed their approach to colonial studies at LSE.[134] In a generally positive review of books on economic aspects of colonial societies by two other LSE anthropologists and students of Malinowski, Aubrey Richards and Raymond Firth, Lewis criticised them for being too descriptive. In most cases, Lewis argues, colonial administrations either elect to respect traditional societies and oppose all attempts at 'westernisation', or view this approach as highly dangerous and attempt to modernise.[135] Both approaches, according to Lewis, were problematic, and the authors should be more prescriptive in their future work. [136]

It was Perham's paternalism that stoked his ire, not the pretensions of expert intervention into colonial life more generally. Many colonial students from Africa and the West Indies felt that they were members of a community of experts, a view that Kenyatta, as we have seen, articulated as well.[137] Lewis embraced the same opinion. In 1946, he argued that 'The only people who can transform the colonies into anything worthwhile are the educated Natives, the intelligentsia.'[138] As chapter two noted, binary categories,

[133] A. Lewis, *Newsletter* (September, 1941).
[134] R. Tignor, *W. Arthur Lewis and the Birth of Development Economics*, p. 18.
[135] A. Lewis [no title, review of R. Firth, *Primitive Polynesian Economy* (1939) and A. Richards, *Land, Labour and Diet in Norther Rhodesia* (1939)], *Economica* (February, 1941), p. 116.
[136] Ibid.
[137] P. Zachernuk, *An African Intelligentsia and Atlantic Ideas* (Charlottseville, VA., 2000), p. 98.
[138] P. 342

such as whether their education abroad led students down the path of radicalisation or Westernisation, rarely capture the nuance of how they actually engaged with the ideas they were exposed to. In this case, African elites and those of African descent formed a new sub-group that embraced the analytical methods they encountered in universities abroad that helped enable them claim an expert understanding of their societies. Their expertise, as viewed by themselves and British imperial and academic authorities, derived from a combination of local and metropolitan experiences, including first-hand knowledge of Kikuyu culture or the poverty of the West Indies in the cases of Kenyatta and Lewis, as well as the opportunities made available by the social sciences at LSE and the Colonial Office library.

World War II ushered in a sea change that would open up more opportunities for students to engage with an emerging community of colonial experts. The disturbances in the West Indies led to the Moyne Commission, which described the poverty of the region and laid the foundation for the 1940 CDWA (renewed in 1945). The CDWA of 1940 made provision for a significant extension of research in colonial territories and affirmed that Colonial Governments would need experts with training in one or more of the social sciences to assist in carrying them out.[139] Demographers, anthropologists, lawyers, or students of public administration might be required as advisors or in executive posts in relation to the welfare and development schemes.[140] An LSE memo on the matter argued that the School was well positioned to help in this effort, as it was the only university in the UK devoted entirely to the social sciences and because of its staff, including Mair,

[139] Ibid.
[140] Ibid.

Firth and Lewis (Malinowski having passed away in 1942).[141] Already in 1942, moreover, there was the expectation that there would be a considerable increase in the number of colonial students attending UK universities for graduate research or special courses after the war.[142]

Conclusion

Following World War II, Britain, as well as France, sought out African intellectuals who they had eschewed before as part of the policy of indirect rule and assumptions that they were somehow less authentic than uneducated Africans.[143] One of the strongest colonial voices arguing for colonial development after the war was Arthur Lewis. In 1947-48, Lewis' teaching of colonial economics at LSE was formalised in the School's curriculum, and he was officially appointed Reader in Colonial Economics.[144] The following year, Lewis would become Britain's first black Professor at Manchester in 1948, where he further developed his thinking on colonial economics. Lewis's story was unique – managing to overcome LSE's 'gentlemanly' racism while seizing the opportunity it presented to secure an assistant lectureship, the want-to-be engineer who did not know what economics was but managed to use his LSE training and work in the Colonial Office as a springboard to becoming a founding father of development economics. Yet it was also representative in significant ways.

At the outset of this chapter, we discussed Malinowski's advocacy for practical anthropology and the role he envisaged for it in colonial administration. Malinowski's vision lacked a specific moral dimension. His understanding of empire was not that it was

[141] Ibid.
[142] Ibid.
[143] Burbank and Cooper. *Empires in World History: Power and the Politics of Difference*. 420.
[144] LSE Calendar, 1947-8.

a vehicle for good but rather that anthropologists, who possessed the analytical capabilities to understand native life, had a duty to inform the administrator, reducing his ignorance and thus increasing the chances of good government. On the one hand, Malinowski's position was consistent with older notions of the imperial civilising mission, which also sought to use Western knowledge for the improvement of the colonies. On the other hand, his students signalled the emergence of a new phenomenon in the relationship between British academia and the Empire, namely the emergence of African and other black experts who drew on the authority of the social sciences to enhance their credibility and whom Malinowski encouraged.

Like Kenyatta and Robeson, Lewis also came to LSE as a student in the 1930s. More than anyone, his career at the School represented the emergence of a new colonial elite that signalled a transition between the end of empire and the initial shaping of a world after empire. Indeed, in Lewis, the Empire had come full circle. A colonial student-turned lecturer, Lewis understood his experience and university training as positioning him within a black intelligentsia that was best suited to address colonial needs. Before the new funding for the colonies made available by the end of World War II and the CDWA, Lewis had established himself as a respected government advisor and by 1943 a lecturer on colonial economics. As with so many other colonial students, overseas study fundamentally shaped Lewis' career, and with it, the relationship between the university and colonial or undeveloped economies, which would soon have the option of taking advice from a colonial expert.

4

The Pink Professor and the Pamphleteer: Harold Laski and Socialism at LSE, 1920-1950

A Foreign Element

Arthur Lewis and Bronislaw Malinowski were by no means the alone in standing out at LSE. In the spring of 1923, a concerned citizen wrote to LSE Director William Beveridge expressing her fears about the School, particularly raising alarm that the university was infecting its students with socialist ideas.[1] The accuser, Miss M.A. Clay, was especially worried about the Political Science department, which was increasingly becoming associated with one of its young lecturers, Harold Joseph Laski. She wondered if the teaching of such an important topic as political ideas should be left in the hands of a 'foreigner'.[2] Clay's fears deluded her – Laski was born and bred in Britain, a fact Beveridge assured her of.[3] But her suspicions of Laski and the teaching of politics at LSE would be repeated and intensified by others in succeeding decades. Indeed, political science at LSE became a serious matter, perhaps even more so in regards to foreign students, who had the potential to spread ideas to the colonies and abroad.

Even more than Malinowski, Laski played a robust role in the intellectual lives of his students, and certainly in their political experiences.[4] As we have noted, he

---

[1] M.A. Clay to W. Beveridge, 7 April 1923, WBP, 2B/22/4, LSE.
[2] Ibid.
[3] W. Beveridge to M.A. Clay, 12 April 1923, WBP, 2B/22/4, LSE.
[4] For a general biography of Laski's life and work, see: I. Kramnick and B. Sheerman, *Harold Laski: A Life on the Left* (London, 1993). For a more in depth view of Laski's ideas, see P. Lamb, *Harold Laski: Problems of Democracy, the Sovereign State and International Society* (New York, 2004); Lamb, 'Harold Laski (1893-1950): Political Theorist of a World in Crisis', *Review of International Studies* 25, no. 2 (April 1999), pp. 329-42. Lamb, 'Laski's Ideological Metamorphosis', *Journal of Political Ideologies* 4, no. 2 (1999), pp. 239-260; A. A. Ekirch Jr., 'Harold J. Laski: The Liberal *Manqué* or the Lost Libertarian?', *The Journal of Libertarian Studies* 4 no. 2 (Spring, 1980), pp. 139-150; Jena, Krisna C. and Krusna C. Jena, 'Harold Laski and his Concept of Liberty', *The Indian Journal of Political Science* 21, no. 1 (Jan.-March,

championed Indian independence, corresponded with Gandhi about mentoring South Asians and developed close relationships with colonial student-activists, most notably V.K. Krishna Menon. Laski relished his role as a teacher of young minds from around the world, once boasting to his friend Oliver Wendell Holmes Jr. about having 'a whirl of new students, black, brown, yellow and white – the Hindu, the Chinaman, the American from Iowa'.[5] His students came from all over the world and form an impressive list. In addition to Menon, they included, from India, Renuka Ray, G.L. Mehta, B.K. Nehru, Minoo Masani, Jyoti Basu and K.R. Narayanan, as well as Canadians C.B. Macpherson and Pierre Elliot Trudeau.

Lahiri and Mukherjee have both argued that the political ideas and practices engaged with in Britain exercised significant influence over the emerging worldviews of colonial elites who studied there. They alluded to the importance of life in Britain, including classes in history and politics, in highlighting to South Asian students the contradictions between notions of liberty in the Western tradition and the status of imperial rule in India.[6] In some cases, the books students encountered encouraged their nationalism by highlighting fundamental tenets of liberalism, and, in so doing, illuminate the contradiction between great British texts on freedom, such as John Milton's plea for

---

1960), pp. 62-9. For a highly critical view of Laski, see H. Deane, *The Political Ideas of Harold J. Laski* (New York, 1955). G.G. Eastwood, *Harold Laski* (London, 1977). For a hagiographic appraisal, see K. Martin, *Harold Laski, 1893-1950: A Biographical Memoir* (London, 1969). M. Newman, *Harold Laski: A Political Biography* (London, 2009); Newman, 'Class, State and Democracy: Laski, Miliband and the Search for a Synthesis', *Political Studies* Vol. 54 (2006), pp. 328-48; Newman, 'Harold Laski Today', *Political Quarterly* 67, no. 3 (July-September 1996), pp. 229-38.

[5] H. Laski to O.W. Holmes Jr., 30 September 1926, in M. de Wolfe Howe (ed.) *Holmes-Laski Letters*, vol. 2, (Cambridge, 1953), p. 879.

[6] See Lahiri, pp. 124-5, 177; Mukherjee, *Nationalism, Education and Migrant Identities,* pp. 218-223, For Mukherjee's section on communism see pp. 224-249.

free speech in *Areopagitica*, the works of Edmund Burke or John Stuart Mill, and the reality of censorship and foreign rule in India.[7]

Yet as with the extensive literature on the relationship between metropolitan anti-colonial activists and British socialism, which focuses on political connections revolving around the CPGB, the ILP and the Labour Party, the experiences that students had inside classrooms and how relationships with academics affected their intellectual development is underexplored.[8] Laski's teaching thus provides a lens to examine the significance of classes, relationships between professors and students and the university more broadly in exposing colonial students to socialist ideology. To be sure, interest in Laski's life and work became rejuvenated with the end of the Cold War and the resulting soul-searching on the left, as well as his centenary in 1993. Yet despite his relationships with colonial students being widely acknowledged, in memoirs, obituaries and biographies, and notwithstanding the claim that Laski's teaching may have been his most significant legacy, there has been little scholarly exploration of his teaching.[9]

Indeed, the final two chapters of this thesis seek to enhance our understanding of the ways in which colonial students in Britain were exposed to socialist ideas, what those ideas were and how students ultimately assessed them. This chapter explores Laski's teaching and how he communicated his beliefs to students. I argue that Laski in particular

---

[7] See Lahiri, pp. 50, 124-5.

[8] M. Ahmed, *The British Labour Party and the Indian Independence Movement, 1917-1939* (London, 1987); K.C. Arora, *Indian Nationalist Movement in Britain, 1930-1949* (New Delhi, 1992) (the latter focuses on Laski's work on Indian independence within the Labour Party); P. S. Gupta, 'British Labour and the Indian Left, 1919–1939' in Nanda, B.R. (ed*.), Socialism in India* (New Delhi, 1972), pp. 69-122. *Essays in Honour of Prof. S.C. Sarkar* (New Delhi, 1974).

[9] The most in depth attempts have been by Martin, p. 250-254 and Kramnick pp. 333-36, 589, as well as the author's earlier essay, B. Moscovitch, 'Harold Laski's Indian Students and the Power of Education, 1920-1950', *Contemporary South Asia* 20, no. 1 (March, 2012), pp. 33-44. For Dahrendorf's account, see Dahrendorf, pp. 231-2. For relationships with individual students, see P. Lamb and D. Morrice, 'Ideological Reconciliation in the Thought of Harold Laski and C.B. Macpherson', *Canadian Journal of Political Science* 35, no. 4 (December 2002), pp. 795-810; M. Newman, 'Class, State and Democracy: Laski, Miliband and the Search for a Synthesis', *Political Studies* 34 (2006), pp. 328-48.

became the hub of an international group of students who were drawn to his teaching. LSE offered students several distinct ways to engage with leftist groups and individuals inside and outside the School, from Fabian socialists to communists. I assess how Laski's teaching was both reflective of existing currents in socialist thought yet also offered students a distinct set of ideas, which above all sought to incorporate elements of liberalism into Marxism. Based on student lecture notes, I affirm that Laski's teaching often closely reflected his political writings. Before proceeding to discuss how students assessed Laski's thought in the final chapter, I emphasise how his charisma as a teacher, his personal engagement with students and his involvement in anti-colonial politics strengthened his appeal and ability to have a lasting intellectual impact.

Harold Joseph Laski

Perhaps Laski's youthful admirers saw something of themselves in their professor. The sociologist Edward Shils, who lectured at LSE, offered a description of his diminutive but irrepressible former colleague.

> He was short and extremely thin; he had narrow shoulders joined by a thin neck to a very small head with black hair slicked down and divided in the middle by a wide white avenue. He had a small black mustache. His bright black eyes, seen through black horn-rimmed spectacles, gave him the appearance of an adolescent prodigy.[10]

The contrast between Harold Joseph Laski's unassuming appearance and his outsized role at LSE was the least of his apparent contradictions. A critic yet often apologist for Soviet totalitarianism, a man fond of touting his many high-profile contacts yet always the conspicuous outsider, an academic masquerading as a pamphleteer, or perhaps, some

[10] E. Shils, 'The Career of Harold Laski,' *The New Criterion* (April 1994), accessed 16 June 2104 at http://www.newcriterion.com/articles.cfm/The-career-of-Harold-Laski-4926

accused, vice versa; above all, a defender of freedom for the voiceless who flirted with the idea of revolution that would concentrate power in the hands of expert planners.

Laski was born in Manchester in 1893. His parents were Polish Jews who immigrated to England in the middle of the nineteenth century, part of the large wave of Jewish migrants fleeing the Pale of Settlement that included the family of Ralph Miliband, as well as Moshe Sharett, both future Laski students.[11] Though Laski rejected religion, he claimed that the sense he gained of being treated differently for no tangible reason contributed to his eventual embrace of socialism.[12] Laski's father, Nathan, became a successful cotton merchant, embracing the Gladstonian Liberalism dominant in Victorian England that his son would reject from a young age. A gifted youth, Harold Laski attended Manchester Grammar School, where he claimed to have first embraced a revulsion of what his future colleague at LSE, R.H. Tawney, termed the 'acquisitive society' around him.[13] He subsequently read history at New College, Oxford, where he developed an interest in Fabian socialism.[14] Rooted in the reformed liberalism of thinkers such as L.T. Hobhouse and J.A. Hobson, as well as Fabian socialism, Laski's emerging intellectual trajectory was shaped by a belief that the traditional liberalism to which his family subscribed overlooked a 'whole class of human beings'.[15]

[11] Miliband's family moved from Poland to Belgium, where Ralph was born, after World War I. Ralph Miliband subsequently fled to England after the Nazis invaded. Moshe Sharett's [Shertok] family moved from Ukraine to Ottoman Palestine. Sharett was an early student of Laski and Prime Minister of Israel, 1954-5. For more on Sharett, see G. Sheffer, *Moshe Sharett: Biography of a Political Moderate* (Oxford, 1996).
[12] H. Laski, 'Why I am a Marxist', *The Nation*, 14 January 1939, p. 76.
[13] H. Laski, 'Why I am a Marxist', *The Nation*, 14 January 1939, p. 76.
[14] Ibid.
[15] Ibid. On Hobhouse, Laski wrote that 'He sought with energy, by deed not less than by precept, to enlarge the number of those to whom the idea of liberty has a positive and dynamic meaning'. See H. Laski, *The Decline of Liberalism* (London, 1940) p. 3.

In 1920, his growing reputation, earned teaching and writing in North America, including stints at McGill University, Harvard and Yale, helped him secure a position lecturing at LSE. He obtained a Professorship in 1926 and remained at the School until his death in 1950, when the Chair of Political Science was passed onto Michael Oakeshott, Laski's opposite in so many ways, an anti-rationalist conservative philosopher who shunned political pamphleteering. Coinciding with the intensification of the Cold War in Europe and Asia, Laski's death marked the end of an era at the School.

Students and the Left in London and LSE

That era, the 'Age of Laski' as one British historian called it, was one of the most dramatic in LSE's history.[16] Internationally, Laski's tenure overlapped with a dramatic series of developments that coloured the debates student engaged in at the School. The legacy of the Bolshevik Revolution provided a model that challenged the liberal imperial order predominant since the expansion of free trade from the 1870s, particularly after the Great Depression seemed to highlight capitalism's structural failings. As we have seen, the crises of the 1930s helped mobilise students by encouraging anti-colonial and internationalist sentiments that contested the prevailing political order.[17] Moreover, colonial students were aware of several challenges to the British Empire, which many had experienced personally before disembarking in London. These included the expansion of nationalism in India and the anti-colonial agitation of a small but increasingly vocal number of African and West Indian elites. In Britain itself, the labour movement and success of the Labour Party, which formed its first minority government in 1924, provided an example of how to pursue socialist policies democratically.

[16] M. Beloff, 'The Age of Laski', *Fortnightly* vol. CLXVII, (June, 1950).
[17] For more, see chapter two.

During a period when the local and global underpinnings of the world's political and economic order were being challenged on multiple fronts, interwar universities provided forums for association and discussion of radical solutions to contemporary problems. As we have also noted, New Scotland Yard was concerned enough to monitor the activities of radical students and groups where youths were suspected of being involved in nationalist activities.[18] As Mukherjee has noted, the British Government was especially concerned about Majlis debating societies, including in Oxford and Cambridge, as well as in London.[19] Anxiety about student activities varied depending on location and time. Specific crises, like the outbreak of World War II, increased alarm about student interactions with radical groups, like the University Labour Federation, which, although mainly a Labour organisation, contained a strong communist element that reached out to student organisations. This was especially true in the early 1940s at Cambridge, where it cooperated with the Majlis and other student groups to advocate for Indian independence and to protest the war until the Nazi invasion of the Soviet Union altered the policy of pro-Soviet groups under pressure from Moscow.

LSE's Fabian roots made it a distinct case. On account of World War II, LSE's students and faculty relocated to Peterhouse College, Cambridge. The move did not go unnoticed by British intelligence, which explained the rise in political radicalism at Cambridge in part because of the influx of LSE students and their 'powerful red element'.[20] The question of whether the School was going to be an institution of learning, or propaganda, was something the university faced from its inception. On the overall

[18] For more, see chapter one.
[19] S. Mukherjee, *Nationalism, Education and Migrant Identities*, p. 112.
[20] The Universities and Extreme Politics, 4 April 1940, Indian students in the UK: subversive influences at British universities; report by Sir Aziz ul-huque; note on arrangements for university admission, 1941-44, L/PJ/12/638, file 808/40, BL.

atmosphere of LSE, G.L. Mehta argued that the Webbs did not inflict their political views on LSE, affirming '…the School both in its staff and among students includes all possible variety of views from extreme conservatism to downright Communism'.[21] There were many, however, who disagreed.

Throughout the period under study, LSE faced sharp and mounting criticism from students, University of London administrators, the press and the Colonial Office for demonstrating a bias towards socialism.[22] Laski was often the focus of attacks, fuelled by his prolific journalism, including in the left leaning *Daily Herald*, and a lecturing trip to Moscow in 1934, leading to numerous confrontations with Beveridge in the 1930s. There was even concern over LSE's reputation spreading throughout the empire. In 1949, a crown agent responsible for liaising with colonial governments about the funding of scholarship holders in the UK, wondered whether something could be done to combat the idea that LSE encouraged communism; the impact LSE had in promoting communism, he asserted, was widely believed in the colonies.[23]

Despite efforts to ensure that LSE was primarily devoted to research and education, its Fabian origins were evident through a number of institutions it supported, including the Fabian Nursery. The Nursery, dedicated to promote the discussion of socialism and its propagation, was founded in 1906 and ultimately wound up in 1925.[24] It met in the School and was only open to those under twenty-eight years old.[25] Prominent

[21] G.L. Mehta, 'Sidney Webb', *Amrita Bazar Patrika* 17 October 1947, GLMP, Speeches and Writings, 3rd and 4th Instalments Part 1, NMML.
[22] See 'Criticism of the London School of Economics', 197/A, LSE.
[23] Letter to the Director, 1 June 1949, 'Criticism of the London School of Economics', LSE, 197/A. The Crown agent in question was the Director of Colonial Scholars, J.L. Keith. For more, see A.J. Stockwell, 'Leaders, Dissidents and the Disappointed: Colonial Students in Britain as Empire Ended', *The Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History* 36, no. 3 (Sept., 2008), p. 488.
[24] Executive Committee, Fabian Nursery, Fabian Society H/1, LSE.
[25] Ibid.

socialists and Fabians, including G.D.H. Cole, Sidney Webb, H.G. Wells and George Bernard Shaw, were all asked to lecture about various aspects related to socialism. One member and Laski student, Renuka Ray, recalled being impressed by Shaw's wit. 'In the Fabian Nursery', she recounted, 'he was able to draw out the young and encourage self-introspection among them with lasting results'.[26]

Another Laski student, the political theorist C.B. Macpherson, listened to lectures inside and outside the School in the 1930s. He went to a series of talks organised by the Fabian Society, listening to Kingsley Martin, editor of the *New Statesman*, as well as Shaw and others.[27] The Canadian attended lectures at the LSE Socialist Society, a student group, including one by Leonard Woolf about Labour's foreign policy, after which Woolf accompanied twenty people for tea and Macpherson sat beside him, discussing contemporary issues.[28] He also joined the LSE Marxist Club on a march to Trafalgar Square, where he listened to speeches by ILP and Labour politicians, including James Maxton and Ellen Wilkinson.[29] While Macpherson noted these events in his diary, the intellectual impact of experiences like these is nearly impossible to assess. Yet they do underscore the political experiences available to students at LSE beyond everyday classes, much of which was closely connected to the School's history.

Other students, including Krishna Menon and B.K. Nehru, joined the LSE Students' Union. The Union boasts its own journal, *Clare Market Review*, established in 1905, which has published works by several Fabian writers, including Shaw, as well as

[26] R. Ray, *My Reminiscences*, pp. 41-2.
[27] C.B. Macpherson, journal entries, 9 November 1933 and 23 November 1933, CBMP, UTA.
[28] Ibid., 12 November 1934, CBMP, UTA.
[29] C.B. Macpherson, journal entry 14 January 1934, CBMP, UTA.

Laski and Beveridge.[30] In the 1930s, the Union became increasingly left wing, and communist literature was widely circulated.[31] Some Union members became particularly aggressive in protesting the established order, which included vilifying staff.[32] The difficulties of the 1930s boiled over in 1934, when a Marxist student paper, *Student Vanguard*, went so far as to accuse someone in the LSE faculty of helping the Colonial Office spy on Indian students. After Beveridge expelled six students involved in the accusation, there was a rally, ultimately unsuccessful, outside LSE calling for Beveridge's termination.[33]

In addition to its history, LSE's location in central London was a further reason the School's students had unique and plentiful opportunities for political engagement, as well as access to radical literature and ideas. As we have seen in chapter two, London was the centre of myriad student organisations and political groups, including associations like the India League and the CCC, which both had connections to the CPGB. London's activist organisations and student groups provided additional forums for debate and political stimulation indirectly linked to the university that was responsible for their presence.

As with the LSE Students' Union, most groups that students belonged to contained a variety of views. For instance, the Central Association of Indian Students

[30] In the first edition in 1950 after Laski's passing, students, colleagues and friends were effusive in their praises.
[31] Norman and Jeanne MacKenzie wrote that 'Current political unrest was reflected by the behaviour of students at the L.S.E., where Communist literature circulated widely and appeals to revolt through resolutions in the Students' Union turned into an organized campaign of rebellion and vilification of the staff'. See: B. Webb in Norman and Jeanne MacKenzie (eds.), *The Diary of Beatrice Webb Volume Four, 1924-1943: The Wheel of Life* (Cambridge, MA., 1985), pp. 328-9.
[32] Ibid.
[33] C.B Macpherson attended a meeting in support of reinstating Frank Meyer. He recalled three hundred people in attendance. See C.B. Macpherson, Journal entry, 28 May 1934, CBMP, UTA. For more, see Kramnick, p. 323.

(Abroad) [CAISA] was established in 1929 to help Indian students organise and coordinate their activities and claimed to have no political or religious affiliation. The CAISA was a generally moderate organisation, and received explicit instructions from India, where it received funding, not to identify themselves with the Marxist Shapurji Saklatvala.[34] Saklatvala and other metropolitan activists nevertheless encouraged CAISA members to embrace more radical thinking.[35] Although a minority, some students in the CAISA formed a study group that Saklatvala had influence over.[36] British intelligence feared that these students returned to India as 'rabid communists', including some who eventually joined the Communist Party of India.[37]

If much of what occurred in some spaces, not least of which no doubt include seedy restaurants and smoke-filled pubs, remains lost to history, we do know that students also networked and discussed politics in nearby apartments. P.N. Haksar, for instance, began his studies at LSE in the late 1930s. He made use of his spacious apartment in Primrose Hill, near Regent's Park, to host leftist discussion groups. Guests included fellow LSE student Jyoti Basu, as well as Indira Nehru and her LSE love interest Feroze.[38] Haksar would later serve as Indira Gandhi's Secretary [1967-73]. If meetings provided important social and networking opportunities for some, others derived a lasting ideological influence. Basu, who was also Secretary of the London Majlis, credited these discussions, which often took place during the holidays, involving students from London, Oxford, Cambridge and elsewhere, for solidifying his belief in

[34] 'Extract from Weekly Report of the Director', Intelligence Bureau, Home Department, Government of India, 7 January 1933, Central Association of Indian Students (Abroad), L/PJ/12/406, BL.
[35] Ibid.
[36] Ibid.
[37] Ibid.
[38] J. Basu, Oral History Interview, pp. 14, 15, NMML. See also: S. Banerjee (ed.), *Contributions in Remembrance: An Homage to P.N. Haksar*, Haksar Memorial Volume II: Reminiscences and Haksar Memorial Lectures (Chandigarh: Centre for Research in Rural and Industrial Development, 2004).

communism.[39]

The prevalence of radical ideas in and around LSE was further intensified by the School's focus on the social sciences, which encouraged an emphasis on contemporary problems[40] through the study of anthropology, sociology, politics and economics. When the political engagement of staff and students was added to the mix, it proved to be volatile. As Beatrice Webb remarked during the turbulence of 1934:

> The trouble with the School is, I fear, destined to become worse during the next decade. Political and economic studies, carried on in London, one of the hubs of the political and financial world, by an assembly of some three thousand students of all races and professions – undergraduates and post-graduates, youths and maidens, and men and women in the prime of their life – under the direction of a large and miscellaneous stag of professors and assistant professors, is bound to develop heated antagonism of creed and class.

LSE's history, geography, vibrant student life and focus on the social sciences helped expose students to political agitation and radical ideas. Yet despite its reputation, LSE in fact boasted a diverse faculty and offered students a wide range of ideas. Tawney, an economic historian, was an admired teacher and served in student committees.[41] A Christian socialist, Tawney remained sceptical of communism. Indeed, as Dahrendorf has written, Tawney was closer to symbolising the avoidance of bias in research that Webb,

---

[39] J. Basu, Oral History Interview, pp. 14-15, NMML.

[40] The British philosopher J.W.N. Watkins also emphasised how LSE was distinguished by its engagement with current events. He attended LSE in the 1940s before becoming a professor there. Watkins drew from Evelyn Waugh's *Put Out More Flags* to underscore his point. Early in the novel, Poppet Green and her friends were discussing the fleeing of poets Parsnip and Pimpernell to the U.S. The irony of two poets with pretensions of being contemporary avoiding the major historical event of their time, the Second World War, was lost on the discussants and had to be pointed out by an LSE student. 'Thus the aesthetic wringle might have run its familiar course, but there was in the studio that morning a cross, red-headed girl in spectacles from the London School of Economics… "What I don't see", she said… "is how these two can claim to be *contemporary* if they run away from the biggest event in contemporary history…It's just sheer escapism", she said. The word startled the studio, like the cry of 'Cheat' in a card-room."[40] For Watkins, LSE was synonymous with action, and produced people who 'impatiently cut through obfuscating highbrow talk to get to the real issue.'[40] For direct quote, see E. Waugh, *Put Out More Flags*, (London, 1948), p.43.

[41] Dahrendorf, p. 146. He served, for instance, as Honourable President of the Christian Union.

and Beveridge, favoured.[42] Ideologically, furthermore, there was a gulf between how Political Science, dominated by Laski, was taught compared with Economics, which boasted the free market economists Arnold Plant, Lionel Robins and Friedrich von Hayek among its faculty members.

B.K. Nehru highlighted the distinction between these disciplines at LSE, dryly attesting that in the economics wing of the School, he did not recall 'any lectures in Marxist economics or any admiration for the labour theory of value on which it is based'.[43] Gladstone Mills, who claimed Laski was mainly responsible for LSE's leftist reputation, also affirmed the strength of LSE's liberal and conservative traditions, embodied by Robbins and Hayek.[44] In a letter home describing his lectures, G.L. Mehta, another Laski student, wrote of his history courses that '…there was no panacea for human ills and the evils one can cure in one's own lifetime are too few. Again all study of history makes one conservative for one is oppressed with a sense of complexity and far reaching characters of all events and of the ultimate futility of all efforts.'[45]

Any student associated with Laski, to be sure, heard lectures from other LSE professors; many, such as K.N. Raj, later important in helping to draft India's First Five Year Plan, took classes with the classical liberals.[46] Some LSE students, moreover, applied specifically due to the presence of teachers other than Laski. Another economist, Amiya Kumar Dasgupta, chose Robbins and LSE over John Maynard Keynes and

[42] See Dahrendorf, p. 241.
[43] B.K. Nehru, *Nice Guys Finish Second*, p. 98.
[44] G. Mills, *Grist for the Mills*, p. 83.
[45] G.L. Mehta in A. Basu, *G.L. Mehta: A Many Splendoured Man*, p. 59.
[46] K.N. Raj, student dossier, LSE.

Cambridge after reading the former's influential book, *An Essay on the Nature and Significance of Economic Science*.[47]

The narrative of LSE uniformly propagating socialist ideas, then, must be significantly qualified. Firstly, students were exposed to political thought inside and outside of LSE that shaped their intellectual experience of overseas study. Even within the same organisations, like the CAISA, students were exposed to both moderate positions as well as communist ideas. As Dahrendorf has pointed out, moreover, an institution as diverse as LSE necessarily possesses divisions and offers varied viewpoints.[48] That Robbins and Hayek worked alongside Tawney and Laski speaks to the vigorous debate of ideas that students could engage with. Yet neither Hayek nor Robbins appealed to students the way Laski did. To be sure, much of LSE's socialist reputation during the interwar period in fact revolved around one professor. Harold Laski's thought and teaching both reflected the radical politics students encountered inside and outside the university while significantly shaping it in discernible ways that highlighted his own efforts to find a compromise between liberalism and Marxism.

Poisonous Teachings

> 'I am a socialist, though from time to time I shall prescribe other books as an antidote to my poison'. 'If you disagree, come along to my study and tell me where I'm wrong'.[49]

Laski's inaugural lecture as Professor of Political Science in 1926 was as close as he came to articulating a teaching philosophy. He denied wanting to impose his ideas on

[47] S. Howson, *Lionel Robbins* (New York, 2011), p. 253.
[48] Dahrendorf, p. 405.
[49] K. Martin, *Harold Laski*, pp. 265-6.

his students to create a body of followers.[50] Rather, he claimed to desire that a pupil of his should '…learn the method of testing his own faith against the only solid criterion we know – the experience of mankind'.[51] If not expressly motivated by proselytisation, he nevertheless acknowledged that a teacher could not be completely objective. Continuing in his inaugural, Laski affirmed, 'That does not, of course, mean that in the exposition of political philosophy it is one's business to pretend to impartiality'.[52] The professor's passion for politics and belief in the power of education suggests an awareness of his potential impact in facilitating the creation of knowledgeable leaders, even if we are to accept that he did not consciously attempt to create disciples who would implement his ideas in practice.

As we saw in the introduction, an increasing number of students began taking courses in the social sciences after World War I, exposing them to new criticisms of politics, society and democracy. With the expansion of the social sciences, exemplified by the growing reputation of LSE, more colonial students opted to supplement their professional training with the knowledge and approaches from newer fields of inquiry, or focus entirely on one of the social sciences. Political Science in particular became an academic discipline at the turn of the century. It was still in an early phase of its development and there was scepticism in British intellectual circles about its possibilities, yet Laski asserted the importance of a separate discipline focused on politics and government, firmly grounded in history.[53]

---

[50] H. Laski, *On the Study of Politics* (London, 1926).
[51] Ibid.
[52] Ibid.
[53] Ibid., p. 8. For the development of the discipline, see J. Hayward et al., *The British Study of Politics in the Twentieth Century*, p. 18. As Laski noted in his Inaugural, Political Science still did not have a journal of its own. See H. Laski, Inaugural, p. 25.

Indeed, Laski's lectures and seminars focused primarily on the history of government, European political theory (specifically British and French political thought) as well as constitutional history.[54] He also offered classes in Marxism and the history of socialist thought.[55] Unlike Cambridge or Oxford, lectures were the predominant medium of teaching at LSE.[56] Although the School did not offer the tutorial system associated with Oxbridge, Beveridge, a Balliol man, introduced the Advisor of Studies position, a role Laski assumed for many students. The position did not involve the writing of weekly papers, but it did provide a primary advisor for undergraduates and graduates.[57] In addition to attending lectures, undergraduates met with their advisors, wrote papers and sat for exams.

Laski's lecture notes, his scholarly and political work and student notes provide some insight into what transpired in Laski's classes more precisely. Menon took Laski's classes in "Public Administration" and "Political Ideas". His papers include class notes from 1927 and 1928 (including an unfinished game of tic-tac-toe). In his notes from a class entitled "Political and Social Theory" in 1928, Laski presented students with his reading of the social fallout from the Industrial Revolution. As Menon recorded it, the enduring lesson was that '…private enterprise cannot be left unfettered', as it was contrary 'to the well-being of society'. Laski affirmed that the history of the nineteenth century 'proves it'.[58]

Menon's notes certainly indicate that Laski injected his socialist critique of classical liberalism into his classes. Renuka Ray, who also studied under Laski in the

[54] LSE Calendar, 1934-5; LSE Calendar, 1949-50, LSE.
[55] LSE Calendar, 1949-50, LSE.
[56] R. Dahrendorf, p. 175.
[57] Ibid., p. 145.
[58] 'Political and Social Theory, Lecture notes from Laski, 4 March 1928', KMP, box 3, file 3/10, NMML.

1920s, affirmed that there was significant overlap between his writing and his teaching.[59] He often, for instance, recommended his own books in course syllabi.[60] Lionel Robbins went so far as to question Laski's ability to convey 'truth' and be 'objective', calling Laski's teaching 'systematically propagandist'.[61] Robbins nevertheless affirmed that Laski was at the height of his teaching powers in the early 1920s, and although a socialist, had not yet descended into what the free market economist dubbed 'parlour Marxism'.[62]

By the late 1920s, Menon's notes not only reflected Laski's increasing disenchantment with nineteenth century liberalism but also a shift in his thought to a greater acceptance of state power over the individual. His first books, *Studies in the Problem of Sovereignty* (1917) and *Authority in the Modern State* (1919), two of his most original works, had articulated a pluralist worldview, centred on the belief that sovereignty should not be vested solely in the state.[63] He asserted that other associations, such as churches and trade unions, should possess some sovereignty as well. For Laski, the individual had the right to resist an oppressive government if they deemed it to be immoral.[64] These early essays were grounded by a preoccupation with authority, freedom and obligation to the state and would remain lifelong preoccupations.

Laski's evolving thought was shaped by the inequities and labour unrest he witnessed throughout the post-war Atlantic world. These included his involvement in the

[59] R. Ray, *My Reminiscences*, pp. 34-5. Ray wrote: 'His [Laski's] lectures on European liberal thought in the nineteenth century and his commentary on the *Communist Manifesto* of Mark and Engels, which were later published as books, give an indication of his radical views'.
[60] See, for instance, LSE Calendar, 1934-5; LSE Calendar, 1949-50, LSE.
[61] L. Robbins, *Autobiography of an Economist*, pp. 82.
[62] Ibid., p. 80.
[63] See, for example, H. Laski, *Studies in the Problems of Sovereignty*, 1917, p. 25.
[64] For a further discussion on Laski's changing position on obligation to the state, see K.K. Mishra, 'Fabianism and Harold Laski', in *Essays on Fabian Socialism* (eds.) M.M. Sankhdher and S. Mukherjee (New Delhi, 1991), pp. 80-91.

1919 Boston Police Strike that led to his leaving a lectureship at Harvard, and a series of disputes in Britain, culminating in the 1926 General Strike, which resulted in severe productivity losses yet failed to ease labour tension. The governments' truculent responses to the demands of labour's supporters for improved conditions fuelled Laski's belief that what he described as 'abstract political democracy' was unresponsive to the needs of those without economic influence.[65] The Depression and 1931 political crisis, which led to the creation of the Tory-dominated National Government, increased his scepticism of Fabian gradualism and further encouraged him to see Marxism as the necessary vehicle to advance 'economic democracy', which he believed was vitally needed to avert disaster.

To be sure, Laski's notion of economic democracy, which coloured his writings and teachings, was distinct from the Marxism students were exposed to through communists like Saklatvala. Tawney, whose work inspired Laski, also sought to expand traditional notions of democracy. As he argued in 1931, understanding liberty as the antithesis of equality was unhelpful.

> Hence, when liberty is construed, realistically, or implying, not merely a minimum of civil and political rights, but securities that the economically weak will not be at the mercy of the economically strong, and that the control of those aspects of economic life by which all are affected will be amenable, in the last resort, to the will of all, a large measure of equality, so far from being inimical to liberty, is essential to it.[66]

Although he was not alone, Laski's language and consistent argument for economic democracy distinguished him on the left. He postulated as early as 1925 an understanding of liberty as being dependent on economic equality. A poor individual, he argued, whose poverty prevented him from experiencing the same leisure, education and consumption

[65] H. Laski, 'Why I am a Marxist', *The Nation*, 14 January 1939, p. 78
[66] R.H. Tawney, *Equality*, 4th edn. (London, 1952), p. 186.

patterns as a wealthy counterpart, lacked, practically speaking, the latter's freedom, even if living in a democracy that theoretically ensured political rights for all.[67] As we shall see, for some students this could ultimately lead to supporting revolution, as Laski's theory of obligation developed to a point in which an individual could judge the state on the criteria of how that state provided him or her these basic rights.[68]

For Laski, what was necessary was to effectively engender practical economic liberty so that virtually everyone had the opportunity to maximise their potential. In his 1936 book, *The Rise of European Liberalism*, he argued that the growth of liberty in seventeenth and eighteenth Europe was an exclusive type of liberty, enjoyed only by the emerging bourgeoisie. The attempts by English radical groups in the 1640s, such as the Levellers, to extend political rights to a broader section of society was the failed revolution that Laski now called for in the early twentieth.[69] In 'The Decline of Liberalism', an address delivered four years later amidst the Second World War, Laski reasserted that in the existing system of social organisation, man's capacity for growth was restricted.[70] Indeed, in order to enjoy the same opportunities, one needed economic democracy.

Many students who had Laski as an advisor engaged in research bearing their mentor's interests. Both Menon and Anila Bonnerjee (married name Graham) wrote theses on English politics in this period. For her thesis, entitled 'Political thought from 1689-1815: A critical review of contemporary criticisms of Burke's "Reflections on the revolution in France"', Bonnerjee took Laski's classes on French and English political

[67] H. Laski, 'Socialism and Freedom', *Socialism and Freedom* (London, 1925).
[68] For more on Laski's theory of obligation, see K.K. Mishra, 'Fabianism and Harold Laski', in M.M. Sankhdher and S. Mukherjee (eds.), *Essays on Fabian Socialism* (New Delhi, 1991), p. 85.
[69] H. Laski, *The Rise of European Liberalism* (New York, 1962), p. 226.
[70] H. Laski, *The Decline of Liberalism* (London, 1940), p. 13.

theory, as well as English constitutional history.[71] Her criticism of the Tory support of Burke is remarkably similar to Laski's stance against opponents of radical social change in the twentieth century. 'A threatened order clinging tenaciously to its privileges. Opposed to all change. Heartily endorsed Burke's point of view'.[72] For Laski, of course, the 'threatened order' could easily be applied to propertied interests in the interwar period.

Moving far away from his earlier pluralism, Laski hence concluded that the change he desired would require a strong state to undertake radical transformations in the existing organisation of society. This would feature mass nationalisations, including the establishment of a public role in health, education and industry, and, more generally, a movement toward an increasingly planned society, underpinned by '…a new conception of property in which social ownership and control replace individual ownership and control'.[73] It would require the state to own and control the land, import-export trade, transport, fuel and power while also assuming control of capital and credit, including nationalising the Bank of England.[74] In order to carry out reforms, Laski envisioned a committee of experts advising the cabinet, who would then obtain the necessary approval of parliament.[75]

---

[71] A. Graham, student dossier, LSE.
[72] A. Graham, *A Critical Review of Contemporary Criticism of Burke's Reflections on the Revolution in France* (London School of Economics and Political Science M.Sc. (ECON) thesis, 1938), LSE.
[73] H. Laski, *The Decline of Liberalism* (London, 1940), pp 13. (22-3).
[74] H. Laski, *Reflections on the Revolution of our Time* (New York, 1943), pp. 307-8. Laski believed that this would be run by many people, including businessmen. Something along the lines of Gosplan, the body responsible for central economic planning in the USSR, would be created, in which a committee of experts would advise the Cabinet, who would in tern bring proposals to Parliament for approval (pp. 309-10).
[75] Like Jawaharlal Nehru, he anticipated waves of modernising experts in the post-war period by seeing the Tennessee Valley Authority as a successful model, as well as an enduring symbol that the positive state could be useful and would be difficult to reverse. Indeed, in theory and practice, the idea of central planning as a legitimate and necessary function of the state gained wider acceptance across the political spectrum domestically, as well as internationally. The Soviet Union had Gosplan. The Bombay Plan,

These measures were targeted to correct a world that was enduring a crisis, perhaps, according to Laski, unlike anything since the fall of the Roman Empire.[76] By the late 1930s, economic and political developments had encouraged Laski, like other earlier Fabian Socialists, to move closer to Marx and the Soviet example, as radical solutions to the present crisis seemed necessary. Laski developed from a pluralist fox into a Marxist hedgehog, simplifying most of what he wrote and said to a Marxist understanding of history as a product of economic factors. The existing political order, and the economic system that it rested on, were in upheaval. Eastern Europe's nascent democracies, born from World War I, had fallen to dictatorship. Conservative reaction to the left produced Fascism in Italy and Nazism in Germany. Even in Britain, the formation of the National Government in 1931 suggested to Laski that efforts to establish economic democracy would meet determined opposition.

Although Laski maintained that he was committed to not use the lectern as a pulpit, his criticism of democracy and in particular his emphasis on the idea of economic democracy was clearly visible in Pierre Trudeau's lecture notes. While most students did not preserve a record of Laski's classes, Trudeau's papers include detailed notes. The future Canadian Prime Minister attended LSE in 1947-48. He took lectures from Laski that included "Political and Social Theory", "British Constitution" and "Present Status of Democratic Government".[77] From Trudeau's notes, we see that Laski's classes drew on the history of political thought, from Plato to Hobbes and Rousseau on to contemporary

---

advanced by Indian industrialists in 1944, foreshadowed India's First Five-Year-Plan. For more, see: D. Ekbladh, *The Great American Mission: Modernization and the Construction of an American World Order* (Princeton, 2010).

[76] Laski repeated this claim many times, comparing the current historical situation to the fall or Rome or the Protestant Reformation. See, for instance: H. Laski, 'Revolution by Consent', *The Nation* 22 March 1941, p. 349.

[77] J.A. Bursey to Stephan Clarkson, 4 October 1988, P.E. Trudeau, student dossier, LSE.

thinkers like Hobhouse. He discussed various theories of governance, including conceptions of the liberal state and the Marxian state, liberty in the modern state, rights, the nature of law and democracy.

While exposing students to the canon of Western political thought, he also used the great thinkers to underline his own beliefs. He mentioned Alexis de Tocqueville's belief that equality was the antithesis of liberty, while making it clear this was not his own view.[78] In "British Constitution", Laski was critical of democracy in its current manifestation and emphasised that '…a political democracy is not necessarily an economic or social one'.[79] Trudeau elaborated in his notes, noting that Laski's 'statistics show that beyond 15% of the population, practically no "public opinion" exists. The rest take no interest in public affairs, and their mind is made up for them'.[80] Laski challenged students to question the nature of democracy and freedom, as well as the role of the state, as he did in his own writings.

Traditional notions of what constituted a political democracy were not only questioned but also condemned. He expanded on these themes in a class entitled 'Political and Social History'. As Trudeau recorded it, 'Freedom is the result of the experience of economic well being. In absence of latter, increase of freedom is in jeopardy.'[81] As we have seen, Laski drew on Marxist thinking to argue that egalitarian economic conditions were necessary for the possibility of political freedom. If economic freedom did not expand, it could lead to the erosion of existing political freedoms, as it

[78] P.E. Trudeau, 'File 26 London School of Economics – Course 405: British Constitution 1947-48', Pierre Elliot Trudeau Papers [TP], MG 26 02 vol. 8, Library and Archives of Canada [LAC].
[79] Ibid.
[80] Ibid.
[81] P.E. Trudeau, 'File 28 London School of Economics – Course 436 Political and Social Theory (Laski) notes, 1947-48', TP, MG 26 02 vol. 8, LAC.

did in Germany. According to Laski's lecture, 'Freedom expands where the members of the society have an equal interest in its outcome'.[82]

But how far was he willing to go to achieve what he believed to be economic freedom? At what point would the effort to secure economic democracy imperil political democracy? Did he, finally, encourage his students towards believing in the necessity of a communist revolution? Another Canadian student, C.B. Macpherson, noted Laski's elusiveness on the matter of violent revolution. In one of his lectures on Marxism in the troubled year of 1934, with civil strife at LSE and many on the left still bitterly disappointed about the formation of the National Government three years prior, Laski, he recorded, 'seems more inclined to the necessity for forceful revolution in the change to any socialism. Yet he was quite clear that we in England at any rate should aim first at constitutional procedure, the conditions not being ripe for revolution'.[83] Laski's position had hardened, but he remained hesitant.

The professor's earlier work in particular had produced thoughtful reflections on violence, revolution and the responsiveness of political democracy to the challenges of the time.[84] His 1927 book, *Communism*, offered insight into the origins of his ambiguous views on the matter. His book was one of the first introductions of the subject in English

[82] Ibid.
[83] C.B. Macpherson, journal, 14 February 1934, CBMP, UTA.
[84] Michael Freeden argues that liberalism seeped into the development of socialist thinking, a trend that he suggests Laski's career demonstrates. As was the case with left liberals, he explored 'the implications of liberty in the economic sphere'. He agrees that for Laski, 'Equality was an extension of self-government because its absence meant the rule of limited numbers and the wielding of undue influence; it was, *pro tanto*, essential to freedom'. Freeden asserts that at least until the early 1930s, and arguably beyond, when Marxism figured more prominently in his thinking, 'elements of liberal thought played a key role in forming Laski's ideas, and that between his pluralist and Marxist phases he was to all intents and purposes a left-liberal'. See M. Freeden, *Liberalism Divided: A Study in British Political Thought, 1914-1939* (Oxford, 1986), pp. 306-08.

and presented a pithy summary of the ideology's development.[85] Laski asked his readers to view matters of liberty, equality, a career open to talents and social justice in light of the institutions through which they were to be brought about. Communists, he asserted, did not reject these ideals; rather, communism enriched our understanding of these classic purposes.[86]

In the same book, Laski also offered incisive and prescient criticism of the ideology. Conjuring the spirit of Lord Acton's famous quip about power, Laski wrote:

> It is a commonplace of history that power is poisonous to those who exercise it; there is no special reason to assume that the communist dictator will in this respect be different from other men. Indeed no group of men who exercise despotic authority can ever retain the habit of democratic responsibility. That is obvious, for example, in the case of men like Sir Henry Maine and Fitzjames Stephen, who, having learned in India the habits of autocracy, become impatient, on their return to England, of the slow process of persuasion which democracy implies.[87]

The examples of Maine and Stephens, both nineteenth century British Jurists in India, indicated Laski's distaste for the use of British power in the Subcontinent, and likely resonated with South Asians, such as Jawaharlal Nehru and G.L. Mehta, who read the book.[88] More generally, Laski warned that dictatorial power, whether in the guise of a commissar, or the Government of India, could be corrosive and unresponsive to the demands of citizen-subjects and should be avoided. Revolutionaries could decide to maintain power for reasons very different from the ones for which they seized it, and the

[85] Labour politician Michael Foote affirmed it was the first 'real book' on communism by an English critic. See Kramnick, p. 259.
[86] H. Laski, *Communism*, p. 54.
[87] Ibid., pp. 174-5. This was a recurring theme in Laski's writing. The argument can be traced as far back as Edmund Burke, a thinker Laski greatly admired.
[88] G.L. Mehta, 'Erudite Scholar and Creative Thinker,' *Times of India* 27 March 1950, GLMP, Subject File, First Instalment, NMML; J. Nehru, 'Some Books on Russia', *The Hindu* 4 April 1928, from *SWJN*1, vol. 2, p. 401.

means '…involved in the use of violence may so enter into the original end as completely to transform its nature'.[89]

Laski's preference, as Macpherson recorded, was for the transcendence of capitalism through peaceful change. During World War Two, he further developed his thinking. The war against Hitler, he wrote, could ultimately bring some good if it was fought for the 'democratization of economic power'.[90] What was needed was a revolution by consent. 'If we claim to be fighting for democracy and freedom, what better way is there of proving our claim than to broaden and deepen *in the midst of war* the democracy and freedom we have'.[91] Laski called for 'setting our own house in order in a democratic way'.[92] This tension between means and ends came to light in a review of the British-born communist Rajani Palme Dutt's 1940 book *India To-day*, Laski outlines a primary distinction between himself and Dutt.[93]

> The great difference between Mr. Dutt and myself is that he thinks only of the end; I cannot disregard the price of achieving that end, and I do not have Mr. Dutt's conviction of its possible nearness in time or its historical inevitability. He contemplates without shrinking sacrifices of human life and happiness which may well make those of the Soviet Union in its march to victory relatively small in comparison; I do definitely shrink from them. He does not believe that there is any way but that of revolutionary bloodshed. I admit the grave possibility of this; but there are stages on the road to freedom that, in my judgement, may still be passed over in peace. Mr. Dutt seems to me immensely to exaggerate the ease and simplicity with which the problems of India can be solved.[94]

Laski wrote this in May 1940, when Nazi victories in Europe and threats to British sovereignty made him even more sceptical of war and conflict. Yet there is no doubt that Laski was repelled by the idea that the kind of violence witnessed in the Soviet

[89] H. Laski, *Communism*, pp. 167-8.
[90] H. Laski, *Reflections on the Revolution of our Time* (New York, 1943), p. 306.
[91] H. Laski, 'Revolution by Consent', *The Nation* 22 March 1941, p. 350.
[92] Ibid., p. 352.
[93] R.P. Dutt, *India to-day* (London, 1940).
[94] H. Laski, 'India To-day', *Left News* no. 49 (May, 1940), p. 1484.

Union could ravage Britain during its revolution in social organisation, and that he hoped other countries could avoid it as well. But Laski still believed adamantly in the necessity of that revolution. On the use of violence, Laski wrote:

> …it is surely obvious that there is no justification for the resort to violence until the resources of reason have been exhausted. The resort to violence, even if it is to be successful, means trusting the officials who control the application of violence. It does not mean liberty; it does not mean equality; and it does not mean justice. It means the despotic application of power by men whose intentions, however admirable, are the creatures of circumstances.[95]

Laski was unambiguous regarding his distaste for the use of violence in transforming society, yet vague about what to do when 'the resources of reason have been exhausted'. As he described as early as 1933, in *Democracy in Crisis*, his ideal was for a socialist government to be elected and, crucially, for the political and economic establishment to accept its legitimacy.[96] This essentially called for one class to cede its power in favour of ensuring economic rights for the rest; economic democracy would be achieved, and political democracy preserved. Yet Laski viewed this as a long shot. One class, he affirmed, was highly unlikely to participate in its destruction at the hands of another, which was essentially what Laski's revolution called for. Again, the rise of fascism in Europe, or the failure of the second Labour government in 1931 underscored this. 'The establishment of socialism in terms of democratic peace involves so profound a revolution in the psychology of the privileged class, so rapid an adjustment to new motives and new values, that a doubt whether it is practicable is at least a permissible speculation'.[97] In *The Road to Serfdom*, his colleague Hayek emphasised Laski's

[95] H. Laski, *Communism,* p. 180.
[96] H. Laski, *Democracy in Crisis*, pp. 240-1. While Laski championed the Labour Party's social reforms after 1945, he would later write that the government did not go far enough in bringing about a true revolution in Britain's social organisation.
[97] Ibid., p. 241. See also, Laski, *Communism*, pp. 82, 88-90.

equivocal stance, affirming that the question of whether a Labour government could risk its policies being overturned following the next general election was one that Laski left open.[98]

A man replete with contradictions, Laski formed the centre of an intellectual hub for students at LSE at a pivotal time when the wake of World War I, the nationalist challenge to imperialism in India and the alternative path laid out by Moscow challenged the existing pillars of economic and political organisation. Laski's promotion of economic democracy symbolised a fusion of Fabian socialism and the ideal of the Soviet Union with liberal presuppositions, including an enduring faith in parliamentary government and a scepticism of state power over the individual. It was a set of ideas, often conflicting, rather than a coherent philosophy, which Laski communicated in a caring, dynamic and personal way that resonated with students and increased the power of his message.

His Door was Always Open

The overlap between his writing and teaching reflected Laski's passion for both endeavours. He enjoyed teaching and spoke fondly of his students.[99] Most students, in turn, referred to an amiable, lively and interactive lecturing style, which often challenged students to defend their opinions impromptu. K.R. Narayanan recalled that, 'Laski used to say that education has to be through the clash of ideas and debates with students and teachers rubbing their shoulders and knocking their heads against one another in creative

[98] F. Hayek, *The Road to Serfdom* (Chicago, 1944), pp. 62-63.
[99] H. Laski to O.W. Holmes Jr., 4 October 1924, *Holmes-Laski Letters*, vol. 1, p. 664; H. Laski to O.W. Holmes Jr., 4 October 1925, *Holmes-Laski Letters*, vol. 1, p. 791.

exchanges of thoughts and ideas'.[100] Renuka Ray fondly recalled Laski providing her and G.L. Mehta the opportunity to refute fellow student (and Laski's future colleague) Lionel Robbins' remarks on the responsibilities of the British Empire – according to Ray, Mehta's witty retort sent the class into fits of laughter.[101]

The depictions of Laski's classes are consistent regardless of regional background or time. Gladstone Mills, who attended LSE during its wartime evacuation to Cambridge, singled him out as a 'particularly stimulating and witty teacher'.[102] The Jamaican student remembered that one of Laski's courses, "Social and Political Theory", attracted students from Cambridge as well as American G.I.s who were stationed in a nearby camp. His class was often 'so crowded that if you did not arrive at least 20 minutes before the lecture, you had to resort to standing or sitting on the floor'.[103] Lee Kuan Yew described Laski as magnetic and scintillating.[104] B.K. Nehru, indeed, made sure to rouse himself out of bed for Laski's Wednesday morning lectures, despite electing to sleep in on most other days.[105] Particularly appealing was his ability to speak on nearly any subject relentlessly without notes, during which there was 'pin drop silence'.[106]

The Canadian student Dalton Camp, later a political strategist, went further, likening one of Laski's lectures to theatre.

> Students queue up for his lectures, standing outside the auditorium for as long as 10 minutes before the scheduled hour. They fill all available seats, sit in the aisles and stand at the doors. Once inside, there is a tumult of much conversation, scuffling of feet and jockeying for position. And then, from the wings, enters Laski. There is a kind of "curtain parts and houselights dim" atmosphere about it

[100] K.R. Narayanan, *President K.R. Narayanan: Selected Speeches* July 1997 to December 1999, vol. 1, (New Delhi, 2003), p. 157.
[101] R. Ray, *My Reminiscences*, p. 35.
[102] G. Mills, *Grist for the Mills*, p. 82.
[103] Ibid., 83.
[104] L.K. Yew, *The Singapore Story,* p. 105.
[105] B.K. Nehru, in Joan Abse (ed.), *My LSE* (London, 1977), p. 26.
[106] B.K. Nehru, *Nice Guys Finish Second*, p. 94.

> all. The conversation breaks off, the scuffling ceases, leaving a room full of throbbing silence. Professor Laski removes his spectacles, pours a glass of water, drinks, and then begins his lecture.[107]

Although Camp enjoyed his time at LSE and studying under Laski, his illusion to theatre raises the question of entertainment in Laski's classes. Camp's remarks were consistent with other appraisals, indicating there was a quality to Laski's lectures beyond the academic occasionally bordering on the superficial. Another Canadian, C.B. Macpherson, wrote after attending his first lecture that Laski seemed promising but his humour contained 'a tinge of stereotyped cleverness about it'.[108]

Robbins – a student-turned intellectual foe – pointed to his ersatz quality of his thinking.[109] As a student in the early 1920s, Robbins was a socialist. Following a discussion with Laski about socialism, the young student was nevertheless 'most disappointed' and convinced Laski knew little of economics.[110] The future economist was no doubt right, as Laski's passion was for politics, and despite his embrace of Marx his writings contained little in the way of specific economic prescriptions to the problems he highlighted. Perhaps more damning, Robbins was equally unimpressed by his professor's character. Robbins believed Laski was extremely difficult to work with and would always be a 'lonely figure surrounded by friends'.[111] Laski's phraseology was highly synthetic and superlative, such that Robbins suspected behind his teacher's 'acute analytic apparatus there was a juvenile personality'.[112] For Robbins, Laski's was posing to hide a lack of emotional balance.[113]

---

[107] Quoted from: G. Stevens, *The Player: The Life and Times of Dalton Camp* (Toronto, 2003), p. 58.
[108] C.B. Macpherson, Journal, 9 October 1933, CBMP, UTA.
[109] L. Robbins, *Autobiography of an Economist*, pp. 81.
[110] L. Robbins, diary, Robbins Papers, 2/7 file 1 of 2, LSE.
[111] Ibid.
[112] Ibid.
[113] Ibid.

A penchant for anecdotes of his association with the famous and powerful added an affected quality to his lectures. Yet his ability to entertain was also one of his strengths as a teacher. Despite his criticisms, Robbins went on to highlight Laski's Socratic style of teaching and his capacity to teach in an organised way that was easy to understand.[114] His appeal as an advisor and teacher, moreover, exceeded providing entertaining lectures. Laski had a unique talent to bond with younger people and make them feel respected. Trudeau recalled, '*Sa porte était toujours ouverte à ceux qui avient faim et soif de la justice, et il recevait avec une égale simplicité les chefs d'États et les pauvres étudients.*'[115]

'At Homes'

Laski's wife, Frida, complemented her husband's personal engagement, showing great affection for keen students.[116] Weekly 'at homes' held by the Laskis in their London residence provided students with opportunities to mingle with their professor and his many friends, both unknown and prominent. This further distinguished Laski from other LSE faculty members, like Tawney, who tended not to socialise with his students. On one occasion, Dalton Camp stayed so late at Laski's home that he subsequently wrote his Professor to apologise.[117] C.B. Macpherson began attending Laski's 'at homes' as well. Macpherson's diary from 1933-34 mentions a tea at Laski's he attended, in which

[114] L. Robbins, *Autobiography of an Economist*, p. 81.
[115] P.E. Trudeau, 'Blum et Laski', *Cité Libre*, 1, no. 1 (June, 1950), p.38. 'His door was always open to those who were hungry and thirsty for justice and he welcomed heads of state and poor students with the same simplicity', [Author's translation].
[116] Frida also cooperated directly with Krishna Menon, for example in a conference regarding women's rights in India in 1931. See KMP, box 1 6/6, NMML.
[117] G. Stevens, *The Player,* p. 59.

Laski enjoyed holding court and provided anecdotes about his famous friends and acquaintances, including Shaw and H.G. Wells, and current affairs.[118]

Frida and Harold's daughter, Diana, affectionately recalled after Laski's passing that on these occasions her father's study was full of students from all over the world.[119] In some cases, relationships with both Frida and Diana persisted after Laski's death. P.G. Mavalankar, later a political scientist and MP in India, lived with Frida while studying at LSE in the early 1950s, and corresponded with her after returning to Gujarat.[120] Frida also maintained a correspondence with Menon, as well as Jawaharlal Nehru, with whom she was in touch regarding the latter's forward to the Hindi publication of Laski's magnum opus, *A Grammar of Politics*.[121]

This amounted to continued education with a personal touch, and extended to taking some students on trips abroad. In 1945, two Federal Bureau of Investigation [FBI] agents reported to then Director J. Edgar Hoover that Joseph P. Kennedy Sr. declared that after six months with Laski his son was 'a completely devout communist on his way to Spain to fight for the Spanish loyalists'.[122] Surely an exaggeration, the remark does underscore both Laski's reputation as well as his potential to influence. Joseph Kennedy Jr. enrolled in the 1934-5 session as a General Course student, the equivalent of a year abroad. Given its reputation, the choice of LSE was puzzling, and Rose Kennedy asked her husband why LSE won out over Oxford or Cambridge. The senior Kennedy hoped that his sons would learn how to counteract socialism by exposing him to the most

[118] C.B. Macpherson, Journal, 29 October 1933, CBMP, UTA.
[119] Kramnick, p. 195.
[120] '28 November 1959', no. 13, P.G. Mavalankar Papers [PGMP], speeches and writings by him, NMML; P.G. Mavalankar to R. Dahrendorf, 5 January 1981, P.G. Mavalankar, student dossier, LSE.
[121] Kramnick, p. 589.
[122] Quoted from Kramnick, p. 431

talented purveyors of the creed, Laski in particular.[123] According to Rose, Joseph said that, 'These boys are going to have a little money when they get older, and they should know what the "have nots" are thinking and planning'.[124] He later said of Laski, 'I disagreed with everything he wrote…But I never taught the boys disapprove of someone just because I didn't accept his ideas. They heard enough from me, and I decided they should be exposed to someone of intelligence and vitality on the other side'.[125]

Joseph Jr. took courses in international relations and public administration. He also attended Harold and Frida's 'at homes'.[126] According to the LSE record, his Supervisor was Richard Greaves, though he seems to have worked closely with Laski, writing weekly essays for him.[127] There is some confusion, but it appears that at the request of Joseph Kennedy Sr., Greaves took Joseph Jr. around Europe, while Laski and his wife brought him to Moscow while he was giving lectures there.[128] The future President John F. Kennedy arrived at LSE the following year, also as a General Course student, but left after a month due to illness, and never took any courses. Rose recalled Joseph Jr. coming home 'well versed' in the ideas of socialism but denies that this created serious friction at home.[129]

Laski's warmth and devotion to his students highlights the importance of individual personality and charisma, nuances too often ignored in broad transnational histories. If we are to understand the role of overseas study in conveying ideas to students destined to draw on their intellectual experiences abroad when they return home, Socratic

[123] R. Kennedy, *Times to Remember*, (New York, 1974), p. 170.
[124] Ibid., pp. 170-1.
[125] Ibid., p. 171. (Kennedy also mentions that when John F. Kennedy was writing his book on Joe he said that his time with Laski was important in convincing him to go into public service).
[126] F. Laski, oral history interview, 5 August 1966, JFKL, p. 3.
[127] R. Kennedy, p. 171.
[128] Ibid., p. 171. See also, F. Laski, oral history interview, 5 August 1966, JFKL, p. 3.
[129] Ibid., p. 172.

teaching, trips and 'at homes' mattered as much as the ideas themselves. Laski's charisma, combined with his respected academic position, distinguished him from Dutt, Saklatvala and other metropolitan communists and supporters of Indian and colonial students who sought to advance their own political positions. He was, moreover, further distinguished by his activism, which took him from the classroom to the podiums of the London-based Indian nationalist movement.

The Pamphleteer

The podium outside LSE provided Laski with a greater licence to articulate his views to a domestic audience as well as his students from abroad. Although destined to change increasingly after World War II, a large measure of fluidity still existed between academia and politics during the interwar period. The fact was well illustrated by LSE's faculty. Laski was passionately involved in Labour Party politics, eventually becoming Chairman of the party [1945-6]. Tawney was also politically active. He was a member of the Fabian Society and ran for parliament three times after World War I, all unsuccessfully. Beveridge, Sidney Webb, Hugh Dalton and Clement Attlee all lectured at the School, something Renuka Ray proudly commented on in her memoirs.[130] As we have seen in the previous chapter, Malinowski, whose seminars were celebrated, was also a public intellectual.

Yet more than anyone at LSE, Laski played the part of both the academic and the pamphleteer, writing prolifically for partisan causes in periodicals and speaking widely. Macpherson would later write that his professor's admiration for Burke was in part a result of this model, his 'belief that no line should be drawn between political theory and

[130] R. Ray, *My Reminiscences*, p. 39.

political pamphleteering'.[131] As a propagandist, Laski further augmented his status amongst colonial students in particular in a way that Tawney never did. Laski's outreach strengthened the connection between political agitation, the university and ideas, and as we shall see was integral to his closest relationship with a student, V.K. Krishna Menon. Although his primary focus as a thinker and agitator was Eurocentric and revolved around bringing social and political change to Britain, he advocated passionately for both an end to empire, especially in South Asia, and social change in newly independent states.

His interests in anti-colonialism and Indian nationalism forged a particularly strong bridge to his South Asian students. Unlike other leading leftist intellectuals whose families had ties to the Raj, such as Tawney, George Orwell, Fenner Brockway and Beveridge, Laski's practical involvement with the subcontinent was neither inherited nor official. In contrast to other Fabians like Russell, the Webbs or Shaw, moreover, he never travelled east of Suez. In 1924, he was summoned for jury duty in a libel case, in which the former Governor of Punjab, Michael O'Dwyer, sued Sir C.S. Nair over comments about the former's role in the Jallianwala Bagh [Amritsar] Massacre in 1919. O'Dwyer won the case easily, with Laski being the only dissenting juror. Laski's interest in India continued to grow, promoted by his role as an unofficial advisor to Sir John Sankey during the Round Table Conferences that deliberated about constitutional reforms in India [1930-2].

[131] C.B. Macpherson, 'Review of "The Dilemma of Our Times: An Historical Essay by Harold J. Laski", by Harold J. Laski' *Political Studies* 2 (1954), p. 176.

Laski was privately more sceptical about the practicality of Indian independence than he was publicly, at least until the early 1930s.[132] Yet he firmly believed in the immorality of empire, its purely economic motivations and, building on an argument that traces back to Burke, its potential deleterious effects on democracy in Britain. He spoke on Indian nationalism as far back as the early 1920s at the Indian Students' Union and Hostel.[133] Laski also wrote in Indian publications, including the *Congress Socialist*. In one article, Laski emphasised the need for socialism to underpin true democracy.[134] In another, he denounced British imperialism by comparing it to German and Italian fascism, a common criticism from British and Indian leftists, including Bertrand Russell and Jawaharlal Nehru.[135]

From the 1930s onward, Laski's relationship with his Indian students and with India was reinforced by his association with his former student Menon. Laski attested to the importance of his association with Menon for his involvement with the independence movement. 'I do not know how many times I have gone to meetings that I did not want to attend, have made speeches that I did not want to make, have written articles that I had no time to write because I was under the grim control of this irrepressible embodiment of the will of India to be free'.[136] In fact, Laski believed he owed Menon an invaluable debt of gratitude for making him a 'member of his army'.[137]

While a pupil in the late 1920s, Menon attended the Laskis 'at homes'. The two remained close after Menon's graduation, with Harold and Frida helping Menon - a

[132] H. Laski to O.W. Holmes Jr., 15 June 1930, *Holmes-Laski Letters*, vol. 2, p. 1261.
[133] 'Lectures, Group Conferences, Study Circles, Visits, Plays and Concerts, 1920-1924', Indian Students' Union and Hostel (London, 1925).
[134] H. Laski, 'No Democracy Without Socialism' *Congress Socialist* 1, no. 17 (11 April 1936), p. 11.
[135] H. Laski, 'Liberty is Indivisible', *Congress Socialist* 1, no. 12 (7 March 1936), p. 3.
[136] Quoted from: D.S. Adel, *Krishna Menon and Contemporary Politics* (New Delhi, 1997), p. 35.
[137] Ibid.

workaholic who often subsisted on little more than green tea - recover from a suicidal mood in 1938.[138] Laski also remained institutionally connected to Menon through the India League. Frida Laski, as well as students Jyoti Basu, Anita Graham, B.K. Nehru, Renuka Ray, K.L. Shelvankar, P.N. Haksar, Feroze (and Indira) Gandhi were all members.[139] As indicated in chapter two, the organisation depended on support from a network of metropolitan supporters, including members of the Labour Party, the ILP and the CPGB, with Laski serving as its President and Bertrand Russell its Chairman.

As Nicholas Owen has argued, relationships between colonial activists and metropolitan radicals enabled agitators like Menon to form contacts that furthered their ability to organise and protest.[140] Laski played an important role in this process as an LSE professor, furthering political connections as well as using groups like the India League to continue communicating his ideological message to students. Laski's position was distinct, as he was neither a politician nor a pure agitator but ostensibly held a respectable academic position, and thus provided a bridge between the classroom and the messier world of anti-colonial agitation, while providing the India League with greater legitimacy.

An example of Laski's practical relevance to Menon's network of British allies was evident in 1934, when Menon sought to attract more followers to sign a League memorandum. He wrote to Laski, 'As you know most of the people whose signatures we want are not familiar with the problem and would probably want to have some assurance that the substance of it is all right'.[141] His subsequent letter to the journalist H.N.

[138] T.J.S. George, *Krishna Menon: A Biography* (London, 1964), p. 113.
[139] K.C. Arora, *Indian Nationalist Movement in Britain, 1930-1949* (New Delhi, 1992), pp. 211-215.
[140] N. Owen, *The British Left and India*.
[141] V.K. Krishna Menon to H. Laski, 18 May 1934, KMP, box 3, file 7/3, NMML.

Brailsford namedrops Laski and other supporters: 'I think I am allowed to say that the Memorandum was carefully considered and approved by Professor Laski prior to its coming before the Executive. Also Professor Laski has signed it. Mr. Bertrand Russell and Mr. Grenfell, M.P. will sign it on behalf of the India League'.[142] By 1936, Menon had moved closer to the CPGB. Even then, however, association with supporters like Laski provided him with greater legitimacy. Laski was considered an authority on India and British politics, and was respected even by many who detested his views, such as Joseph Kennedy. He thus afforded an aura of credibility to agitators who were even more defined by their outsider status than he was.

Beyond practical considerations, Laski's involvement with the League offered another chance to articulate his views on the direction he hoped India would take after obtaining independence and the type of individual necessary to procure such change. Like Russell and others, Laski spoke frequently at India League events, often alongside Menon, continuing the message from his books and LSE lectures.[143] At a public meeting held by the India League in 1936, Laski continued the themes outlined in his books and LSE lectures, addressing the poverty of the Indian masses as dictating the political situation in that country.[144] He lamented how ignorant he believed most British citizens were about India and suggested that it took the drama of an Amritsar to shake them and convince them that India's struggle was their own, namely 'the universal class-war for economic freedom'.[145]

---

[142] V.K. Krishna Menon to H.N. Brailsford, 30 May 1934, KMP, box 3, File 7/3, NMML.
[143] In a 1937 conference about civil liberty in India, for example, both Laski and Menon spoke, the latter about civil liberty in Bengal. For more, see *Manchester Guardian*, 17 September 1937, p. 20.
[144] 'Extract from New Scotland Yard report', 20 May 1936, L/PJ/12/450, BL.
[145] Ibid.

Laski was speaking at a time of disappointment for many Indian nationalists, who were frustrated by the 1935 Government of India Act, which as Samuel Hoare, Secretary of State for India declared, provided 'a semblance of responsible government' while retaining the 'realities and verities of British control.'[146] Nationalists roundly criticised the Act for not transferring any real power to Indians. Laski concluded his speech by saying that when the Labour Party next assumed power, it should reform the abuses of the Indian legislature and grant political *and* economic freedom to Indian masses, who at this point were still controlled not only by the Viceroy but, according to Laski, also capitalists and wealthy landowners.[147]

If Laski tried to restrain himself in an LSE lecture room, he felt no such compunction at India League gatherings, speaking directly to the many students who attended meetings. 'Indian students', Laski proposed, 'should utilise the knowledge they gained at the Universities of this country, not for the furtherance of their own or imperialistic interests, but in the service of their people and class.'[148] For Laski, the ideal student used the classroom as a foundation for a life of political action. At another India league meeting, just months before the Government of India Bill became law, Laski elaborated on his aspirations for the Indian students he taught. An intelligence report on the event remarked that although Laski had to restrain himself in the classroom, he felt 'unmuzzlled' at the India League platform.[149] The report summarised Laski as saying that he divided his Indian students into three classes: namely, those who sought an English education to enhance their career prospects; those who were willing to absorb

[146] Quoted from M. Misra, p. 134.
[147] 'Extract from New Scotland Yard report', 20 May 1936, L/PJ/12/450, BL.
[148] Ibid.
[149] Ibid.

English biases and viewpoints; and, lastly, those who would use the benefits of an English education in order to serve the interests of their country. Laski was clear he preferred the engaged student, who looked beyond personal and class interests.

This engaged student was also a highly-Westernised, 'modern' individual. In essence, Laski was describing someone who embraced his own interpretation of history, largely derived from Western tradition and examples, and the current historical moment, which called for a mixture of Westminster democracy with Marxist statism. This would rescue not only Britain from the twin threats of capitalism and fascism, but also could be used as a model for India. Laski affirmed that Britain's struggle for economic democracy could be a prototype that could help ensure that economic rights accompany political freedom in India. As he saw it, economic democracy was as vital to securing real freedom for the majority of Indians as it was in Britain. The vessel through which these aims were to be realised was the student who embraced Laski's teachings, and there was a clear example. 'Indian students could do worse', Laski reportedly said, 'than follow the example of V.K. Krishna Menon, who had sacrificed so much for India, and had done much in her service.'[150]

Silence and Beyond

The twin triumphs of India's eventual independence and the Labour Party's electoral success that preceded it unfolded amidst a trying personal period for Laski ultimately leading up to his passing in 1950. As the radical Chairman of the Labour Party, he became a focus of Tory attacks during the 1945 General Election. His views made him an easy target, eliciting a characteristically terse plea from Atlee, who, writing

[150] Ibid.

to Laski, suggested that 'a period of silence on your part would be welcome'.[151] Laski was never one to stay silent, in the classroom or the press. In particular, his ambiguity about how consensual he wanted his desired revolution to be led to some controversial remarks, eventually inviting the allegation of his advocating revolution (without consent), prompting him to file an ultimately unsuccessful libel suit against his accuser.[152] Although buoyed by Labour's post-war victory and reforms, he had hoped for more substantial change, and was further troubled by the intensification of the Cold War before passing in 1950.

In his eulogy to the professor, Nehru argued that Laski's concern for India and understanding of what India required was a personal source of inspiration and underlined his respect for the professor's work.

> It is difficult to realise that Professor Harold Laski is no more. Lovers of freedom all over the world pay tribute to the magnificent work that he did. We in India are particularly grateful for his staunch advocacy of India's freedom, and the great part he played in bringing it about. At no time did he falter or compromise on the principles he held dear, and a large number of persons drew splendid inspiration from him. Those who knew him personally counted that association as a rare privilege, and his passing away has come as a great sorrow and a shock...[153]

Indeed, the continuation of Nehru's eulogy to Laski underscored his work for political freedom in South Asia, the network he established with Menon and other students:

> The late Prof. Laski, of considerable international reputation, had been a distinguished Professor of Political Science connected with the University of London, and a former Chairman of the British Labour Party's Executive. The meeting in his memory had been organised by the India League. The High Commissioner for India, Mr. Krishna Menon, who had studied in London under Prof. Laski for ten years, said India owed him a special debt of gratitude for having been actively associated with the struggle for Independence for nearly 30

[151] Newman, *A Political Biography*, p. 268.
[152] Ibid., 280.
[153] J. Nehru, 'Tributes to Harold Laski', *The Hindu*, 4 May 1950.

> years. Many of his former pupils had gone on to attain high positions in various parts of the world. In India itself there was not a University, which did not have a student of Laski's on its teaching staff...[154]

As Nehru suggested, Laski left behind a significant intellectual legacy through the students he taught. Examined in the context of larger organisational units, such as the British Empire, we see the importance of national institutions like universities as spaces in which individuals from diverse regional backgrounds could be exposed to ideas, in this case brewed in the caldron of the post-World War I Atlantic. Universities provided concentrations of potential recruits for anti-colonial agitators and communist agents. Organisations like the CPGB reached out to students, while individuals like Saklatvala influenced study groups that nurtured communist sympathies. LSE in particular had a distinctive role in students' exposure to ideology. While Beveridge drew on Webb's aspiration of promoting non-partisanship, Laski further politicised LSE, blurring the barrier between professor and pamphleteer in his classes and on the podium outside the lecture hall.

Laski's relationship with his students was the most profound in a British university since the time of T.H. Green and Benjamin Jowett, and likely one of the most important in the twentieth century. Jowett – scholar, administrative reformer and Oxford Don – mentored Cornelia Sorabji, later India's first female advocate, but was more famous for his many British students who graduated to high positions in the UK and the Empire.[155] Jowett, as we have seen, instilled in his students a belief in the British Empire's capacity to act as a force for good. He sought to convey to his pupils, including

---

[154] J. Nehru, 'Tributes to Harold Laski', *The Hindu*, 4 May 1950.
[155] Indian students at Balliol College considered Jowett highly welcoming. See J. Brown, *Windows into the Past: Life Histories and the Historian of South Asia* (Notre Dame, 2009), p. 25. His British students included Alfred Milner, H.H. Asquith, Sir Edward Grey, Lord Lansdowne and Lord Curzon.

ICS probationers as well as philosopher T.H. Green and historian Arnold Toynbee, that helping the disadvantaged at home and abroad was the best way an Oxford man could spend his life.[156] Laski also encouraged his students to lead active, political lives. Reflecting the changing moral opinions on empire after World War I, he nevertheless believed imperialism to be fundamentally immoral, and furthermore encouraged his students to see the world's political and economic underpinnings as faulty and heading for disaster unless they were changed in haste.[157]

In his classic book on the attraction of intellectuals to communism, the French sociologist Raymond Aron wrote,

> The main difference between the progressivism of the disciple of Harold Laski or Bertrand Russell and the Communism of the disciple of Lenin concerns not so much the *content* as the *style* [original italics] of the ideologies and the allegiance they demand. It is the dogmatism of the doctrine and the unconditional submission of the militants which constitute the originality of Communism, which is inferior on the intellectual plane to the open, liberal versions of progressive ideology but perhaps superior for anyone who is in search of a faith.[158]

Laski's aversion to violence, desire consensual revolution and scepticism of the state's power of the individual no doubt separated the content of his teachings from those further to the left that students came into contact with. Yet the quote is interesting for a number of reasons. Laski was one of the first to compare communism to religion in his 1927 book *Communism*, going so far as comparing the Bolsheviks to the Jesuits.[159] His use of religious faith as a conceptual category to better understand communism preceded Aron's by nearly three decades, and is demonstrative of his perceptive capacities. To be sure, his appreciation of communism as a vessel for a moral-spiritual force, like Jowett's empire,

[156] R. Symonds, 'Oxford and Empire', p. 692.
[157] Ibid.
[158] R. Aron, *The Opium of the Intellectuals*, (New Brunswick, NJ., 2006), p 257.
[159] H. Laski, *Communism*, p. 51.

was also indicative of his radicalism. His argument for economic democracy was underpinned by a belief in the inherent goodness of communism, a faith he communicated to his students via the lectern and the India League pulpit.

Laski raised questions about democracy, economic rights and how to ensure that individuals had the opportunity to maximise their potential. He further provided thoughtful criticisms of communism in theory and practice, and analysed the challenges of building a new country from the ashes of an empire that was synonymous with capitalist control. As students left LSE, these questions remained highly relevant, and they would refer back to Laski and their university experiences as the economic and political foundations of newly independent countries were being built. The tensions in Laski's thought, and the complex legacy of liberalism and socialism that colonial students were exposed to in Britain, became apparent in how his students assessed their professor.

5

A Ghost in the Meeting: 'Economic Democracy' and the Spread of Ideas, 1930-*c*.1955

'It is odd to reflect that, though
he never passed Suez, Laski had
greater influence in India
than Lord Curzon'.[1]

~Sir Ivor Jennings

'Harold Laski was one of the great
teachers whose students have spread
all over the world. He taught not
only economics and politics but also
how to apply them to human
welfare'.[2]

~Jawaharlal Nehru

What Ghost? Which Meeting?

For someone who never set foot in the colonial world outside of Canada, Laski was certainly well travelled, at least in spirit. A chair was reserved, so the story went, for the professor's ghost at every cabinet meeting in India.[3] Herein such hyperbole lies much of the difficulty in assessing Laski's legacy as a teacher, which some have argued shaped the political thinking of postcolonial leaders throughout the former British Empire and beyond.[4] It has been asserted, for instance, that Laski influenced Ghana's first Prime Minister, Kwame Nkrumah, yet it is unclear what this means in practice, or how this

[1] I. Jennings, in H. Kumarasingham (ed.), *SWIJ* (Cambridge, 2014), p. 223. My thanks to Harshan Kumarasingham for altering me to this reference.
[2] J. Nehru, 'Message from the Prime Minister of India, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru to the Harold Laski Institute of Political Science, Ahmedabad', 17 August 1956, PGMP, Subject Files: Personal Files, NMML. Nehru wrote this in 1956, on the occasion of the second annual day celebrations at the Harold Laski Institute in Ahmedabad, Gujarat.
[3] G. Eastwood, *Harold Laski* (London, 1977), p. 94.
[4] See chapter four.

assumption is substantiated.[5] Despite enrolling at LSE in the 1940s, Nkrumah devoted his time in London primarily to political activism, and Nkrumah's LSE record suggests that his desire to work with Laski was unreciprocated by his would-be mentor, likely on account of Nkrumah's being too preoccupied, even by Laski's standards, with non-academic activities.[6] There is, moreover, no indication that Laski was significantly involved in African diaspora circles, as he was in their Indian, and to a lesser extent Chinese, counterparts, reflecting a tendency within the British left to see the colonies in hierarchical terms that saw India as being closer to home-rule or independence than British Africa.

The legacy of British education on the political views of its overseas students has nevertheless garnered significant attention. As discussed in the introduction, Daniel Patrick Moynihan believed that British universities exerted a strong and lasting influence over the ideological beliefs of leaders throughout the decolonising world. Laski in particular, Moynihan wrote, 'once molded the minds of so many future leaders of the "new majority."'[7] The British Labour Party MP Richard Crossman further suggested that Laski and his friend Kingsley Martin, long-time editor of the *New Statesman*, influenced

[5] J. Morefield, 'Lineages of Empire', p. 213. For more on Nkrumah's time abroad, see: M. Sherwood, *Kwame Nkrumah: The Years Abroad 1935-47* (Legon, Ghana, 1996). Nkrumah briefly mentions Laski, and his interest in political science, in his autobiography. See K. Nkrumah, *The Autobiography of Kwame Nkrumah* (New York, 1957), p. 52. One source of the confusion over Nkrumah might be a sentence in the British weekly magazine *Time and Tide*, which spoke of the 'educated African from the London School of Economics who was going to Africa "preach communism"'. A letter to the Director on 13 October 1950 apologised about the insinuation. Though not named, it likely referred to Nkrumah, who had been arrested on 1 January 1950 for his involvement in protests against British rule in the Gold Coast. See Letter to Carr-Saunders, 13 October 1950, 'Criticism of the London School of Economics', 197/A, LSE.

[6] K. Nkrumah, student dossier, LSE. According to an article in *The Observer*, Nkrumah opted to 'sit for hours in seedy, almost empty cafés, discussing with other Africans their fate and future'. See *The Observer*, 11 February 1951.

[7] D.P. Moynihan, 'The United States in Opposition', *Commentary*, 59, no 3 (1975), p. 44.

'half the leaders of the colonial revolution'.[8] Crossman dismissed Laski's and Martin's ideas as 'bogus, phony and sentimental', but unlike Moynihan, he insisted that the influence resulted in leaders who were 'liberalistic and pro-British'.[9]

Biographical research on individual students has suggested more concretely that Laski played a role in the development of particular students' thinking on liberalism, federalism and Marxism.[10] Yet these studies have little to say about a major question that arises when the biographical dots are connected, namely what, if any, general conclusions can be drawn about the legacy of British socialism abroad through a comparison of Laski's students, both from India and elsewhere? If Laski formed the hub of an intellectual and political cluster of students, as chapter four argues, how did they engage with Laski's work after they graduated? How, moreover, did students from different countries react to the same ideas? Indeed, examining how Laski's students approached concepts of liberalism, democracy and Marxism in relation to his thought offers a window into the impact of British higher education on the transnational spread of political ideas after World War II.

---

[8] See: R. Crossman, *The Backbench Diaries of Richard Crossman* (New York, 1981), vol. 3, p. 377 (diary entry for 22 February 1969). While Laski's purported impact was considered strongest over his students, scholars have also pointed to his influence on other anti-colonial nationalists. For an account of Laski's influence on Julius Nyerere, see T. Molony, *Nyerere: The Early Years,* p. 161-2. Molony notes that *Grammar* was assigned in Nyerere's class in Edinburgh, and emphasises the similarities between Laski's writing on the state's role in ensuring the conditions for individual flourishing and free speech and Nyerere's own thought.

[9] R. Crossman, p. 377.

[10] This is particularly evident in recent biographies of Pierre Trudeau, with some going so far as to suggest an influence over Trudeau's approach to federalism, which became so crucial to his politics as Prime Minister. See J. English, *Citizen of the World: The Life of Pierre Elliott Trudeau* vol. 1 (Toronto, 2006), pp. 170-74 (for federalism, see: pp. 173, 195). English has further written that 'Harold Laski became, for Trudeau, a model: an engaged intellectual whose philosophical and political thought had influenced one of the major movements of the twentieth century – the British socialist movement as embodied by the Labour Party' (J. English, pp. 171-2); A. Mills, *Citizen Trudeau: An Intellectual Biography, 1944-1965* (Don Mills, ON., Oxford University Press, 2016) see especially chapter 3; M. Nemni and M. Nemni, *Trudeau Transformed: The Shaping of A Statesman*, 1944-65 (Toronto, 2011), see especially chapter 4.

This chapter focuses on students who continued engaging with Laski's work following graduation, comparing their approaches and conclusions. I concentrate on students from three distinct national backgrounds, India, Canada and China, arguing that Laski's thinking appealed internationally to a younger generation that sought intellectual support for a third way between Soviet communism and laissez-fair capitalism, a Marxism that contained fundamental liberal ideas of democracy and individual rights.[11] I begin by examining how G.L. Mehta and Renuka Ray embraced Laski's thinking in the context of early Nehruvian India before proceeding to examine how Canadian and Chinese students assessed their professor in strikingly similar ways as they searched for a socialism that preserved liberal fundamentals. I suggest that Laski, and British education more generally, served to both radicalise students' desire for economic planning while moderating their understanding of how to generate political change by reinforcing liberal norms. Finally, I conclude by examining resistance to Laski's thought, highlighting the limitations to a 'global intellectual history'.

The Centre of Nehru's Thought

Laski's students entered his classroom as the fundamental political and economic foundations of the world were called into question; their professor, in turn, echoed

[11] This argument builds on significant works that have pointed to what one author called a marriage of Marxism and Liberalism (see Lamb above); see also M. Freeden, *Liberalism Divided: A Study in British Political Thought, 1914-1939* (Oxford, 1986) (see especially chapter three, 'Socialism with a Liberal Face'. In comparing Laski's thought to the Canadian philosopher C.B. Macpherson, it has been argued that both sought a marriage between liberalism and Marxism, a conclusion that has also been drawn in a comparison between him and Ralph Miliband. See P. Lamb and D. Morrice, 'Ideological Reconciliation in the Thought of Harold Laski and C.B. Macpherson', *Canadian Journal of Political Science* 35, no. 4 (December 2002), pp. 795-810; M. Newman, 'Class, State and Democracy: Laski, Miliband and the Search for a Synthesis', *Political Studies* 34 (2006), pp. 328-48; W. Leiss, *C.B. Macpherson: Dilemmas of Liberalism and Socialism* (Montreal & Kingston, 2009), pp. x-xi, xv-xvi, 25-28. Xu Xi, moreover, assumes a similar position regarding Laski's Chinese followers, emphasising their search for political and economic rights before the end of the Chinese Civil War in 1949. See Xu Xi, *British Left Wing Writers and China: Harold Laski, W.H. Auden and Joseph Needham* (University of Hong Kong Ph.D., 2013), p. 62.

socialist dogma with his own twist as the solution, emphasising the necessity of not only attaining political freedom but also expanding economic freedom as well, building what Laski called economic democracy. He delivered this message in his writings, as well as his lectures and speeches at the India League. Through his commitment and charisma, Laski became the centre of a hub of students, bridging the gap between the classroom and the bully pulpit that facilitated metropolitan anti-colonialism, most symbolised by the support of V.K. Krishna Menon's India League. But did these relationships have sufficient depth to carry an intellectual legacy of British socialism, and Laski's thinking in particular, beyond the friendly confines of the university and its environs to the political struggles that awaited students when they returned home?

For Laski's Indian students in particular, their studies of political history and government assumed added relevance when they returned to a country emerging from centuries of colonial rule. Independence, finally achieved in August 1947, demanded that old imperial institutions be transformed and new ones be established to suit a newly minted republican government. The ideas that informed the development of democratic government in post-independence India required theoretical precepts and norms as well as individuals to enact them. In this environment, ideas, and the students who emerged from classrooms in England and elsewhere carrying them, were significant for the development of the early post-colonial state.

In the late colonial period into early independence, the extraordinarily catholic Congress Party contained a host of competing visions about which direction the country should take. Gandhians desired a return to the village unit and to cottage industries, to which B.R. Ambedkar responded by asking, what 'is the village but a sink of localism, a

den of ignorance, narrow-mindedness and communalism?'[12] Until his passing in 1950, Vallabhbhai Patel represented a more conservative wing of Congress, opposing Nehru's views on property rights and more sceptical of his embrace of China and was preferred among Congress' Hindu nationalists.[13]

More than anyone, however, it was Nehru's vision of the future that paved India's path ahead. In a highly polemical book, the classical liberal commentator Sanjeev Sabhlok recently blamed Laski for instilling the Prime Minister with a wrongheaded understanding of property rights, namely that they were relative and not to be accorded the sanctity traditionally accorded in classical liberalism.[14] What Sabhlok labels as India's poor performance since Independence – by which he means the disappointments of the so-called Nehruvian-inspired 'licence raj', plagued by overregulation and red tape – was a result of the first Prime Minister's socialism, which Laski played a crucial role in promoting. Sabhlok's argument is not new, and in fact traces back at least to John Kenneth Galbraith, the American Ambassador to New Delhi from 1961-63, who asserted that 'the centre of Nehru's thinking was Laski'.[15]

After completing his degree at Cambridge in 1910, Nehru enrolled at Inner Temple in London, where he considered studying economics at LSE as well before eventually opting against it.[16] He nevertheless developed strong links to the institution. Outside Nehru's former bedroom in Teen Murti, preserved in what is now the Nehru Memorial Museum and Library, rests a small selection of pictures, one of which is of the

[12] R. Guha, *India After Gandhi* (New York, 2007), p. 107.
[13] M. Misra, p. 271
[14] S. Sabhlok, *Breaking Free of Nehru: Let's Unleash India!* (New Delhi, 2008), p. 106.
[15] Quoted from Kramnick, p. 589.
[16] J. Nehru to M. Nehru, 22 September 1910; J. Nehru to M. Nehru, 11 November 1910; J. Nehru to M. Nehru, 10 August 1911. See: *SWJN*1 vol. 1, pp. 79-81, 91.

bespectacled LSE academic. How significant was Laski in shaping Nehru's ideology?

Nehru read extensively during his multiple stints in gaol for protesting British rule, including diverse authors from G.D.H. Cole to P.G. Wodehouse and the German General Erich Ludendorff.[17] We know he requested numerous works by Laski as well.[18] Rajkumari Amrit Kaur, India's future Minister of Health and Family Welfare, wrote to Nehru inquiring if he had read Laski's essay, *The Danger of Being a Gentleman*, which Nehru acknowledged he possessed and would try to read soon.[19] We also know that Nehru admired Laski's book, *Communism*, mentioning it in an article for *The Hindu*.[20] As noted in the previous chapter, Laski's book praised communist achievements and suggested a revolution may be necessary to transform government, but was also sceptical of the unpredictability of revolutions and critical of Soviet repression. Nehru met Laski through Menon's India League and quickly came to admire him. In their surviving correspondence, Laski seems to have offered some minor political advice to Nehru[21], as well as council about Indira Nehru's [later Gandhi] education.[22] Nehru also maintained a correspondence with Laski's wife, Frida, after Laski's passing, writing to her in 1955 agreeing to write the preface to the Hindi edition of *A Grammar of Politics*.[23]

Nehru recounted in his autobiography being 'vaguely attracted' to the Fabians and socialist ideas when studying in England, along with other current debates such as the

[17] For example, see: 'Books read in prison', *SWJN*1, vol. 6, pp. 420-27.
[18] See, for example, J. Nehru to Padmaja Naidu, 10 Jan 1941, from *SWJN*1, vol. 11, p. 530. Nehru requests Laski's book *Where Do We Go From Here*; J. Nehru to P. Naidu, 6 Feb 1941, from *SWJN*1, vol. 11, p. 546. Nehru requests Laski's book *The State*.
[19] J. Nehru to A. Kaur, 6 August 1940, from *SWJN*1, vol. 11, p. 418.
[20] J. Nehru, 'Some Books on Russia', *The Hindu* 4 April 1928, from *SWJN*1, vol. 2, p. 401.
[21] H. Laski to J. Nehru, 6 November 1935, J. Nehru Papers, Correspondences, Part I Volume no. 42, NMML.
[22] See H. Laski to J. Nehru, 18 Feb 1936 and J. Nehru to H. Laski, 20 February 1936, J. Nehru Papers. Correspondences, Part I Volume no. 42, NMML.
[23] Kramnick p. 589.

Irish question and women's suffrage.[24] Throughout the 1920s, his travels to the USSR and Europe, including, as we have seen, the Brussels Conference in 1927, exposed him to communist ideas. Nehru shared a strong intellectual affinity with Laski in particular, reflective of the intellectual climate of the British left which both inhabited, as well as Nehru's specific admiration for Laski's work. Like Laski, Nehru understood fascism, and even the British National Government of 1931, as a reaction to the strength of organised labour.[25] Both appreciated the Soviet Union's egalitarian philosophy, while preferring a democratic political system, a fact that likely endeared Laski's *Communism* and its criticism of Soviet tactics to Nehru.

Like Laski, Nehru came to believe that economic freedom for the Indian masses would have to follow on the heels of political independence. As early as 1928, in an article entitled *Swaraj and Socialism*, Nehru wrote that 'We may demand freedom for our country on many grounds but ultimately it is the economic one that matters'.[26] Indeed, Nehru's move in the 1930s to the left and his increasing attraction to the Soviet Union, which he believed faced similar problems as India, was similar to Laski's. 'Substituting Indian capitalists in the place of British capitalists', he argued, 'will not alter the lot of India'.[27] In an article for the *Bombay Chronicle* he recounted the increasing knowledge of India's poverty and the need to avoid Indian vested interests assuming power over the country.[28] The 1931 Karachi Session of Congress, memorable for developing more detailed positions on how Congress would act politically and economically, asserted that

[24] J. Nehru, *An Autobiography*, p. 25.
[25] J. Nehru, *Nehru: The First Sixty Years*, p. 313.
[26] J. Nehru, 'Swaraj and Socialism', *The Hindu* 11 August 1928, from *SWJN*1, vol. 3, p. 371.
[27] J. Nehru, 'Socialism will Dissolve Communism', *SWJN*1, vol. 7, pp. 231-2.
[28] J. Nehru, 'Congress and Socialism', *The Bombay Chronicle* 20 and 31 July 1936, from *SWJN*1, vol. 7, pp. 317-25.

'in order to end the exploitation of the masses political freedom must include real economic freedom for the starving millions'.[29] What was urgently needed was to think about what kind of *swaraj* was most desirable.[30] For Nehru even if independence was the primary goal, political liberty, as in Laski, required socialism.[31] Economic democracy was interchangeable with socialism, without which political democracy lacked tangibility.[32] The eventual Preamble to the Constitution, affirming a commitment to socialism and democracy, reflected this sentiment.

The evidence linking Laski to Nehru contains more smoke than gun than Galbraith and Sablhok acknowledge; it would be more accurate to say that the two were intellectual soul-mates who recognised their similar ideas that emerged from the same stew of Fabian socialism, reformed liberalism and sceptical admiration of the Soviet Union. If Nehru drew inspiration from Laski, the professor saw Nehru as someone who shared his worldview. He later told Renuka Ray that India was fortunate to have him as their first Prime Minister.[33] In 1945, Laski alluded to the future Prime Minister as a kindred spirit, saying that Nehru was distinct among Congress leaders as someone who appreciated the connection between politics and economics.[34] For Nehru, as for Laski, the central issue was poverty in India. Freedom must be attained in order to tackle this issue.[35] The spy describing the scene wrote that there was a roar of approval.[36] Indeed,

[29] Ibid., pp. 321; 322-3.
[30] Ibid., pp. 321; 322-3.
[31] See, for instance, J. Nehru, *An Autobiography* (London, 1936), pp. 166, 364.
[32] Concerning the Congress Socialist Party, Nehru wrote to Masani: '…Socialism…includes political freedom, for without that there can no social and economic freedom'. See J. Nehru to M. Masani, 10 December 1935, M.R. Masani Papers, File 3, NAI.
[33] R. Ray, *My reminiscences,* p. 36.
[34] Intelligence assessment by Ronald Bedford, sent to India, concerning Laski speech, 14 Nov 1945, L1/1 1439.
[35] Ibid.
[36] Ibid.

Laski accurately noted in 1939 that Nehru desired more than a political revolution to gain independence, but that he wanted '…a social revolution, which would effect a complete change in India's economic system'.[37] British rule, Laski continued, was fundamentally opposed to that transformation, which could only be procured after independence.[38] Laski's stance against British rule, as we have seen, played a major part to endearing him to Indian nationalists. Yet his intellectual inspiration was equally compelling and perhaps more enduring, particularly for those, like Nehru, who were committed to parliamentary democracy but looking for supplement it with social, or economic democracy.

To be sure, the closest relationship Laski formed with a student was with Nehru's friend, Menon. As we have seen in the previous chapter, Laski proved to be a useful contact to Menon within Labour Party circles, while in turn learning more from his former student about anti-colonial activities and aspirations. There are indications that this practical relationship was complemented by an important intellectual affinity as well. In a striking, if somewhat hyperbolic exclamation, Menon affirmed that 'Professor Laski's life has been the moral foundation on which many of those who really knew him and loved him have sought to build the essential structure of their thinking and social values'.[39] Menon went on to say that it could 'perhaps be a hundred years before the original and the epochal contributions that he has made will begin to be realised in their importance to and implications for political and social thought and organisation'.[40]

---

[37] H. Laski, 'Pandit Nehru', *Daily Herald*, June 1934 [no further details], J. Nehru Papers, Part IV, Articles on Jawaharlal Nehru, NMML.
[38] Ibid.
[39] V.K. Krishna Menon. Quoted in G.N. Singh. 'Laski – The teacher and the political scientist'. Ahmedabad: Harold Laski Institute of Political Science, 1957. p. 7.
[40] V.K. Krishna Menon to P.G. Mavalankar, 16 August 1954 [date received, no send date], PGMP, Subject Files: Personal Files, NMML.

In the same panegyric, Menon asserted that 'Professor Laski lives in the hearts and has illuminated the minds of generation of Indians, students as well as others'.[41] Menon remembered his 'passion for liberty and justice', associating it with his support of Indian independence.[42] But his appreciation went beyond Laski's support of independence. Menon noted that his interpretation of progress was essential to Laski's thought.[43] He highlighted Laski's belief in 'social values' as being 'the essence of a living and progressing society', while also recognising 'the essential and fruitful quality of divergences…'[44] Menon was vague on details, but suggested that the relationship he enjoyed with Laski went beyond political pragmatism. His emphasis on Laski's notion progress and social values and affirmation of the importance of divergence within a society suggests an attempt to reconcile liberal and socialist concepts**.**

Mehta, Ray and Economic Democracy

Like Nehru, Menon's writings contain scant references to Laski's specific ideas. G.L. Mehta and Renuka Ray present two more empirical case studies in how Laski's thinking was interpreted by his Indian pupils. Following graduation in 1924, Mehta embarked on a job writing for the English language newspaper *Bombay Chronicle*. He was also active in business, briefly worked on the Planning Commission and eventually joined the Indian Foreign Service. Like Jawaharlal Nehru and other British-educated South Asians, Mehta maintained a strong cultural and intellectual affection for numerous British thinkers, including Shaw and Tawney. He also requested several works by British authors, while also ordering periodicals such as the *New Statesman* and *Punch* to be sent

[41] Ibid.
[42] Ibid.
[43] Ibid.
[44] Ibid.

to his residence in Calcutta.[45] Notably, Mehta furthermore maintained a profound, life-long admiration of Bertrand Russell. This led him to review the philosopher's books and retain copious clippings related to Russell's work in his personal papers.[46] He later earned a Master's degree in Bombay in which he focused on Russell's philosophy.

Laski was no doubt one of a legion of writers that informed Mehta's thinking, but one whose impact remained palpable and also reflected and attested to Laski's extensive following in India. 'Hardly any British thinker or writer, with the possible exception of Bertrand Russell, is so well-known to the present generation in India as Prof. Harold J. Laski'.[47] He reviewed Laski's work for decades following his graduation, and the two maintained a correspondence. Laski thanked Mehta for reviewing his work and expressed gratitude for the general interest he and his father displayed for his recent writings. He wrote that there were few people whose goodwill he was more concerned with than India's freedom fighters.[48] Mehta continued to review his work during the Second World War as well.[49]

The influence of Fabian socialism, LSE and Laski specifically is evident in Mehta's writings on democracy in the early post-colonial state. Discussing LSE's founder, Mehta wrote that 'Sidney Webb's masters were Bentham and John Stuart Mill and he stressed from the earliest days that the democratic ideal of "the greatest happiness for the greatest number" cannot be fulfilled merely by extending political democracy but

---

[45] A. Basu, p. 113. Some of the books included H.N. Brailsford's *Subject India* and Cole's *Fabian Socialism*, as well as books by Robins (and Hayek), the complete works of Milton, Alexander Pope, Alfred Lloyd Tennyson and Joseph Addison.
[46] See: GLMP, press clippings, NMML.
[47] G.L. Mehta, 'Harold J. Laski', n.d., no. 81, GLMP, Speeches and writings, 3rd and 4th Instalment, NMML.
[48] H. Laski to G.L. Mehta, 7 January 1931, GLMP, 3rd and 4th Instalment Part 1, Correspondences, NMML.
[49] G.L. Mehta, 'Revolutionary Cure for Hitlerism: Disorder Dreaming of the New Order' *Free Press Journal*, 18 March 1941, GLMP, 3rd and 4th Instalment Part 1, Speeches and Writings, File 15.8.1951 S. No. 27, NMML.

that economic democracy was also essential for its full realisation'.[50] Mehta's reading of Laski further shaped his understanding of the concept of economic democracy. Writing on the fourth anniversary of Indian independence in 1951, he argued, 'We cannot expect men to devote their time to the pursuit of creative activities so long as most of the time of the majority of men is spent in the simple task of staving off starvation, and satisfying their elementary needs of food, clothing and shelter'.[51] If we recall, this is precisely what Laski argued for, namely that citizens required established economic rights, without which the full development of the individual, and freedom, was impossible. For Laski in particular, political democracy was always desirable, but its contemporary manifestation contained demons within it because it maintained the power of the dominant class at the expense of everyone below. Remembering Laski in 1950, Mehta wrote in *The Times of India* that Laski maintained 'that the effective cure for the evils of political democracy lay not only in better education as well as civil training and discipline but also in a more equitable social order which ensures economic opportunity for all'.[52] Mehta came close to arguing for the state to guarantee specific economic rights.

Mehta asserted this to honour Laski's passing, but the timing was also significant in another way. It was two months after the inauguration of the Indian Constitution, whose prime author, another LSE graduate, B.R. Ambedkar, had successfully embedded ideas of social democracy into Indian law in an attempt to offset historical inequalities. Ambedkar gave concrete expression to the idea of expanding political democracy,

[50] G.L. Mehta, 'Sidney Webb', *Amrita Bazar Patrika*, 17 October 1947, GLMP, Speeches and writings, 3rd and 4th Instalment Part 1, NMML.
[51] G.L. Mehta, 'The Real Meaning of Progress', 15 August 1951, *Independence Supplement*, GLMP. 3rd and 4th Instalment Part 1, Speeches and writings, NMML.
[52] G.L. Mehta, 'Erudite Scholar and Creative Thinker', *Times of India* 27 March 1950, GLMP, 1st Instalment, Subject Files, NMML.

affirming 'a political democracy without an economic and social democracy is an invitation to trouble and danger'.[53] In the aftermath of independence, Indians grappled with the question of what principles their democracy should be founded upon. The search for ideological precepts which would provide a foundation to the new state motivated students to continue engaging with ideas about democracy that they grappled with during their time in London.

Mehta's intellectual appreciation of his former professor derived from his interpretation of Laski's effort to build the theoretical foundations for a more inclusive democracy. Renuka Ray had similar reflections. She later recalled that '…when I joined the London School of Economics, I came across some of the great thinkers and educationists of the period who perhaps exercised a great influence in moulding my future career in many ways'.[54] In particular, she argued that the emphasis on making democracy more inclusive was consistent with LSE's fundamental project, which was not to spread communism but to expand the meaning of democracy.

> Those years were the hey-day of the London School of Economics as the centre of progressive and socialist thought not only in England but throughout the world. There were students from all parts of Asia and Africa, apart from the European countries. In the twenties it was the only institution of its kind. The school vibrated with life and the search for a democratic political system wherein not only political liberty but economic and other freedoms would be possible. It opened many doors for me because it fostered every school of thought.[55]

Ray's paternal grandparents were members of the *Brahmo Samaj* reformist movement founded by Rammohan Roy in the 1820s.[56] Her background conditioned her

[53] H.S. Dwivedi and R. Sinha, 'Dr. Ambedkar: The Pioneer of Social Democracy' *The Indian Journal of Political Science* 66, no. 3 (July-Sept., 2005), pp. 661-666.
[54] R. Ray, Oral History Interview, p. 7, NMML
[55] R. Ray, *My Reminiscences,* pp. 33-4.
[56] Ibid., p. 4.

to be political from a young age.[57] The political environment at LSE suited her well, and she became the only woman on the Indian Students' Union executive committee.[58] Following graduation, she devoted her life to public service and women's rights. She would later become involved in the All-India Women's Conference, dedicated to the uplift of women and children, becoming President in 1932 and again in the 1950s. Ray worked on the Hindu law bills in the 1940s (eventually passed as the Hindu code bills, which sought to codify Hindu personal law, in the 1950s), was one of fifteen women on the Constituent Assembly and worked with refugees from East Pakistan following Partition, eventually being appointed Union Minister for Rehabilitation in West Bengal. She was also a member of the Lok Sabha from 1957-67. As Ray wrote in 1953, she encouraged women to become involved politically and economically, in planning and development.[59]

While not singling out Laski, Ray used language is in line with her erstwhile professor and the profound intellectual legacy she attributed to LSE. On the day of India's independence, Ray looked ahead to new challenges, such as banishing poverty and ill health, warning against forgetting 'that we have yet to achieve economic independence without which political freedom has little meaning'.[60] For Ray, this meant ensuring economic freedom, as well as the rights of women and minorities; ideas, again, that resonated in a country in the midst of constitutional debates that sought to address historical inequities.

[57] Ibid., p. 16.
[58] Ibid., p. 37.
[59] See, R. Ray, 'Women and the Five Year Plan' No. 22, 19 January 1953, Speeches and writings, RRP, NMML; R. Ray 'Women as Citizens of Free India' (no. 14), 6 July 1951, Speeches and writings, RRP Papers, NMML.
[60] R. Ray, 'Message on 15 August 1947', Speeches and writings, RRP, no. 6, NMML.

For Indian students like Ray and Mehta, notions they engaged with as students in Britain became more compelling not only when they seemed to apply to problems facing India but also when they bore similarity to thought being produced by Indian nationalists. For students already familiar with the works of thinkers such as Dadabhai Naoroji, Laski's emphasis on the Marxist-Leninist idea of capitalism leading to a search and domination of foreign markets, control over raw materials and adjustment of tariffs to protect the home market must have seemed familiar.[61] Moreover, for both Mehta and Ray, Laski shared fundamental similarities with Gandhi. As Asha Mehta has written, for Indian socialists, there was a parallel between the effort of some British socialists to link socialism and democracy and Gandhi's emphasis on non-violence and a decentralised economy; when they, in short, accepted '*Satyagarha* as a revolutionary weapon'.[62]

G.L. Mehta, for instance, wrote,

> No one, so far as I am aware, has argued better than he the vital thesis that there are moral limits to the authority and sovereignty of the State and that, in the ultimate analysis, the citizen has the right to disobedience because the final sanction in any civilized political society is the conscience of its citizens. Indeed, if any political basis were needed for Gandhiji's theory and practice of 'Satyagraha', Laski's treatises on sovereignty and some of his later books such as 'The Danger of Obedience' and 'Liberty in the Modern State' provide that basis.[63]

As he was familiar with Laski's writings after he graduated, Mehta could have emphasised Laski's increasing affinity for the role of the state. Yet he chose to stress Laski's early writings, in which he articulated scepticism of state authority and a belief that the individual had the right to resist an oppressive government they judged to be

[61] H. Laski, *Communism*, p. 113.
[62] A. Gupta, 'Fabianism and Indian Socialism', in M.M. Sankhdher and S. Mukherjee (eds.), *Essays on Fabian Socialism* (New Delhi, 1991), pp. 54-5.
[63] G.L. Mehta, 'Erudite Scholar and Creative Thinker', *Times of India* 27 March 1950. GLMP, NMML.

immoral.[64] Coupled with his enduring preference for non-violent political change, Mehta's admiration for both Gandhi and Laski prompted him to see a parallel.

Ray's writings, moreover, suggested that Laski's message on economic freedom may have owed some of its legitimacy in her eyes to its similarity to the Mahatma's thinking. Ray had travelled with Gandhi around India before going to London. She claimed that, despite reserving great accolades for LSE and her time in Britain, she never found another system 'comparable to the Gandhian one'.[65] In a piece entitled 'Gandhiji is most valuable contribution to Indian life and thought', it is evident she drew inspiration from Gandhi that could easily be attributed to Laski.[66] Ray affirmed that, 'To Gandhiji, economic and social freedom against a background of an incorruptible moral base was of paramount importance. According to him, swaraj could only be real when each individual could develop to be self-reliant and express himself to the fullest without interfering with the same rights of others. This was the basis of the Sarvodya Society in which he believed'.[67] In her memoirs, she later affirmed that for Gandhi, swaraj was not only political, but economic and social as well, and that he believed in right to for female self-expression.[68] Elsewhere, Ray compared Gandhi's concept of swaraj to Nehru's understanding of democracy, which, again, was not only political, but also affirmed 'economic and social freedom'.[69]

She might as well have been speaking of Laski. To his admiring colonial students, Laski's ideas overlapped with other sources of inspiration, from both India and Britain.

---

[64] See: *Studies in the Problem of Sovereignty*, p. 19.
[65] R. Ray, *My Reminiscences*, 32.
[66] R. Ray, 'Gandhiji is Most Valuable Contribution to Indian Life and Thought', RRP, Speeches and writings, No. 76, NMML.
[67] Ibid.
[68] R. Ray, *My Reminiscences*, pp. 23, 48.
[69] R. Ray, 'Nehru and parliamentary Democracy', in Subhash C. Kashyap (ed.), *Nehru and Parliament* (New Delhi, 1986), p. 59

Gandhi and Laski made especially peculiar intellectual bedfellows, given their emphatically distinct political and economic views. Gandhi's focus on the village unit, distaste for industry and scepticism of socialism was far removed from Laski's hope for a centralised industrial civilisation, which was much closer to Nehru's vision for India's future. Indeed, for Ray and Mehta, their embrace of Laski's socialism did not transform them into Laskites, but Gandhian socialists. Their thought reflected the intellectual side of a type of rooted cosmopolitanism discussed in chapter two. In this case, elements of British socialism, bearing Laski's distinct language and emphasis, were seen to be commensurate with more local thinking that diverged significantly from Laski's beliefs.

A Revolution by Consent

In her memoirs, Ray criticised Nehru, suggesting he should have gone further in implementing many of the socialist reforms he believed in and that he was too considerate of the opposition.[70] She nevertheless still praised the commitment India's first Prime Minister displayed to democracy.[71] Depending on interpretation, the difference between communism and the practical steps required to engender a social revolution that would usher in a new economic system, in Britain or India, could be quite narrow. The primary difference, as both Nehru and Laski understood it, was deference to democratic practice and abhorrence for violent revolution. Students remembered their professor in two principal ways. As we have seen, Laski's writings and lectures advocated expanding the traditional notion of political liberty to include what he identified as economic democracy. The inevitable corollary to this question, which Laski wrestled with throughout his career, was how to generate and maintain a social revolution.

[70] R. Ray, *My reminiscences,* p. 214.
[71] Ibid.

The most obvious example for enforcing economic freedom for many students was the Soviet Union, which, as Nehru pointed out, was similar to India insofar as it was an agricultural country seeking to rapidly address mass illiteracy and poverty.[72] As we have seen, Laski admired Moscow's efforts in theory, if not always in practice. His LSE colleague, Hayek, had the opposite belief. For the Austrian economist, socialism paved the road to totalitarianism, the case study being the rise of National Socialism in Germany.[73] Laski's biographer Herbert Deane furthermore argued that Laski's views on democracy shifted with the winds, often criticising the ideology for barely masking its subservience to capitalism, sometimes praising it, particularly when in juxtaposition to the Nazi alternative during World War II.[74] Yet the majority of his students recalled his affinity for democracy and demonstrated a deep belief in the idea themselves.

Laski's affirmation for the democratic path to change was most evident in the early to mid 1920s, when his writings were more influenced by pluralism. Laski conveyed this message to students outside the classroom as well as inside. In 1923, for instance, he participated in a debate against Shapurji Saklatvala about the desirability of reorganising society through parliamentary methods.[75] Saklatvala had strong sympathies for the USSR and the Communist International. According to a reviewer of the debate, Saklatvala's rhetoric was colourful and dramatic. He argued that the public was being prevented from hearing the facts about Russia. 'Scratch the Russian', he said, 'and you

[72] J. Nehru, *Nehru: The First Sixty Years*, pp. 127-8.
[73] See F. A. Hayek, *The Road to Serfdom*.
[74] H. Deane, *The Political Ideas of Harold J. Laski*, pp. 225-8.
[75] *The Indus*, 3, no. 1, (July, 1923).

will find the civilizer of Europe'.[76] Minor reforms through parliamentary means were useless. 'Such small reforms as had been secured during the last century', he argued, 'were snatched from the hands of the exploiters of the poor'. [77]

Laski followed Saklatvala, according to the reviewer, with a 'brilliant speech'.[78] 'So far as the Russian Revolution was concerned, he thought that violence was inherent in it. He abhorred dictatorship of all sorts; he had no sympathy with either Lenin or Mussolini. He was one of those who believed in the truth of democracy. By constant harmonious discussion the truth was bound to emerge. Only such changes were worth while as were secured by the method of peaceful persuasion'. [79] 'Democracy', Laski argued, 'was the greatest hope for the future…' Continuing with an example which he personally exemplified, '…Mr. Laski said that the very fact that in this country a Labour Government was looked upon as a possibility, proved the efficiency of Parliament. The emancipation of the Jewish race, and the rise into national prominence of the Labour and Socialist parties were real achievements'.[80] At this point, Laski had confidence in the prospects of revolutionary change being procured though democratic channels. 'In this way and in course of time', the writer continued, 'he had no doubt that all that reformers desired would be secured, and secured without any of the doubtful blessings of wanton destruction and terrorism'.[81]

The debate transpired at the Indian Students' Union & Hostel and was reported in the *Indus* magazine. On this occasion, the article describing the debate suggested that

[76] Ibid., p. 8.
[77] Ibid., 3, no. 1, (July, 1923), p. 9.
[78] Ibid.
[79] Ibid.
[80] Ibid.
[81] Ibid.

Laski could moderate radical arguments, arguing to students in favour of democracy by providing historical examples of its success and warning of the possibilities of violence inherent in revolutionary change. Mehta, a student from this period, remembered his professor in an obituary affirming that Laski believed in the inevitability of social change, and the 'impossibility of maintaining unrequited privileges'.[82] The social order needed to change – according to Mehta, Laski felt this development was inevitable. Nevertheless, Mehta continued, 'in his incisive book "Communism" published some years ago, he declined to accept the Communist argument of a violent upheaval and contended that once the foundations are shaken, there is no guarantee that the forces of the Right will not seize the initiative…'[83] According to Mehta, Laski – an admiring critic of Burke – conjured his spirit of preferring reform to revolution.

As we have seen, while Laski's writings contain an aversion to violence, they also convey a scepticism that any worthwhile change in social organisation could be procured without force. Given this ambiguity, can we reach a generalisation about what students took away from Laski's classes? Continuing from the passage quoted above, Mehta wrote that Laski '…also argued the case of evolutionary socialism while condemning playing with revolution and 'mouthing revolutionary phrases'.[84] Defending the use of constitutional methods for social change in a political democracy, he recalled Laski's observation that 'this is less dramatic than the revolutionary way but it is at least as enduring' and that it has 'the supreme merit of avoiding the immense pain and bitterness

[82] G.L. Mehta, 'Erudite Scholar and Creative Thinker', *Times of India* 27 March 1950, GLMP, 1st Instalment, Subject Files, NMML.
[83] Ibid.
[84] Ibid.

the revolutionary way is bound to inflict'".[85] Inspired both by Gandhi's support for non-violence and Laski's thinking, Mehta chose to remember this rather than Laski's more ambiguous thoughts on violence.

Speaking again on Republic Day in 1952, Mehta remembered Laski while emphasising the importance of political democracy in India's five-year-old republic. Mehta underscored the significance of the path paved with persuasion and cooperation as opposed to coercion and violence. 'Heroic methods and shortcuts are likely to have results sometimes precisely the opposite of what are intended. When a democratic method is abandoned, there is no knowing what forces may be generated. It is easy to castigate democracy. But as Prof. Laski remarked, if you can destroy the case for democracy in 20 minutes, you can destroy the case for any other system of government in five'.[86] As Mehta saw it, Laski did not see democracy as an inherent good, but rather, reminiscent of Winston Churchill's quip on the same topic, the least bad option.

Writing in her memoirs, Ray remembered Laski's lectures on classical liberalism and the *Communist Manifesto*, later published in books, and how his radical stances 'influenced the minds of the youth in my day'. [87] More particularly, he '…understood and conceded that there might be much to learn from Marxist theories and even the revolution that was taking place in post-war Russia under the new Soviet regime. Yet he was not enamoured of the totalitarian aspect of the latter. Harold Laski was a man who inherently believed in freedom of thought for all races and for all peoples'.[88] Her later emphasis on the individual recalls Laski's thinking on economic rights. 'The main difference between

[85] Ibid.
[86] G.L. Mehta, 'A.I.R. broadcast on 'Renewal of Faith', 26 January 1952, GLMP, No. 32, Speeches and writings, 3rd and 4th Instalment Part 1, NMML.
[87] R. Ray, *My Reminiscences*, pp. 34-5.
[88] Ibid.

Communism and Democracy, as I see it, is that the structure and the frame work of a Democratic state must be so fashioned as to encourage and foster the creative personality of the individual. He must be helped towards the fullest self expression in consonance with the common good of all.'[89]

The support for democracy that students encountered even in the most radical of LSE classrooms complemented the practice of political freedom through parliamentary democracy and freedom of expression that they witnessed around them. As Mukherjee and Lahiri have noted, the relatively free environment that Indian students found themselves in contrasted to the political oppression at home.[90] The deviation from India was impressive and striking, even for the future revolutionary S.C. Bose.[91] By highlighting its opposite, exposure to freedom helped to incite nationalist aspirations. Yet it also inculcated preferences for particular political ideas closely linked to nationalism.[92] Lahiri notes that the Bengali writer and Civil Servant R.C. Dutt's positive impression at observing people enjoying the right to governing themselves first hand and concludes that seeing a 'democracy in action' sowed the seeds of Dutt's nationalism.[93] Mukherjee has moreover shown the positive impressions students had about British political life, pointing to a claim by Fazl-I-Hussain, a Punjabi politician, that he learnt what 'independent nations call liberty' and grasped the 'distinction between freedom and slavery' at Cambridge in 1900. The Indian journalist Frank Moreas admired democracy

[89] R. Ray, 'What Are Democracy's Best Answers to Communism', radio talk, n.d. (between 1946-9), Speeches and Writings, RRP, NMML.
[90] S. Mukherjee, *The Experience of the England Returned*, p. 218.
[91] See Lahiri, pp. 155-7, including the views of R.C. Dutt, N.G. Ranga, S.C. Bose and Krishnabhabani Das.
[92] For instance, D. Shukla said of Oxford in the 1930s: 'It speaks a lot for the British tradition of freedom, and their confidence in the openness of their society that they exposed us, the civil servants of an empire, to the free and academic atmosphere of a great university rather than of a government institution'. (Quoted from Symonds, *Oxford and Empire*, p. 265.)
[93] Lahiri, p. 155.

while a student at Oxford in the 1920s, while another writer, the author Mulk Raj Anand, was impressed by the challenge miners posed to the government during the General Strike in 1926 while a student at University College. [94]

Democracy could inspire nationalism, but many nationalists also desired democracy in its own right. The historian Sunil Khilnani has written that democracy was given to the Indian people through the 'political choice of an intellectual elite'.[95] One of the great ironies of Britain's imperial legacy was the role overseas education, itself the product of centuries of authoritarian rule that created an English-speaking elite dependent on British education for career advancement, played in convincing that intellectual elite of the merits of democracy. Experiences in Britain, including the ideas students engaged with in their classes, played an important role both in advancing new criticisms of democracy in its contemporary form and, in a more general but no less important sense, promoting the idea of democracy itself at a time when alternative political systems seemed viable. As Benjamin Zachariah has observed, totalitarian alternatives, from Italian fascism to Nazism, were often held up in India as other political models that could be used to initiate radical social and economic change.[96] Soviet communism in particular was admired for being relatively less harmed by the Great Depression.

Despite his firm stance against British rule in India, to be sure, Mehta admired British democracy, visiting parliament during his time in England.[97] He expressed his opinion in the importance of the British inheritance when it came to the rule of law, an independent judicial system, parliamentary government and its democratic procedures

[94] S. Mukherjee, *The Experience of the England Returned,* pp. 221-3.
[95] S. Khilnani, *The Idea of India* (London, 2004), p. 34.
[96] B. Zachariah, 'British and Indian Ideas of "Development:" Decoding Political Conventions in the Late Colonial State' *Itinerario* 23, no. 3-4 (Nov. 1999), p. 169.
[97] A. Basu, pp. 64-66.

and the idea of democracy as inspired by thinkers like Mill.[98] Students were also impressed by the act of holding free elections. Jawaharlal Nehru recounted his interest in the 1906 General Election in his autobiography while at Harrow.[99] Renuka Ray supported the Labour Party in the 1922 General Election, visiting housewives in their homes, engaging in what she called 'street-by-street canvassing'.[100] She claimed to have convinced many people to vote, in part by offering to baby sit while they were out.[101]

Ray further spoke of the effects of Britain's post-war socialist reforms undertaken through democratic means, suggesting it exerted a significant influence on her.[102] She specifically emphasised the advancement of socialism in England and other western countries by evolution, not revolution, again evoking Laski's revolution by consent.[103] In a speech in 1951, Ray accentuated that while the state had a duty to advance economic and social equality of opportunity, it must be vigilant to maintain individual liberty and freedom of expression.[104] Ray lost touch with Laski following graduation, yet expressed a keen interest to Krishna Menon to meet him as late as 1949 while planning a trip to London.[105]

Based on student appraisals, Laski's hope to expand and preserve traditional notions of democracy were among his most lasting influences on his students. Commenting on his former teacher, Mehta observed that although Laski was 'an ardent advocate (or 'proponent' to use his own favourite word) of radical transformation of the

[98] G.L. Mehta, Oral Interview, Centre of South Asian studies, 7 July 1970, pp. 22-3.
[99] J. Nehru, *Autobiography*, p. 17.
[100] R. Ray, *My Reminiscences*, p. 38.
[101] Ibid.
[102] R. Ray, 'Socialism', RRP, Speeches and Writings, No. 93, NMML.
[103] Ibid.
[104] R. Ray, 'Some Aspects of Constructive Nation Building', 26 January 1951, RRP, speeches and writings, no. 13, NMML.
[105] R. Ray to V.K. Krishna Menon, 16 March 1949, RR Papers, correspondences, NMML.

existing social and economic order,' he 'was somewhat conservative and cautious so far as formal government' is concerned.[106] Mehta recalled that a 'partiality for the British political system was, to quote one of his favourite expressions, 'an inarticulate major premise' of his political thought'.[107] Laski's increasing embrace of Marx in the 1930s provoked ambiguity on the matter, but he never ceased advocating for democratic as opposed to revolutionary change.

Mehta and Ray were two of Laski's early students at LSE and consequently had not attended Laski's lectures when he more fully embraced Marxism in the 1930s. Nor did they experience the radicalism at LSE in the 1930s and the intensified political and international debates in Britain following the Great Depression. Yet although economic and political developments over the succeeding two decades convinced Laski of the truculence of capitalist interest and made him sceptical that change could be procured though parliamentary means, Laski's affinity for parliamentary democracy and non-violent change prompted some radical students to consider him too conservative, further indicative that his radicalism had limits.

In 1940, for instance, a student group, the LSE Socialist Society, published a letter criticising Laski's idea of revolution by consent, arguing that the ruling classes would never cede power and that it was not even consistent with Laski's other positions.[108] From the signing of the Nazi-Soviet Pact in August 1939, Comintern policy jettisoned its commitment to maintaining a popular front against fascism. Reflecting the many cleavages within leftist politics outside the university, sometime soon after, a

[106] V.K. Krishna Menon. Quoted in G.N. Singh. 'Laski – The teacher and the political scientist'. Ahmedabad: Harold Laski Institute of Political Science, 1957.
[107] Ibid.
[108] 'LSE Socialist Society', 23 October 1940, small LSE deposits 42, LSE.

Democratic Socialist Society broke away from the Socialist Society and formed its own body of students who believed that socialism should be pursued through democratic channels. According to the new Society, the final decision to split ranks emerged when some members of the Socialist Society attempted to impose the People's Convention on the group and Laski gave the inaugural lecture of the new Society.[109] His notion of 'revolution by consent' remained a sensitive point for the Socialist Society. Following the break, the Socialist Society published their response, attacking the new group for hypocrisy and inaction. It wrote, '"Revolution by consent" and all the other ideological excuses for inaction, must not confuse us'.[110]

One of Laski's British students in the 1940s, Ralph Miliband, later suggested that his former teacher's intellectual goal was the creation of a socialist state that remained free.

> In essence, Laski sought throughout his life to explore the conditions in which fundamental social changes which he deemed urgent and desirable in our society might be realized without the obliteration of freedom; how, furthermore, socialism as a form of economic and social organisation might be combined with political democracy.[111]

Laski was rarely clear about how this would be achieved. Yet from Miliband's perspective, 'Laski was a libertarian to the root of his being. No-one who attended his lectures on the history of political ideas at the London School of Economics could fail to see that to him the drama of history was the struggle for toleration, for the exercise of reason in human affairs, for the extension of individual freedom…'[112] This is surely an

[109] 'The Democratic Socialist Society', n.d., small LSE deposits 42, LSE.
[110] 'LSE Socialist Society', statement from the executive committee, small LSE deposits 42, LSE.
[111] R. Miliband, 'Harold Laski's Socialism', *The Socialist Register* (London, 1995), p. 240
[112] Ibid., p. 258.

exaggeration.[113] As we have seen from his writings in the previous chapter, his increasing support for central planning as the best means to bring about profound social change from the mid 1920s onwards and his refusal to clearly answer whether a violent social revolution was necessary if all else failed exposes him as a someone who, maintaining some weariness of state power from his earlier pluralism, was more skeptical of private enterprise than of state power. What Miliband did capture, however, was the tension in Laski's conflicting beliefs.[114]

Neither Stalinism nor Capitalism: A Global Third Way?

That tension could prove infuriating to his critics, but was also the primary source of his intellectual appeal, to India and elsewhere. While Laski's teaching on socialism and criticisms of democracy resonated with South Asians in particular, students from other regions also expressed great interest in his work. While diverse writers, including Lenin, Hobson, Naoroji and Laski, had criticised imperialism, capitalism and the link between them, increasing revelations about Stalin's purges, the Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact and, later, Nikita Khrushchev's further revelations about Soviet crimes in his 1956 Secret Speech, furthered the desire for an alternative that was neither capitalist nor communist.

Canadian students present an illuminating parallel to their Indian counterparts. As we have seen in the first chapter, imperial institutions, including the Rhodes Scholarship and the UBBE, sought to use overseas study to strengthen Britain's ties with its settler colonies. The Rhodes Scholarship in particular shaped several prominent Canadians.

[113] Miliband mentions Laski's questioning in 1932 that the establishment of socialism could be achieved peacefully. See R. Miliband, *Parliamentary Socialism: A Study in the Politics of Labour* 2nd ed. (London, 1972).
[114] Indeed, for Michael Newman, what unites Laski and Miliband is a mutual effort to reconcile the contradictions between liberalism and Marxism. See M. Newman, 'Class, State and Democracy: Laski, Miliband and the Search for a Synthesis', *Political Studies*, vol. 54 (2006), p. 345.

Lester B. Pearson [Prime Minister, 1963-68] studied modern history as a Rhodes Scholar from 1923-25.[115] Later in the decade, Escott Reid, the future diplomat and High Commissioner to India, followed suit. The socialist broadcasting innovator Graham Spry, as well as diplomats Norman Robertson and John King Gordon also studied as Rhodes Scholars.[116] Another Canadian, the imperial federalist Sir George Parkin, was a student himself at Oxford in the nineteenth century before becoming the organising secretary of the Rhodes Trusts during its first two decades from 1902-1922.

While LSE's place in Canadian history is less formalised, it has been no less significant in playing a role in shaping the country's leaders. Laski's Canadian students included the future central banker Louis Rasminsky, as well as Camp, Macpherson and Trudeau. The latter case represents both an individual finding his intellectual footing while also reflecting the international breadth of Laski's appeal. In his youth, Trudeau was influenced by the Catholic Church of Quebec's scepticism of democracy. At a time when many of Laski's Indian students were protesting against Franco, Trudeau, still in Canada, may have participated in an anti-Republican rally in Montreal in 1936, while also displaying an interest in fascism and expressing anti-Semitic sentiments.[117]

His journey through the world's leading institutions of learning provoked a serious re-evaluation. After studying law at Université de Montréal, Trudeau studied at Harvard, École libre des sciences politiques and finally LSE. He credited Harvard with entrenching his belief in freedom. 'The view that every human must remain free to shape his own destiny became for me a certainty and one of the pillars of the political thought I

[115] Pierre Trudeau applied but was rejected. See J. English *Citizen of the World*, pp. 65-7.
[116] For more on interwar Canadian Rhodes Scholars, see D.E. Torrence, 'Instructor to Empire: Canada and the Rhodes Scholarship, 1902-39', in *Canada and the British World* (eds.) P. Buckner and R.D. Francis (Vancouver, 2006), pp. 262-7.
[117] Nemni, *Young Trudeau*, pp. 187-88.

was working to develop'.[118] In France, he came under the influence of Jacques Maritain and Emmanuel Mournier. He believed that the former's philosophy of personalism in particular provoked him to embrace a 'doctrine of absolute liberalism'.[119]

LSE, the end point of his formal education, was where his inchoate thinking began to take shape.[120] He entered LSE in 1947 as a research student (he did not have to sit and write an exam). He lived in an agreeable apartment in Kensington that contrasted starkly to the post-war austerity around him. Trudeau's living conditions prompted his Canadian classmate and later political scientist Paul Fox to comment that Trudeau was like 'a young nobleman on a Grand Tour…'[121] He was a member of the Canadian Students' Club, described as mildly left wing.[122] Generally though, Trudeau seems to have been uninvolved in student politics or clubs at LSE.[123] His original thesis subject, "Liberties of the Province of Quebec", was eventually changed to "Studies on Liberty, Authority and Obedience", of which he wrote five chapters before leaving LSE. In his memoirs he asserted that he wanted to know 'how governments work and why people obey. Does the ultimate authority lie in the state or in the human individual? Whom should one choose: Antigone or Creon?'[124] Though he did not complete his research, Trudeau attended Laski's lectures and seminars while reading extensively under him on subjects including jurisprudence, political theory and moral and social philosophy.[125]

---

[118] P.E. Trudeau, *Memoirs*, pp. 39-40.
[119] P.E. Trudeau, *Memoirs*, p. 40.
[120] Ibid., p. 47.
[121] Quoted from S. Clarkson and C. McCall, *Trudeau and Our Times*, vol. 2, pp. 47-8 (based on the authors' interviews with Joan and Paul Fox, 10 November 1991).
[122] *The Times*, 2 January 1969, from P. E. Trudeau, Student Dossier, R/47/9, LSE.
[123] S. Clarkson and C. McCall, *Trudeau and Our Times*, vol. 2, pp. 46-7.
[124] P.E. Trudeau, *Memoirs*, pp. 46-7.
[125] P.E. Trudeau, student dossier, LSE. This included reading and taking notes on Laski's own work, such as *Liberty in the Modern State*. See P.E. Trudeau, 'London School of Economics – Lecture Notes and Readings 1947-48', TP, MG 26 02 vol. 8. LAC.

'My reflections as a student, undertaken at Harvard, Paris, and London, reached their conclusion at LSE. When I left this institution, my fundamental choices had been made.'[126] In particular, Trudeau described an obsession with freedom, authority and obedience. In his memoirs, he asserted that his '…basic philosophy was established from that time on, and it was on those premises that I based all my future political decisions; it was that philosophy that underlay all my writings'.[127] Indeed, part of the basis of that thinking was the building of an intellectual bridge between capitalism and socialism.

It was this search for third way, inspired by a dissatisfaction with both classical liberalism's inability to sufficiently address inequality and the Soviet model's totalitarianism, that Trudeau shared with Indians like Nehru, Mehta and Ray. Despite their differences, they all understood Laski's work as informing this quest. Trudeau reserved space in the first volume of the journal he founded in 1950 to write, 'C'est en quoi les capitalistes et les staliniens furent ses ennemis jurés'.[128] Speaking of Laski and another hero, the French Popular Front Prime Minister Leon Blum[129], Trudeau wrote 'Socialistes, ils rejetaient néanmoins la primauté du stalinisme. Et démocrates, ils dénonçaient quand même l'État libéral'.[130] Believing that angering everyone was a sign one was on to something, Trudeau admired the fact that the two were disagreeable to purists on both sides of the Iron Curtain.[131] He recognised Laski's inconsistency but suggested it was the conscious price he paid to pursue his positions with energy and

[126] P.E. Trudeau, *Memoirs*, p. 47.
[127] Ibid.
[128] P.E. Trudeau, 'Blum et Laski', *Cité libre* vol. 1, no 1, (June, 1950), p. 38. 'This is why both Stalinists and capitalists were his sworn enemies'. (Author's translation).
[129] Blum was Prime Minister on three occasions: 1936-7; 1938; 1946-7.
[130] P.E. Trudeau, 'Blum et Laski', *Cité libre* Vol. 1, no 1, (June 1950), p. 38. 'As socialists, they rejected Stalinism. And as Democrats, they also denounced the liberal state'. (Author's translation).
[131] Ibid.

passion.[132] Reflecting the sentiments of Laski's Indian admirers, Trudeau felt that what was particularly valuable was his effort to reenergise the free, liberal state with egalitarian ideas inspired by socialism while avoiding the erection of a Soviet-style state that was antithetical to democracy.

For Trudeau, 'Il n'y avait en Angleterre personne de plus pointilleux sur l'équité que Laski, ni de plus intrépide à combattre pour elle'.[133] Indicative of Trudeau's respect and Laski's lasting influence, the future Prime Minister later wrote in his journal, 'Son oeuvre immense, écrite et vécue, n'a été qu'une recherche continue de la cité libre, on des hommes pourraient vivre dans la tolérance, et éventuellement dans l'amour'.[134] Trudeau's appreciation of Laski is further indicated by the three obituaries he preserved among his personal papers, including one emphasising Laski's effort to demonstrate the compatibility of liberty and equality.[135]

That effort appealed to students who were increasingly inspired by Marxist ideas and the perceived social and economic successes of the Soviet Union, but who also firmly believed in the ideals of political democracy they either experienced at home, like Trudeau, or abroad for the first time, ironically, in the heart of the British Empire. The message continued to resonate with Trudeau decades later. Writing in 1995, he and a co-author alluded to Laski's fear that unless an intellectual bridge was built between capitalism and collectivism, an age of terror and revolutionary violence would be unavoidable. They insisted that 'The accuracy of that insight was a major stimulus to

[132] Ibid.
[133] Ibid. 'No one else in England was as determined as Laski was to fight for fairness and justness'. (Author's translation).
[134] Ibid. 'His extensive oeuvre, written and lived, was driven by a constant search for freedom. This freedom would be characterised by tolerance and, eventually, the possibility of love'. (Author's translation).
[135] TP, LAC.

each of us decades later as we surveyed an analogous circumstance: the growing gulf of indifference and misunderstanding in the North at events in the South…'[136] The authors suggested that even in the wake of the Cold War, future Canadian foreign policy should be based on Laski's plea, contributing to an intellectual bridge to a dramatically changing Russia and China.[137]

Trudeau was the highest profile of Laski's Canadian students, but he was hardly alone. As Peter Lamb and David Morrice have written, Laski's impact is also noticeable in the work of the Canadian political philosopher C.B. Macpherson's thought.[138] He began his undergraduate studies at the University of Toronto just months before Wall Street crashed in October 1929.[139] Macpherson came to LSE on the advice of his teacher at Toronto, who had previously studied under Laski himself.[140] He arrived in 1933 to pursue an MSc (Econ) degree, focusing on political theory since 1689 with Laski as a supervisor.[141] Macpherson later became an expert on Hobbes and Locke and wrote critically of capitalism, while searching for a way to bring about a social democracy that would preserve individual liberty.

Laski had argued that property relations determined state action. Macpherson's LSE thesis built on this, examining the role of trade unions and voluntary societies in England from the turn of the century to the time of writing. He argued that what analysts of these organisations always missed was the state's role in maintaining property

---

[136] I. Head and P.E. Trudeau, *The Canadian Way: Shaping Canada's Foreign Policy, 1968-84* (Toronto, 1995), p. 218.
[137] Ibid., pp. 262-3.
[138] P. Lamb and D. Morrice, 'Ideological Reconciliation in the Thought of Harold Laski and C.B. Macpherson', *Canadian Journal of Political Science* 35, no. 4 (December 2002), pp. 795-810
[139] Leiss, p. 20.
[140] I. Kramnick, p. 336. (Macpherson would later return to the University of Toronto, where he became a respected and popular teacher in his own right, his students including the prominent Canadian left wing politician Ed Broadbent).
[141] Crawford Brough Macpherson, student dossier, LSE.

relations. Whether the system was capitalist or communist, the state must forbid the recognition of associations 'unless there can be attained a system of property relationships so satisfactory that no groups within the society or outside it would have a sufficient interest in attacking it'.[142] Macpherson claimed his work had implications for the understanding of state sovereignty. Continuing from the quote above, he insisted that, 'in that event only, the function for the performance of which the State otherwise needs to claim sovereign powers would no longer be essential, and recognition and powers could be given to voluntary associations commensurate with the real functions they fulfil in society'.[143]

Following graduation, he expanded specifically on the related subject of economic democracy that became central to his intellectual efforts. For Macpherson, like Laski, economic democracy would be crucial to any effort of making political democracy more tangible to people beyond the propertied classes.[144] He acknowledged that to bring about socialisation and extend state control over private enterprise, it would be necessary to cede some democratic rights and concentrate extensive power into the hands of government.[145] He discounted the challenge that providing a government this much power might make it less responsive to parliament and more prone to taking executive action as not being insurmountable; pressure groups, for instance, could help mitigate the weakening of democracy, as could continuous advisory and consultative committees.[146] It is beyond the scope of this research to probe the practicality or validity of Macpherson's

[142] C.B. Macpherson, *Voluntary Associations Within the State 1900-1934, With Special Reference to the Place of Trade Unions in Relation to the State in Great Britain* (LSE MA thesis, 1935), p. 336. CBMP, Macpherson Papers, UTA.
[143] Ibid., pp. 336-7.
[144] C.B. Macpherson, 'The Meaning of Economic Democracy', *University of Toronto Quarterly* vol. XI, No. 4, (July, 1942), p. 404.
[145] Ibid., p. 411.
[146] Ibid., p. 412.

philosophy. Rather, the important point is his search for a compromise that linked him to Laski and his fellow LSE alumni.

Like Mehta, Macpherson reviewed Laski's work as well. He praised Laski's suggestion that the Marxist vision is 'essentially humanist in its emphasis on the worth and possibilities of the individual' and argued that liberals should recognise this.[147] Macpherson applauded Laski's assertion that the Russian Revolution was the successor to the tradition of Christianity, the Reformation and the Renaissance, by having uniquely provided for the release of human personality.[148] In his review, it would seem that Macpherson was expressing his own desire for a bridge between liberal humanism and Marxism. Indeed, in a later review, Macpherson, echoing Trudeau and perhaps seeing himself in the mirror, called Laski's thought 'too Marxist for the liberal and too liberal for the Communist'.[149] Again, Macpherson noted his belief that Laski saw the totalitarianism of the USSR as aspiring toward ultimately making people free. This, however, did not preclude him from assuming a liberal criticism of Russian authoritarianism and the orthodoxies of the Soviet state in science, politics and the arts.[150] For Macpherson, echoing Miliband and perhaps again seeing something of himself, Laski's real and ultimately unresolved dilemma was 'the ambivalence between the values of liberalism and the values of Communism'.[151]

---

[147] C.B. Macpherson, 'Review of "Faith, Reason and Civilisation: An Essay in Historical Understanding" by Harold J. Laski' *The Canadian Journal of Economics and Political Science* 11, no. 2 (May, 1945), p. 311.
[148] Ibid. On a similar point, Mehta disagreed with Laski's notion that a change in material conditions could have a spiritual effect, arguing that the abolition of property rights in the USSR did not lead to a spiritual revolution. See G.L. Mehta, 'Revolutionary cure for Hitlerism: Disorder Dreaming of the New Order' *Free Press Journal*, 18 March 1941.
[149] C.B. Macpherson, 'Review of "The Dilemma of Our Times: An Historical Essay by Harold J. Laski", by Harold J. Laski' *Political Studies* 2 (1954), p. 176.
[150] Ibid.
[151] Ibid.; C.B. Macpherson, *The Life and Times of Liberal Democracy* (Toronto, 2012), p. 69

The international interest in sources that addressed this dilemma is perhaps best illustrated by Laski's Chinese students, who despite emerging from a cultural background more isolated from British and Western thought, found inspiration in Laski's ideas. The period of disunity in China following the collapse of the Qing Dynasty in 1912 intensified fundamental questions about the nature of politics, economics and society in the modern era that were had been asked since the late imperial period. In this effort, human rights campaigners, liberals and democrats became attracted to Western learning for sources of inspiration.

This was particularly true of those associated with the May Fourth Movement, so named for having developed out of a student protest on 4 May 1919. Long simmering resentments over Western influence surfaced after China's disappointment at the Paris Peace Conference, which handed previously German concessions in Shandong to Japan. Propelling the May Fourth Movement was a desire for change and modernisation, a search for China's identity in the modern age, and an attraction to science, as well as international political ideas and literary trends.

The May Fourth generation tended to have a Western style education or be educated in the West or Japan.[152] As Chinese enrolment increased throughout Britain and the U.S. during the period under study, more students and intellectuals became exposed to Anglo-American writers. Concurrently, British intellectuals developed an increasing interest in China and attained a significant following in that country. Bertrand Russell, so admired by Mehta, garnered particular interest.[153] In fact, Mehta first heard Russell speak

[152] P. Mishra, *From the Ruins of Empire* (New York, 2012), p. 206. See R. Mitter, *A Bitter Revolution: China's Struggle with the Modern World* (Oxford, 2005), pp. 6, 22.
[153] Jayaprakash Narayan, for instance, wrote to Masani saying that while studying in Wisconsin, Russell was his 'god'. Narayan to Masani, 6 May 1944, M.R. Masani Papers, File 3, NAI.

in London in 1921, when he addressed his trip to China from the previous year.[154] Russell had given a series of well-received lectures in China – popularity for Russell's thought was such that there was a Russell Study Society.[155] Eileen Power, moreover, travelled there in 1920 after receiving a travelling fellowship. Tawney made the trip in 1932 and wrote about China in *Life and Labour in China,* while Shaw visited later in the 1930s, as did writers W.H. Auden and Christopher Isherwood. Joseph Needham, whose interest in the Middle Kingdom was stimulated by Chinese graduate students in Cambridge, conducted research in China during World War II that informed his monumental series, *Science and Civilisation in China*.

A recent dissertation highlighted Chinese intellectuals' engagement with Laski's writings in particular, affirming that they chose selectively and struggled with the tension between his Marxism and liberal sympathies with an eye to addressing China's specific political problems.[156] Referring to Laski as a 'renowned critic of capitalism and at the same time a firm believer in revolution by consent',[157] the author, Xu Xi, calls Laski the most significant thinker for Chinese liberals in their 'search for an ideal Chinese democracy in which both liberty and equality'[158] could be achieved. Xu has built on work by Edmund K. Fung and Marina Svensson.[159] Fung examines responses to the 'crisis of modernization', which he argues formed the intellectual foundations of modern china. He

[154] G.L. Mehta, 'Bertrand Russell', 14 March 1970 [unpublished], G.L. Mehta Papers, Speeches and Writings by Him, s. no 41, NMML.
[155] J. Spence, *The Gate of Heavenly Peace*, (New York, 1981), p. 136.
[156] Xu Xi, *British Left Wing Writers and China: Harold Laski, W.H. Auden and Joseph Needham* (University of Hong Kong Ph.D., 2013), pp. 16, 62.
[157] Ibid., p. 62.
[158] Ibid.
[159] E. Fung has noted that Laski's works were translated into Chinese (including *Authority in the Modern State*, *Communism, Democracy in Crisis, Grammar* and *The State in Theory and Practice*). Zhang Junmai, who had studied in Jena University in Germany, translated *Grammar*, with a long introduction devoted to Laski's thought in 1927 (Fung, *The Intellectual Foundations of Chinese Modernity* (New York, 2010), pp. 212-13).

asserts that modernity is multi-layered, with many of the people in his study holding liberal, socialist and conservative positions simultaneously.[160] Svensson further suggests that Laski's 'socialized conception of human rights' found a receptive audience.[161] As she points out, Chinese admirers were attracted to Laski's ideas of rights as permitting the individual to fully develop.[162]

What is missed in these works are the remarkable similarities Laski's Chinese students displayed to other overseas students. Luo Longji, for instance, graduated from Tsinghua University in Beijing where he was a student leader during the May Fourth Movement. He then attended the University of Wisconsin[163] and finally received a PhD from Columbia University in 1928, writing on *The Conduct of Parliamentary Elections in England*.[164] He had spent a year researching in 1925 in London, where he met Laski and studied under him at LSE. Luo wrote about human rights in the magazine *Xinyue* (*The Crescent*) with the writer Liang Shiqiu and other Anglo-American educated Chinese, including Hu Shi (who helped found *Xinyue* in 1928).[165]

In an essay in 1929 in *Xinyue*, Luo argued for the state's role in ensuring what he calls human rights: 'Thus, the so-called necessary conditions for life definitely do not end with clothing, food, shelter, and bodily safety; we must add all the conditions that make for developing one's individual nature, nurturing one's personality, and becoming the

---

[160] E. Fung, *The Intellectual Foundations of Chinese Modernity*, p. 256.
[161] M. Svensson, *Debating Human Rights in China: A Conceptual and Political History* (Lanham, 2002), p. 162.
[162] Ibid., p. 163.
[163] The University of Wisconsin, like LSE, was particularly known for its radicalism and could benefit from further research in its own right. Wang Zaoshi also went to Wisconsin, doing a Ph.D. there, and was also a student of Laski while a research fellow at LSE. The Marxist-inspired journalist K.S. Shelvankar had attended the University of Wisconsin in the 1920s, as did Indian activist Jaiprakesh Narayan and the Ceylonese Trotskyite Philip Gunawardena.
[164] Xu Xi, *British Left Wing Writers and China: Harold Laski, W.H. Auden and Joseph Needham* (University of Hong Kong Ph.D., 2013), pp. 26-7.
[165] Xu Xi, p. 28.

best possible person one can be'.[166] Luo emphasised what Laski termed economic democracy and the state's role in guaranteeing the individual had the necessary tools to develop fully. The above quote is reminiscent of Laski's belief in the necessities of a full life and the state's role in assuring them.

On the other hand, Luo quoted liberally from Laski in support of his belief that the 'theory of state omnipotence is bankrupt', reflective of Laski in his pluralist phase.[167] He argued that there were many institutions in society, the state being only one of them.[168] After quoting Laski's assertion that human rights exist prior to law, that they are law's primary goal, and that the quality of a state depended on how effectively human rights are protected, Luo discussed what he believed to be the limits to a state's authority. 'The people's obedience to the state has conditions, rather than being absolute. The most important of these conditions is that the state protects human rights, and thus protects the necessary conditions for people's loves. If ever the state does not serve this function, the people's duty to obey the state has ended'.[169] He again quoted Laski's remarks at length, using the professor's authority to support his argument. 'Let this serve as a bit more of an explanation,' he prefaced Laski's quote by affirming, 'of my view of the relation between human rights and the state'.[170]

Luo argued that he was not simply advocating the defiance of authority or the overthrow of the state and specifically disavowed an adherence to Marx and the Russian anarchist Mikhail Bakunin.[171] Rather, he wrote that people must grasp that a constitution

[166] Luo L., *On Human Rights* (1929) in *The Chinese Human Rights Readers: Documents and Commentary 1900-2000*, (eds.) S.C. Angle and M. Svensson (New York, 2001), p. 141.
[167] Luo L., *On Human Rights*, p. 145.
[168] Ibid.
[169] Luo L., *On Human Rights*, p. 145.
[170] Ibid., p. 146.
[171] Ibid.

protects human rights, but that a 'constitution also relies on the protection of human rights'.[172] He considered revolt a serious matter, but the 'human right of revolution' always remained with the people.[173] Luo, like Laski, walked a fine line between promoting instability and possible revolt on the one hand and cautioning against undue radicalism on the other. If a state could benefit its entire population, Laski believed a revolution might be the only way to end unjust rule.

This is again reminiscent of Mehta, who drew from Laski's thinking on the bounds of state sovereignty when he claimed that there were limits to the obedience one owed to the state, an argument from which he drew a parallel to Gandhi.[174] Indeed, as Mehta and Ray did with the Mahatma, Luo's attraction to foreign ideas was strengthened when parallels could be made with more local thinking. In Lou's case, he found inspiration from the ancient Chinese philosopher Mencius, particularly regarding the right of regicide.[175]

As Fung asserted, Laski's students became 'university professors, economists, writers, journal editors, social critics and political activists'.[176] Wu Enyu also did a PhD, studying under Laski.[177] Wu, who had already published about Marx in China, completed a MSc. (Econ). His thesis, entitled 'The Evolution of Karl Marx's Social and Political Ideas with Special Reference to 1840-8', was later published as a book in China, where

[172] Ibid., p. 148.
[173] Ibid., p. 149.
[174] G.L. Mehta, 'Erudite Scholar and Creative Thinker' *Times of India* 27 March 1950, GLMP, 1st Instalment, Subject Files, NMML.
[175] Luo, *On Human Rights*, p. 149.
[176] E. Fung, *The Intellectual Foundations of Chinese Modernity,* p. 137. Other Chinese students of Laski included the writer and activist Wang Zaoshi, Gong Xiangrui, Zou Wenhai, Lou Bangyan, Qian Changzhao and Hang Liwu. The poet, Xu Zhimo, studied politics under Laski before studying literature at Cambridge.
[177] Wu Enyu, student dossier, LSE.

he became a political scientist.[178] Chu Anping was another Laski student and considered a prominent liberal after returning to China. He founded and edited *The Observer*, which drew mainly on Anglo-American educated authors, including Wu and Fei Xiaotong, the anthropologist and student of Malinowski (see chapter three). The magazine supported socialist-inspired democracy that sought to protect both political liberty and economic equality.[179] Unlike Laski's students from India and Canada, his Chinese followers met with extreme political repression, in part because their foreign education made them stand out as bourgeois intellectuals.[180] After the failure of the Hundred Flowers Campaign in 1956, Chu was coerced into confessing his regret that his accusations against the Communist Party of China assisted liberals, including Luo.[181] Indeed, during the ensuing Anti-Rightist Movement [1957-59], Luo was also denounced as one of China's most prominent 'rightists' for discussing the opinions he had written about in the 1920s and 30s. When over 500,000 people who had been purged during the Anti-Rightist Movement were rehabilitated in 1979, Chu and Luo were among five prominent names disregarded.[182]

That students from such distinct backgrounds all embraced elements of Laski's thought suggests several noteworthy individual and world-historical parallels. As outlined in the preceding chapter, students were drawn to Laski's charisma and warmth as a teacher, while Indians in particular appreciated his commitment to anti-colonialism. Yet his ideas were also captivating to a generation of students confronted with the decline of

[178] Ibid.
[179] Xu, *British Left Wing Writers and China*, p. 59.
[180] Weili Ye, *Seeking Modernity in China's Name: Chinese Students in the United States, 1900-1927*, p. 3.
[181] Y.T. Wong, 'The Fate of Liberalism in Revolutionary China: Chu Anping and His Circle, 1946-1960', *Modern China* 19, no. 4 (Oct., 1993), p. 461.
[182] Ibid.

traditional forms of social and political organisation internationally after World War I, as well as the ideas and norms that underpinned them. Soviet communism offered one stark alternative to the old order. For students familiar with Western thought and who admired the practice of Westminster government, Laski's search for a political and social system containing both liberal and Marxist elements was highly appealing.

Swallowing Laski's 'Wisdom'

On the whole, the admiration Laski inspired in his students was remarkable in its intensity, endurance and international composition. Yet Laski stimulated both respect and opprobrium, and some of his students rebelled against his thought, or highlighted his contradictions to argue against the ideas he supported. Isaiah Berlin, who believed Laski to be superficial, speculated that there was a division between British and colonial students, and that British students were less susceptible to Laski's perorations because they were less innocent than foreign students.[183] One such British critic was Lionel Robbins, who appreciated Laski's teaching ability while he was a student in the 1920s, but became a fierce critic of his collectivism when working at LSE in the 1930s.

Robbins was far from the only student who attacked Laski, and contrary to what Berlin suggested, his critics included many students from the colonial world. I.G. Patel [LSE Director, 1984-90], who studied at King's College, Cambridge and read for the economics tripos during World War II, attended lectures by LSE professors due to the wartime relocation. He complained that Laski was mostly anecdotal.[184] Lee Kuan Yew was impressed at first. Before attending Cambridge, the future Prime Minister of

[183] Kramnick, p. 323.
[184] I.G. Patel, *An Encounter With Higher Education: My Years at LSE* (Oxford, 2004), p. 12.

Singapore spent a term at LSE and later wrote that Laski had an impact on him.[185] 'The two or three of Laski's lectures I attended were my first introduction to the general theory of socialism, and I was immediately attracted to it. It struck me as manifestly fair that everybody in this world should be given an equal chance in life, that in a just and well-ordered society there should not be a great disparity of wealth between persons because of their position or status, or that of their parents'.[186] Lee further commented that the 'ideas that Laski represented at that time were therefore attractive to students from the colonies. We all wanted our independence so that we could keep our wealth for ourselves'.[187] Any student aware of earlier writers like Naoroji, as many Indian students were, would have been familiar with the argument that imperialism funnelled wealth away from the colonies. Laski pressed the point, suggesting an expanded understanding of liberty that encompassed economic equality was necessary not only to guard against imperialism from abroad but from the empire of capitalists at home as well.

Generally unimpressed with London, however, Lee fled to the relative security of Cambridge, and later abandoned his interest in socialism and Laski too. Assessing his impact, Lee affirmed that Laski's 'Marxist socialist theories had a profound influence on many colonial students, quite a few of whom were to achieve power and run their underdeveloped economies aground by ineptly implementing policies based on what they thought Laski taught'.[188] This was not all bad in Lee's view, as he claimed that he learned from their mistakes. 'It was my good fortune that I had several of these failed

[185] L.K. Yew, *The Singapore Story: Memoirs of Lee Kuan Yew* (Singapore, 1998), p. 105.
[186] Ibid.
[187] Ibid.
[188] Ibid., p. 104.

economies to warn me of this danger before I was in a position to do any harm in government'. [189]

Goh Keng Swee, who later held several leading positions under Lee, including Minister of Finance [1967-70] and Deputy Prime Minister [1973-84], attended Laski's lectures on Marxism, even though he was not enrolled in his class. Recalling his time at LSE, Goh affirmed that 'the teacher at the LSE that was quite outstanding was Harold Laski', though he did not comment on him much beyond his impressive charisma.[190] To be sure, Laski's charm proved insufficient to have an enduring influence on Goh. As Dahrendorf has written, while early independence projects were associated with social justice, the mantra of economic growth that gained force in the 1980s was also associated with other LSE alumni, including Goh, as well as Hong Kong lawyer, banker and politician Sir Yuet-keung Kan and South Korean newspaper publisher and defender of press freedom Kim Sang-Man.[191]

Evan an admirer of Laski's ideas like Mehta alluded to some of the professor's contradictions. Part of this was likely due to his prolific career. Laski's biographer and critic Herbert Deane pointed out that in less than thirty-five years, Laski published nearly thirty books and over sixty pamphlets and book chapters, in addition to popular and academic articles for periodicals.[192] This, as Deane wrote, left little time for revision and deeper reflection. A second reason was the sheer intellectual challenge in trying to incorporate elements of liberal thought in his Marxism. Mehta understood Laski as trying to bridge the gap between Marxism and individual liberty. 'This ambivalence towards

[189] Ibid., p. 104.
[190] Tan, Siok Sun, *Goh Keng Swee: A Portrait* (Singapore, 2007), p. 59.
[191] Dahrendorf, p. 411.
[192] Deane, *The Political Ideas of Harold J. Laski*, pp. 333-4.

Marxism is, indeed, a marked characteristic of Laski's thinking which arises from his desire to reconcile individual liberty with the Marxian creed. It is a source of much of Laski's basic inconsistencies and reveals a lack of intellectual integration'.[193]

Mehta corresponded about Laski with D.G. Karve, a Professor from the University of Poona [now Savitribai Phule Pune University], who wrote to Mehta that he began as an admiring student of Laski's work, yet eventually adopted a more critical stance. He offered two reasons: 'One of course was the repetitiveness arising out of too much concentration on one or two ideas, namely (1) worth of individual experience of freedom, and (2) the need to have sufficient economic and social security to be able to enjoy political freedom'.[194] Secondly, he was disappointed that in Laski's *Liberty in the Modern State* the Professor 'was not prepared to admit the possibility of a constitutional change from economic freedom to socialism and to suggest, extra legal action to achieve socialism in parliamentary government'.[195] Though not wholly critical, Karve once again highlighted that Laski could be many things for many people, including Laski's most controversial (and contradictory) statements regarding unconstitutional change.

Laski's critics, to be sure, could be as ardent in their denunciations as his champions were in their praise. Minoo Masani was impressed by his trips to the USSR, first in 1927 as an LSE student, and then again in 1935. After graduating, he helped to found the Congress Socialist Party [CSP] and was a regular contributor to the *Congress Socialist*. In one article, Masani claimed he realised the wisdom inherent truth to a tale he heard of a scene that occurred outside a fashionable London hotel, when a wealthy

[193] G.L. Mehta, 'Laski Memorial Lecture', GLMP, 5th instalment, NMML.
[194] D.G. Karve to G.L. Mehta, 7 November 1960, 1st Instalment, Subject Files B, Harold Laski Institute of Political Science, Ahmedabad, Papers and Correspondences Relating to the Above Institution, 1960-63, no. 8, PGMP, NMML.
[195] Ibid.

Maharaja flipped a coin to an English beggar. Who is the exploiter, Masani asked? Colour was not the problem, economics and economic domination was, whether in Britain or India.[196] Despite his epiphany, his fervent socialism began to wane in the late 1930s. He quit the CSP due to divisions in the Indian left and communist infiltration. Stalin's purges and the Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact further alienated him from communism and the Soviet Union. By the time of Independence, Masani was advocating for a mixed economic approach to India's development. Masani was destined to be in opposition his whole life. As the Nehruivian project developed in the 1950s, he moved further right, adopting a classically liberal position.

If Laski represented a fount of moral wisdom for some students, Masani found his offerings to be poisonous. 'It is not unfair', he later wrote,

> 'to say that a whole generation of Indians, from Jawaharlal Nehru and Krishna Menon onwards, sat metaphorically at Laski's feet and swallowed neat the wisdom that flowed from his fluent lips and pen. Laski was articulate, but not profound. He was terribly confused about fundamentals, with the result that his attitude towards communism and the Soviet Union was ambivalent, and consequently, often self-contradictory'.[197]

Far from Laski's hope to reconcile elements of liberalism with Marxism, Masani saw the two ideologies as fundamentally opposed. Unlike Mehta and Ray, he understood Laski's equivocation regarding the question of whether a Labour government could allow its work to be overturned due to the next general election as nothing more than Leninism lite.[198]

Indeed, Masani was not just a harsh critic but, like Laski's admirers, pursued his convictions with passion. In 1953, he established the liberal monthly magazine *Freedom*

---

[196] M.R. Masani, 'Why I am a Congress Socialist', *Congress Socialist* 1, no. 11 (10 February 1935), p. 5.
[197] M. Masani, *Bliss Was It In That Dawn*. pp. 22-3.
[198] M. Masani, 'The Economics of Freedom', speech, Bombay (1965), accessed 1 May 2016 at http://indianliberals.in/liberals-detail/?id=1

First in Bombay. Six years later, Masani, along with his fellow anti-colonial nationalist (and India's first Governor General), Chakravarti Rajagopalachari, founded the Swatantra Party as a liberal opposition to Congress.

Perhaps the most interesting refugee from Laski's socialism was Dalton Camp. The Canadian won a Beaverbrook Overseas Scholarship to study at LSE after a conversation with Max Aitkin (later Lord Beaverbrook), who was being installed as Chancellor of the University of New Brunswick, where Camp was studying. He studied at LSE in the late 1940s.[199] Camp later recalled reading all of Laski's 'published work and attending all of his lectures and seminars that I could'.[200] He later criticised Laski, claiming that after graduation he realised that Laski's work was 'flawed by a vivid imagination', which led him to 'invent half of what he said'.[201] The criticism was in line with other detractors' sentiments, but it did not matter. To Camp, Laski was not a propagandist, but rather above all provoked his students to think critically. 'What one learned - what most of us, I think, learned from Laski - was the value of dissent, although perhaps nothing of its limits. He once described his function as a teacher of politics, which was "to prick people into the insurgency of thought," an observation both characteristic and true'.[202] To be sure, Camp eventually became a Red Tory after returning to Canada, seeking to build his own bridge between conservatism and socialism as Laski had sought with liberalism and Marxism.

Assessing Laski's Impact

[199] Though attending LSE at the same time as Trudeau, Camp did not recall seeing him. G. Stevens, *The Player: The Life and Times of Dalton Camp* (Toronto, 2003) p 356.
[200] D. Camp, speech to the Atlantic Studies Conference speech, 29 April 1978, PANB MC2749.
[201] Ibid.
[202] G. Stevens, *The Player*, p. 59.

Masani asserted that, like other parties in India, the Communist Party's aristocracy was 'drafted to a certain extent from the class of people whose parents could afford an expensive foreign education'.[203] Another former Laski student, B.K. Nehru, echoed these comments. Writing at the end of the Cold War, Nehru attempted to make sense of India's relationship with the left. He noted, with characteristic sarcasm, that one of the most important sources could be traced to the fact that 'In colleges and universities throughout the world and certainly in the United Kingdom (from where we used to borrow, and continue to borrow, all 'modern' ideas), it was believed that all progressive thought was socialistic'.[204] Regarding the first half of the century, and the years between 1920 and 1930 specifically, he wrote that 'During this period there were trained, largely in the United Kingdom, several young people who occupied the seats of power in independent India and helped enthusiastically to establish what we thought would be a socialistic society'.[205]

Nehru's assessment is not that dissimilar from Moynihan's polemic, quoted in the introduction, if expressed in a somewhat muted tone. Laski indeed appears to have been a profound source of inspiration for many of his students. Nehru himself did not believe his time at LSE was particularly remarkable.[206] In assessing the impact of the Political Science department, Nehru pointed to what he called its 'Bolshevism' as having existed 'not so much in wanting to upset the whole system as in merely insisting on recognizing that the people for whose benefit society existed and towards whose betterment governmental policies should be directed, consisted of the entire people of Great Britain

[203] M. Masani, *The Communist Party of India: A Short History* (New York, 1954), p. 47.
[204] B.K. Nehru, 'Socialism at Crossroads', *India International Centre Quarterly* 17, no. 1 (Spring 1990), p. 2.
[205] Ibid., p. 3.
[206] B.K. Nehru, *Nice Guys Finish Second*, p. 96.

and not just the privileged classes'.[207] He later abandoned Laski's teachings and its implications for Britain and India, and told Laski so in a subsequent meeting. According to Nehru, Laski retorted 'What I have taught you was to think independently for yourself. If the University of Life has taught you differently from what it has taught me I am happy that I have been successful as a teacher'.[208]

If Laski was being genuine, he was also being unduly humble. For the many students who abandoned Laski's teaching, it is significant that several others found it useful enough to continue engaging with it after graduation. This chapter has focused on how Laski's students assessed their professor's thought after leaving LSE and has explored some of the ways in which they used his authority to support their beliefs, or attack others. Laski taught at LSE for thirty years. His voluminous writings, moreover, were translated into various languages, including Hindi and Mandarin. Any assessment of his students is thus a restricted enterprise, and heavily reliant on the few students who left significant records of his teaching and their appraisals. For the majority that did not, their views remain unknown. Still more LSE graduates, as Dahrendorf rightly stated, chose more lucrative careers, eschewing politics or political commentary.[209] However, there were nevertheless an impressive number of students who recounted Laski in their subsequent memoirs and writings; given the apparent similarities between his most admiring pupils, strengthened by their regional diversity, a number of conclusions can be proffered.

Despite their cultural, historical and geographic differences, his students all wrested with the moral decline of liberalism, the weakening of empire and concentration

[207] Ibid., p. 98.
[208] Ibid., p. 96.
[209] Dahrendorf, p. 411.

of greater power in nation states, the intellectual challenge posed by the alternate example of the USSR and the increasing use of expert bureaucrats, further spurred by wartime planning, in managing society. Most were stimulated by their time overseas. Laski's critics, and even some admirers, attacked his contradictions, his myopia to the extent, if not the existence, of Soviet repression and his acceptance of concentrating sovereignty in government, thereby reversing his early pluralism and his scepticism of the corrupting influences of power. His enthusiasts, from Trudeau to Macpherson, Luo to Mehta and Ray, all emphasised the expansion of democracy and the search for something other than capitalism or Stalinism. This, of course, meant different things to each student. But the students immersed in his thought, in British culture and education, tended to become social democrats. They were influenced by the example of the Soviet Union as well as by Parliament. That the colony most impacted by British education, India, became the only post-colonial state to have a near flawless record of electoral democracy, is perhaps not unrelated. In assessing Laski's legacy in England, A.J.P. Taylor wrote in 1953 that 'If today in this country there is still no communist movement of any size, if all socialists can still be at home in the Labour Party, we owe it more to Harold Laski than to any other single man'.[210] By providing the intellectual foundation for an attempted marriage between Marxism and liberalism to postcolonial leaders, perhaps Laski's influence was greater abroad.

The similarities between students from different countries, moreover, indicates how widespread Laski's legacy was. They also further illuminate the underlying intellectual parallels between the countries in question, in particular, the post-war, post-colonial intellectual elite, which can be traced back in large measure to the influence of

[210] Quoted from Kramnick, p. 589.

overseas study. To be sure, we should be cautious to see this as an example of something approaching a global phenomenon, which may belie the complexity and unpredictability inherent in the spread of ideas. For one, the student elite that travelled overseas was extremely small and unrepresentative. Additionally, ideas were not simply imbibed; rather, they were viewed through cultural lenses and applied to different countries facing distinctive challenges. If this is an example of how ideas can globalise, it is because the impressive and widespread appeal that Laski enjoyed demonstrated broad similarities of world historical challenges, from the desire for ideas to help match Western advancements in power and prosperity, to the answers seemingly offered to modern challenges by Marxism fused to a radically reformed liberalism.

Conclusion

This thesis has sought to use the institution of the university and the phenomenon of overseas study as lenses through which to explore the transition between the decline of formal European imperialism and the emergence of a post-war, post-colonial world. It has argued that LSE was a particularly fruitful place to explore this development, especially between the end of the First World War and the early 1950s. This was true directly, because of its distinct emphasis on the social sciences and its faculty, including Laski, as well as indirectly, because of its location in the heart of the imperial metropolis, which contained many dynamic political organisations that students joined and participated in.

If Britain was the seedbed of post-colonial leaders that the Jamaican student Gladstone Mills claimed it was in the introduction, the seeds it sprouted have often been misidentified and their fruit misunderstood. For one, this thesis has aimed to balance two historiographical trends in literature on colonial activists in European metropolitan centres that either places insufficient attention on the collaboration between individuals from different colonies by focusing primarily on nationalism, or assesses the emergence of international cooperation and metropolitan 'junction-boxes' uncritically. In interwar London, the translation of moral rhetoric to political action was a business fraught with complications, as perhaps it always is. It was hampered by financial burdens that necessitated a high degree of dependence on communist support, the overarching primacy of the nationalist project and cultural divisions between colonial camps. Limitations to anti-colonial solidarity prevented any broad based institutional apparatus, such as the League Against Imperialism, from surviving the interwar period. The challenges facing

any attempt to erect lasting institutions of cooperation that disputed a more Eurocentric internationalism were immense.

Yet as the experience of LSE students discussed in chapter two indicates, focus on national or regional groups obscures the extent to which cosmopolitan and internationalist positions were adopted. Indeed, this chapter aimed to look beyond binaries of nationalism and internationalism, Anglicisation and radicalisation. In many cases, students became cosmopolitans that were still rooted in their home cultures; several, like Menon, became more nationalist while embracing British culture to a great extent and also developing broader, internationalist views. To be sure, the legacy of Afro-Asian student cooperation continued into World War II and beyond. At a 1941 conference organised by the Labour politician Arthur Creech Jones, Menon spoke alongside Arthur Lewis, with Kenyatta and others in attendance.[1] Menon criticised the British position that the Empire spread order and progress to the colonised.[2] Lewis, drawing on his knowledge and experience of life from in native St. Lucia, attacked the Colonial Office that he worked for, arguing that 'Colonial officials…did not take their duties seriously and it was only when trouble broke out in the colonies endangering British capitalist interests – such as the 1935 strikes in the West Indies – that they attempted to tackle the hob of administration'.[3] As this thesis has argued, events like this could facilitate cooperation between activists from different colonies seeking to buttress particular nationalist positions, while also being a platform for general attacks on British colonialism as well as engagement with larger international visions. In 1943 at a public meeting organised by the India League entitled '480,000,000 and the Atlantic Charter',

[1] Metropolitan Police Report, 20 February 1941, KV2/2509, NAUK.
[2] Ibid.
[3] Ibid.

Menon advocated independence for India and the other colonies. He also sought to position the colonies into a conversation that would determine the norms of the post-war world, affirming that the 1941 Atlantic Charter ought to not just be open to the victims of Nazism, but also be made 'applicable to India and the Colonies'.[4] In the same way that he used the League of Nations in his pre-war anti-colonial rhetoric, he now sought to ensure a role for the colonies in determining the norms that would govern the post-war world order. Through the microcosm of the university, we identified the furthering of internationalist sentiments as well as the specific acts of protest and collaboration that foreshadowed later attempts to establish third-world solidarity, as well as some of the fractures between colonial groups that limited such aspirations.

International exposure itself also shaped career trajectories. Graduates from British universities provided a body of individuals with foreign experience to fill the ranks of new foreign services after independence. Three LSE graduates would go on to become India's ambassador to Washington, including G.L. Mehta [1952-8], B.K. Nehru [1961-68] and K.R. Narayanan [1980-84]. At least one other LSE alumnus from this period served as Ambassador to the U.S., namely the Ethiopian student Yilma Deressa [1953-57].[5] The string of LSE educated diplomats highlights how newly post-colonial countries required those with experience abroad, including students, to fill hastily constructed foreign ministries. As Glenda Sluga has noted in the case of Chinese and Japanese officials at the League of Nations, future careers in international or intergovernmental politics were greatly furthered by overseas study in a European or U.S.

[4] 'Extract from New Scotland Yard report', 20 January 1943, no. 237m, L/PJ/12/455.
[5] Yilma Deressa, student dossier, LSE.

university.[6] For some, this resulted in the complaint that representatives of non-European countries were anything but representative of their peoples.[7] Most colonial students, by virtue of the educational background and financial resources necessary to support overseas study, were already highly distinct from the majority of their peers. While study in Britain deepened this cleavage, the linguistic, cultural and educational experience gained from foreign study also proved to be highly useful for further foreign experiences. [8] In this sense, India's evolving post-independence bureaucracy demonstrated continuity with its ancestor, the ICS, which had also drawn its recruits from British institutions of higher education. As is so often the case, traditional periodisation, including the construction of colonial and post-colonial blocs, is highly misleading. It is hoped that this thesis has served to contribute to clarifying the murky waters separating these two supposed islands of history.

Fittingly, the arch anti-colonial nationalist Menon was appointed as India's first High Commissioner to Britain after Independence. In the early years of the Cold War, his politics made him stand out as a security risk, as they had before 1947.[9] Similar to previous intelligence assessments, the opinion was that he was not a communist, even if he was pro-Russian. Another LSE student, P.N. Haksar, the future Secretary to Indira Gandhi, became Secretary in the External Affairs Department of the High Commission. His communist sympathies were traced to his student days.[10] Still another LSE student,

[6] G. Sluga, *Internationalism in the Age of Nationalism* (Philadelphia, 2013). p. 59.
[7] Ibid., p. 59.
[8] K.L. Mehta, for instance, tried to learn about the practices of other foreigners in London. He grew to enjoy non-Indian food, claiming this helped him when he later served as India's ambassador throughout South America, Africa and Asia and had to adapt to regional cuisines. See: K.L. Mehta, *In Different Worlds,* p. 71. Other LSE students who became involved in the Indian Foreign Service and international institutions include Anila Graham, Renuka Ray, V.K. Krishna Menon and Dharma Vira.
[9] V.K. Krishna Menon, KV2 2512, NAUK.
[10] Ibid.

Anila Graham, a Temporary Higher Executive Officer in the Commerce Department in 1949, was also flagged as a member of the Communist Party of India and for her earlier work on the Indian Sub-committee of the CPGB. [11]

Graham and Menon were also both Laski students. This might suggest early evidence for Moynihan's assessment that British education, with LSE and Laski leading the way, created a cadre of left-leaning anti-Western radicals. The debate that perhaps no one articulated as colourfully as Moynihan continues. Conservative writers are particularly animated against this legacy. A 2015 piece in *The Spectator*, for instance, was entitled, 'British economics graduates have left a trail of misery around the world,' and once again highlights LSE as a prime culprit for radicalising leaders like Kenyatta and Trudeau.[12] It is beyond the scope of this to assess the degree to which such misery can be isolated and followed back to a source on Houghton street. Yet it is noteworthy that the results, as we have seen, were far more complicated than the above polemics might suggest. In fact, the same intelligence report highlighted Menon's antipathy for British imperialism while also acknowledging that he helped facilitate India's entry into the Commonwealth of Nations while serving as India's High Commissioner in London in 1949.[13] At the UN, Menon was a thorn in the side of imperialists and Western Cold warriors, arguing for independence in Africa and often siding with the Soviet Union, most famously after the Kremlin intervened in Hungary in 1956. Yet he was also a

[11] Ibid.
[12] J. Bartholomew, 'British economics graduates have left a trail of misery around the world', *The Spectator*, 25 July 2015, accessed 26 July 2015 at http://www.spectator.co.uk/2015/07/how-british-universities-spread-misery-around-the-world/
[13] V.K. Krishna Menon, KV2 2512, NAUK.

talented diplomat who played an important role in the prisoner of war exchange that followed the Korean War [1953-56].[14]

While Kwame Nkrumah leaned towards the Soviet bloc after becoming Prime Minister of Ghana in 1957, moreover, one of his primary economic advisors, Arthur Lewis, is best described as a moderate. Having met Lewis in London, Nkrumah recruited him to help plan Ghana's economic development after independence. Lewis' biographer, Tignor, rightly sees LSE as a moderating influence on Lewis, including the impact of classical liberals such as Plant, Robbins and Hayek.[15] As we have noted, his relationship with LSE was far more significant than Nkrumah's. Lewis's approach provides additional evidence against the view, which we observed in the introduction, that LSE simply mass produced communists. While committed to expert planning and Fabian socialism, Lewis expressed sober views of communism. 'Any communist must believe', he suggested, 'that it is the destiny of the whole human race to go communist, and that the Red Army is one of the principal instruments created by destiny for this purpose'. [16] Comparing communism to a religion, Lewis affirmed that,

> we are bound to get it wrong if we assume that the Russians are just nice chaps like us, longing to be left in peace to mind their own business, or longing to have some good moral purpose in which to collaborate peacefully with the rest of the world. After a century or so Islam lost its expansionist vigour, and settled down within its own frontiers. The same will happen to Communism after a century or so, but, it is at present only 37 years old.[17]

Lewis' long view of history, formed through a mixture of his experience growing up in St. Lucia, his time in LSE's classrooms and at the Colonial Office library, is not

[14] P.M. McGarr, '"India's Rasputin"? V.K. Krishna Menon and Anglo-American Misperceptions of Indian Foreign Policymaking, 1947-1964', *Diplomacy and Statecraft* 22, no. 2, p. 241.
[15] Tignor, *W. Arthur Lewis and the Birth of Development Economics,* p. 24.
[16] Lewis to R. Calder, Esq., 17 May 1954, box 3, folder 6, correspondences, ALP, SGML.
[17] Ibid.

suggestive of one of Moynihan's colonial communists. Lewis was above all committed to expertise and rational discourse and opposed to both communist and capitalist dogma.[18]

To be sure, long before Lewis and Raymond Aron, Laski also compared communism to a religion. As the final chapter argued, Harold Laski's teachings exercised a significant effect over his students. Yet his students were for the most part attracted to his contradictions as they themselves searched for a balance between liberal political freedoms and Marxism. As we have seen, Indian students were particularly devoted to Laski, a fact which eventually resulted in the creation of the Harold Laski Institute of Political Science in Ahmedabad, Gujarat in the 1950s. It was founded by P.G. Mavalankar, son of the first Speaker of the *Lok Sabha*, who had hoped to study with Laski but arrived to LSE just after his death. He nevertheless maintained an interest in Laski's work and stayed in close touch with Frida Laski, with whom he stayed while residing in London. Back in India, he wrote to Frida: 'Not a day passes when I have not remembered you and your, illustrious husband: I shall always deem it as one of my life's greatest misfortunes that I could not see, and learn under, Harold Laski. Equally true it is my great luck in life that I came so very close to you'.[19]

The Institute became an enduring symbol of Laski's popularity in India. It was inaugurated on Independence Day in 1954 to create a forum for the discussion of political science and hosted several renowned speakers, including Laski's former colleague Shils, as well as Jawaharlal Nehru.[20] By the early 1960s, it held approximately one hundred meetings, programmes and discussions every year, attended by between forty to fifty

[18] R. Tignor, *W. Arthur Lewis and the Birth of Development Economics,* p. 24.
[19] P.G. Mavalankar to F. Laski, 19 March 1955, correspondences, PGMP, NMML.
[20] '1954-60 Notices of Harold Laski Institute of Political Science, Ahmedabad', no. 61, subject files, personal files, PGMP, NMML.

people on average.[21] Discussions were held in English, Hindi, Guajarati and Marathi, and it published a bi-annual journal. The Laski Institute possessed 10,000 books in a reference and lending library, along with nearly five hundred periodicals and fifty newspapers from India and abroad.[22] It is noteworthy that it was advertised as being non-partisan. Annual lectures about Laski's work were held, often fondly recalling his work.[23] The Institute had several works by Laski, some twelve volumes of which were donated by Frida, and a Laski Memorial Room with books on democratic socialism, yet it also promoted the discussion of *The Road to Serfdom*.[24]

In attempting to draw some concluding thoughts about this study, it may perhaps be useful to return to the beginning. At the outset of this thesis, we explored how overseas study was envisioned as a form of soft power after World War I. Internationalists hoped to reduce nationalist tensions following the bloodiest conflict in history, while many who were concerned with Britain's economic and strategic interests embraced the goals of cultural internationalism. At a basic level, these aspirations proved to be obviously - and tragically - utopian. Perhaps unconsciously, the publisher of Mary Trevelyan's memoir included a picture page split in two. The bottom portrays four concentrated chess players, from France, Russia, Abyssinia and India. Hovering over them in another picture on the top of the page is a student listed by his initials, H.K., who was the House's first Nazi.[25]

---

[21] '1961-64 Papers and Correspondence' no. 82, subject files, personal files, PGMP, NMML.
[22] Ibid.
[23] P G Mavalankar to Frida Laski, April 5 1972, '1961-72 Correspondence', no 83, subject files, personal files, PGMP, NMML.
[24] '1954-60 Notices of Harold Laski Institute of Political Science, Ahmedabad', No. 61, subject files, personal files, PGMP, NMML.
[25] M. Trevelyan, *From the Ends of the Earth*, pp. 30-32.

The conversion of ideas and ideals into practice, as always, often produced failures and unintended consequences. The efforts of internationalists like Trevelyan and Rockefeller did little to prevent another war. Yet their aspiration that overseas study would encourage internationalism was in fact realised in some tangible ways, albeit often more through the efforts of students themselves and other interest groups. The desire of colonial officials to use overseas study to further imperial unity and buttress British rule failed to preserve the empire. Yet by educating colonial and other overseas students from throughout the world, British universities, even ones deemed extremely radical, served to extend the reach of Britain's language and culture around the world, as well as the political thought produced by its leading academics and intellectuals.

Zooming out further still, for over two hundred years, the West, above all Britain and America, has possessed a disproportionate and historically unprecedented amount of global economic, political and cultural power. One of the less appreciated ways this has manifested itself is the migration of elites in pursuit of higher education in Western universities. This thesis has argued that the flow of students has exercised a significant impact on twentieth century history. Colonial students in many cases owed their presence in England to British imperialism. As the students in this study left LSE, they took with them experiences and ideas, some of which were rejected, others embraced and adapted to suit local history and needs. If students like Arthur Lewis represented a bridge between the colonial and post-colonial eras, a new development in the migration of overseas students may be reflective of a further shift in global history.

In the fall of 2016, over one hundred students from the U.S., China and the rest of the world embarked on a one-year Masters program in Beijing, modelled after the Rhodes

Scholarship, that is designed to forge tomorrow's leaders. According to Stephan A. Schwarzman, CEO of the private equity firm Blackstone Group who is funding this ambitious scholarship, twenty years from now matters of global security will be determined by American and Chinese officials who studied together as Schwarzman Scholars. With relations between Washington and Beijing already tense and likely to be a determining factor in most of the twenty first century's most crucial challenges, a future meeting between two Scholars might be of great consequence.[26]

Reflecting a rebalancing of economic power in the opening decades of the twenty-first century, the Schwarzman program signals a potential shift in the flow of students thought to represent a future generation of leaders. Further comment on whether this is part of a trend, and what the potential cultural or political effects of this could be is mere guesswork; however, one thing that can be said with reasonable assurance is that history suggests even closely organised plans to educate leaders overseas can yield very different results than intended. It should be noted that the inaugural class arrives on the heels of a protest at the University of Oxford known as Rhodes Must Fall, a campaign launched by a South African Rhodes Scholar to take down a statue of Cecil Rhodes in protest to its links to colonialism, in some ways bringing the empire full circle.

As a final thought, it is noteworthy to highlight how much LSE itself has changed since the period under study. This thesis ends in the early 1950s for several reasons. Firstly, it has been a primary aim to emphasise the importance of the often-neglected interwar period. The departure of Arthur Lewis in 1948 for Manchester and, above all, the death of Harold Laski in 1950, marked the beginning of the end of a unique era in the

[26] B. Moscovich, 'Can Scholarships Prevent Wars? The Past Suggests Not', *The Guardian*, Higher Education Network, 5 October 2016.

School's history. This coincided, broadly, with the decline of British global influence, most symbolically marked by India's independence in 1947, and the development of the Cold War. While the number of international students and migrants would only increase, Laski's School is barely recognisable in the LSE of the twenty-first century. In a 2015 in *The Guardian*, two LSE students referred to their institution as the 'epitome of the neoliberal university'. The two argued that LSE 'is managed and organised around corporate interests, which promote elitism and perpetuate inequality'.[27] Perhaps, as was the case with commentators like Moynihan, they overstated their case. Certainly, current LSE graduates enter many fields, including social work and international development, while LSE's distinction in the broad trend of privatisation in academia is arguable. Yet the two students echoed what many other students and academics feel. LSE's evolution has much to say about the transformation of universities over the last half century. How they develop from now remains to be seen. Yet one thing can be said with some certainty: while the age of Laski is indeed over, foreign students will continue shaping the transformation of the university, while overseas study will remain critical in planting the seedbeds that will shape the ideas of future leaders.

[27] J. McBrien, 'University Protests Around the World: A Fight Against Commercialisation,' *The Guardian*, 25 March 2015, accessed 25 March 2015 at http://www.theguardian.com/higher-education-network/2015/mar/25/university-protests-around-the-world-a-fight-against-commercialisation?CMP=new_1194&CMP=

Bibliography

Primary Sources

Manuscripts and Archival sources

Canada

Library and Archives of Canada [LAC], Ottawa
Pierre Elliot Trudeau Papers (MG 26 020 vol. 2, MG 26 02 vol. 8)

Provincial Archives of New Brunswick [PANB], Fredericton
Atlantic Studies Conference, speech, PANB MC2749
Milton F. Greggs Fonds, PANB MC498

Archives and Records Management, University of Toronto [UTA]
C.B. Macpherson Personal Records, B1987-0069

India

Nehru Memorial Museum and Library [NMML], New Delhi
G.L. Mehta Papers, sr. no. 524
Jawaharlal Nehru Papers, sr. no. 631
P.G. Mavalankar Papers
Renuka Ray Papers, sr. no. 748
V.K. Krishna Menon Papers, sr. no. 542

Oral History Interviews:

Jyoti Basu, interviewed by Shikha Mukerjee and Usha Prasad, accession #781, NMML, 18 December 2001
Renuka Ray, interviewed by [no name], accession # 68, NMML, 6 September 1968

National Archives of India [NAI], New Delhi
M.R. Masani Papers, sr. no. 74

United Kingdom

India Office Records and Private Papers, Asian and African Collections, British Library [BL]
L1/1 1435-1441
L/PJ/12/42
L/PJ/12/323
L/PJ/12/406
L/PJ/12/451
L/PJ/12/455
L/PJ/12/638

The Centre of South Asian Studies [CSAS], Cambridge
V.K. Krishna Menon Papers, documents relating to the India League

Oral History Interview:

G.L. Mehta, interviewed by Uma Shanker, interview # 168, CSAS, 7 August 1970 and 2 October 1971.

Commonwealth and African Studies [CAS], Bodleian Library, Oxford
Arthur Creech Jones Papers, MSS. Brit. Emp. s. 332
Frederick Lugard Papers, MSS. Brit. Emp. s. 30-99
Fabian Colonial Bureau, MSS. Brit. Emp. s. 365

Hull University Archives
Papers of Harold and Frida Laski, U DLA/24

London School of Economics and Political Science Archives [LSE]

Private papers:

Bronislaw Malinowski Papers
Charles Seligman Papers
Lionel Robbins Papers
Raymond Firth Papers
William Beveridge Papers

Institutional and misc.:

Fabian Society Archives
International African Institute collection
LSE Calendars
Small LSE deposits
Student dossiers

National Archives of the United Kingdom, Kew [NAUK]
Colonial Office (CO)
Department of Education (ED)
Dominion Office (DO)
Foreign Office (FO)

Oxford University Archives
Delegates for Oriental Students, DC 39/1

United States

Rare Book and Manuscript Library, Columbia University Archives, New York
Historical Subject Files, Series III: Alumni and Series XIX: Student Life

Rockefeller Center Archives [RCA], Sleepy Hollow
International Education Board Records
Laura Spellman Rockefeller Memorial Archives

Seeley G. Mudd Manuscript Library [SGML], Princeton
William Arthur Lewis Papers [ALP], MC092

Official Publications

Report on the Work of the Indian Students Department 1920-21 (London: Office for the High Commissioner of India, 1922).
Report on the Work of the Education Department, 1929-30 (London: H.S.M.O for the High Commissioner of India, 1930).
Report on the Work of the Education Department, 1930-31 (London: H.S.M.O for the High Commissioner of India, 1932).
Report on the Work of the Education Department, 1931-32 (London: H.S.M.O for the High Commissioner of India, 1933).
Report on the Work of the Education Department, 1932-33 (London: H.S.M.O for the High Commissioner of India, 1934).
Report on the Work of the Education Department, 1933-34 (London: H.S.M.O for the High Commissioner of India, 1935).
Report on the Work of the Education Department, 1934-35 (London: H.S.M.O for the High Commissioner of India, 1936).
Report on the Work of the Education Department, 1935-36 (London: H.S.M.O for the High Commissioner of India, 1937).
Report on the Work of the Education Department, 1936-37 (London: H.S.M.O for the High Commissioner of India, 1938).
Report on the Work of the Education Department, 1937-38 (London: H.S.M.O for the High Commissioner of India, 1939).
Report on the Work of the Education Department, 1938-39 (London: H.S.M.O for the High Commissioner of India, 1940).
Universities Bureau of the British Empire, *Second Congress Proceedings*, (London, 1921).
Universities Bureau of the British Empire, *Third Congress Proceedings,* (London, 1926).

Memoirs and diaries

Atlee, Clement, *As It Happened* (London: Heinemann, 1954).
Basu, Jyoti, *With the People: A Political Memoir* (New Delhi: UBS Publishing Distributers, 1997).
-----, *Memoirs: A Political Autobiography*, (Calcutta: National Book Agency, 1999).
Clegg, Arthur, *Aid China 1937-1947: A Memoir of a Forgotten Campaign* (Beijing: Foreign Language Press, 2003).
Crossman, Richard, *The Backbench Diaries of Richard Crossman*, vol. 3, (New York: Holmes & Meier Publishers, 1981)
Davies, H.O., *Memoirs* (Ibadan, Nigeria: Evans Brothers, 1989).
Duggan, Stephen P., *A Professor at Large* (New York: Macmillan, 1943).
Hewins, W.A.S., *Apologia of an Imperialist: Forty Years of Empire Policy* (London: Constable, 1929).
Kaul, T.N., *Reminiscences, Discrete and Indiscrete* (New Delhi: Lancers Publishers, 1982).
-----., *My Years through Raj to Swaraj* (New Delhi: Vikas Publishing House, 1995).
Kennedy, Rose, *Times to Remember* (New York: Doubleday, 1974).
Listowel, Judith, *This I have Seen* (London: Faber and Faber, 1943).
Makonnen, T. Ras, *Pan Africanism From Within,* edited by Kenneth King, (New York: Oxford University Press, 1973).
Masani, M.R., *Against the Tide* (New Delhi: Vikas, 1981).
-----, *Bliss was it in that Dawn: A Political Memoir up to Independence* (New Delhi: Arnold Heinemann Publishers, 1977).
Mehta, K.L., *In Different Worlds: From Haveli to Head Hunters of Tuesang* (New Delhi:

Lancers Books, 1985).
Mills, Gladstone, *Grist for the Mills: Reflections on a Life* (Kingston: Ian Randle Publishers, 1994).
Nehru, B.K., *Nice Guys Finish Second* (New Delhi: Viking, 1997).
Nehru, Jawaharlal, *An Autobiography* (London: John Lane the Bodley Head, 1936).
Nkrumah, Kwame, *The Autobiography of Kwame Nkrumah* (New York: T. Nelson & Sons, 1957).
Patel, I.G., *An Encounter with Higher Education: My Years at LSE* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004).
Rao, V.K.R.V. *The Partial Memoirs of V.K.R.V. Rao*, edited by S.L. Rao (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001).
Ray, Renuka, *My Reminiscences: Social Developments During the Gandhian Era and After* (New Delhi: Allied, 1982).
Robbins, Lionel, *Autobiography of an Economist* (London: Macmillan, 1971).
Robeson, Eslanda Goode, *African Journey* (London: Victor Gollancz ltd., 1946).
Roy, M.N., *M.N. Roy's Memoirs* (New York: Allied Publishers, 1964).
Trevelyan, Mary, *From the Ends of the Earth* (London: Faber and Faber Ltd., 1942).
-----, 'African Students at Home', *African Affairs* 54, no. 214 (1955), pp. 27-41.
Trudeau, Pierre Elliot, *Memoirs* (Toronto: McClelland & Stuart, 1993).
Vira, Dharma, *Reminiscences* (New Delhi: Vikas Publishing House, 1990).
Webb, Beatrice, *The Diary of Beatrice Webb Volume Four, 1924-1943: The Wheel of Life*, Norman and Jeanne MacKenzie (eds.), (Cambridge, MA: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1985).
Yew, Lee Kuan, *The Singapore Story: Memoirs of Lee Kuan Yew* (Singapore: Prentice Hall, 1998).
Waugh, Evelyn, *Put Out More Flags* (London: Chapman & Hall, 1948).
Williams, Eric, *Inward Hunger: The Education of a Prime Minister* (London: Deutsch, 1969).

Other printed primary sources

Anand, Mulk Raj, *Conversations in Bloomsbury* (Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1995).
Anstey, Vera, *The Economic Development of India* (London: Longmans, Green and co., 1929).
Bonnerjee, Anila, *A Critical Review of Contemporary Criticism of Burke's Reflections on the Revolution in France* (London School of Economics and Political Science M.Sc. (ECON) thesis, 1938).
Gurmkh, Nihal Singh, *Laski the Teacher and the Political Scientist: With a Postscript on the Dangers to Democracy in India* (Ahmedabad: Harold Laski Institute of Political Science, 1957).
Hall, H.D., *The British Commonwealth of Nations* (London: Methuen & co., 1920)
Hayek, Friedrich A., *The Road to Serfdom* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1944).
Head, Ivan and Pierre Trudeau, *The Canadian Way: Shaping Canada's Foreign Policy, 1968-1984* (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1995).
International Secretariat of the League Against Imperialism and for Independence, *The War Danger Over Abyssinia* (London: The League, 1935).
Kenyatta, Jomo, *Facing Mount Kenya: The Tribal Life of the Gikuyu* (London: Secker and Warburg, 1938)
Knowles, Lilian, *The Economic Development of the British Overseas Empire*, (London: George Routledge, 1924).
-----, *The Economic Development of the British Overseas Empire*, vol. 2 (London: George Routledge, 1930).
Laski, Harold, *Studies in the Problems of Sovereignty* (London: H. Milford, 1917).

-----, *A Grammar of Politics* (London: G. Allen and Unwin Ltd., 1925).
-----, *Socialism and Freedom* (London: The Fabian Society, 1925).
-----, *On the Study of Politics* (London: Oxford University Press, 1926).
-----, *Communism* (London: Thornton Butterworth ltd., 1927).
-----, *Nationalism and the Future of Civilization*, (London: Watts, 1932).
-----, *Democracy in Crisis* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1933).
-----, 'The Decline of Liberalism', (London: Oxford University Press, 1940).
-----, 'Revolution by Consent', *The Nation* 22 March 1941, pp. 349-352.
-----, *The Webbs and Soviet Communism* (London: Fabian Publications Ltd., 1947)
-----, *The Dilemma of Our Times: An Historical Understanding* (London: Allen & Unwin, 1952).
-----, *The Rise of European Liberalism: An Essay in Interpretation* (London: Allen & Unwin, 1936; reprint, London: Allen & Unwin, 1962).
'Lectures, Group Conferences, Study Circles, Visits, Plays and Concerts, 1920-1924', (London: Indian Students' Union & Hostel, 1925).
Lewis, Arthur, *Monopoly in British Industry* (London: Fabian Publications, 1945).
Lugard, Frederick, *The Dual Mandate in British Tropical Africa* (Edinburgh: William Blackwood and Sons, 1922).
Luo, Longji, *On Human Rights* (1929) in Angle, Stephen C. and Marina Svensson (trans.), *The Chinese Human Rights Readers: Documents and Commentary 1900-2000* (New York: M.E. Sharpe, 2001).
Macpherson, C.B., 'Review of "Faith, Reason and Civilisation: An Essay in Historical Understanding", by Harold J. Laski' *The Canadian Journal of Economics and Political Science* 11, no. 2 (May, 1945), pp. 310-11.
-----, 'Review of "The Dilemma of Our Times: An Historical Essay by Harold J. Laski", by Harold J. Laski' *Political Studies* 2 (1954), p. 176.
-----, *The Life and Times of Liberal Democracy* (Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1977).
Malinowski, Bronislaw, *Argonauts of the Western Pacific: An Account of Native Enterprise and Adventure in the Archipelagos of Melanesian New Guinea* (New York: Routledge, 2014).
Masani, M.R., *The Communist Party of India: A Short History* (London: D. Verschoyle, 1954).
-----, *Picture of a Plan* (London: Oxford University Press, 1945).
Mehta, G.L., 'Harold Laski Revisited'*, Harold Laski Institute of Political Science* (Ahmedabad: Harold Laski Institute of Political Science, 1960).
Miliband, Ralph, 'Harold Laski's Socialism', in L. Panitch (ed.), *Socialist Register* (London: Merlin, 1995).
Nehru, B.K., 'Socialism at Crossroads', *India International Centre Quarterly* 17, no. 1 (Spring 1990), pp. 1-12.
Nehru, Jawaharlal, *Peace and India*n (London: India League, 1938).
Tawney, R.H., *Equality*, 4th edn., (London: Allen & Unwin, 1952).

Document collections

Abse, Joan (ed.), *My LSE* (London: Robson, 1977).
Ambedkar, B.R., 'Waiting for a Visa', in Vasant Moon (ed.), *Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar, Writings and Speeches*, vol. 12 (Bombay: Education Department, Government of Maharashtra, 1993).
Gandhi, Mahatma, *The Collected Works of Mahatma Gandhi* [*CWMG*]*,* vol. 63 (New Delhi: The Publications Division, Ministry of Information and Broadcasting, Government of India, 1958).
Holmes, Oliver Wendell and Harold Laski, *Holmes-Laski Letters: The Correspondence of Mr. Justice Holmes and Harold J. Laski, 1916-1935,* edited by Mark de Wolfe Howe, 2 vols.,

(Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1953).
Jennings, Ivor, *Constitution Maker: Selected Writings of Sir Ivor Jennings,* edited by Harshan Kumarasingham, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press for the Royal Historical Society, 2014).
Narayanan, K.R., *President K.R. Narayanan: Selected Speeches*, vol. 1 (Delhi: Publications Director, Ministry of Information and Broadcasting, Government of India, 2003).
Nehru, Jawaharlal, *Jawaharlal Nehru's Speeches 1949-1953,* 2nd edn., (New Delhi: The Publications Division, Ministry of Information and Broadcasting, Government of India, 1957).
-----, *Nehru: The First Sixty Years*, edited by Dorothy Norman, vol. 1, (New York: John Day Co., 1965).
-----, *Selected works of Jawaharlal Nehru* [*SWJN*], edited by S. Gopal, 1st series, 15 vols., (New Delhi: Orient Longman, 1972).
Roy, M.N., *Selected Works of M.N. Roy* [*SWMNR*] vol. II, 1923-1927, edited by Sibnarayan Ray, (New York: Oxford University Press, 1988).

Periodicals

Cité libre
Clare Market Review: The Journal of the London School of Economics Students' Union
Congress Socialist
Indus
Manchester Guardian
Political Studies
The Canadian Journal of Economics and Political Science
The Hindu
The Nation
The Straits Times
University of Toronto Quarterly

Web sources

Columbia University 'Off to Columbia, and on to London', accessed 22 March 2013 at http://www.columbia.edu/itc/mealac/pritchett/00ambedkar/timeline/1910s.html

Columbia University 'How to Organize the Downtrodden', accessed 22 March 2013 at http://www.columbia.edu/itc/mealac/pritchett/00ambedkar/timeline/1920s.html

James, C.L.R., 'Sir Stafford Cripps and "Trusteeship"', *International African Opinion* 1, no. 3, (September, 1938), accessed October 2015 at <https://www.marxists.org/archive/james-clr/works/1938/stafford-cripps.htm>

John Fitzgerald Kennedy Library [JFKL], Boston, Oral History Interview
Frida Laski, interviewed by Joseph E. O'Connor, JFKOH-FKL-01, JFKL, 5 August 1966, accessed 24 March 2011 at http://archive1.jfklibrary.org/JFKOH/Laski,%20Frida%20K/JFKOH-FKL-01/JFKOH-FKL-01-TR.pdf

M. Masani, 'The Economics of Freedom', speech, Bombay (1965), accessed 1 May 2016 at http://indianliberals.in/liberals-detail/?id=1

Narayanan, K.R., 'I Grieve the Death of a Good Friend of India: A Tribute to Pierre

Trudeau', *Rediff India Abroad*, 29 September 2000, accessed 1 November 2009 at http://www.rediff.com/news/2000/sep/29pres.htm

Narayanan, K.R, 'The Tata Scholarship Shaped my Personal and Professional Life', accessed 2 July 2011 at http://www.tata.com/aboutus/articlesinside/The-Tata-scholarship-shaped-my-personal-and-professional-life

Rockefeller Foundation, accessed 20 August 2013 at http://rockefeller100.org/exhibits/show/education/international-education-board.

The Institute of International Education, 'Annual Reports of the Director', (1920-29), accessed 12 June 2012, at https://www.iie.org/Why-IIE/Annual-Report

Printed secondary material

Books and articles

Adel, Daljit Sen, *Krishna Menon and Contemporary Politics* (New Delhi: Institute for Socialist Education, 1997).

Adi, Hakim, 'West African Students in Britain, 1900-1960: The Politics of Exile', *Immigrants and Minorities* 12, no. 3 (1993), pp. 107-128.

-----, *West Africans in Britain, 1900-1960: Nationalism, Pan-Africanism and Communism* (London: Lawrence and Wisheart, 1998).

Adi, Hakim and Marika Sherwood, *Pan-African History: Political Figures from Africa and the Diaspora Since 1787* (New York: Routledge, 2003).

Ahmed, Mesbahuddin, *The British Labour Party and the Indian Independence Movement, 1917-1939* (London: Oriental University Press, 1987).

Alpert, Michael, *A New International History of the Spanish Civil War* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1994).

Altbach, Philip and Jane Knight, 'The Internationalization of Higher Education: Motivations and Realities', *Journal of Studies in International Education* 22 (2007), pp. 290-305.

Anderson, Warwick, 'Introduction: Postcolonial Technoscience', *Social Studies of Science* 32, no. 5/6 (Oct.-Dec., 2002), pp. 643-658.

Appiah, Kwame Anthony, 'Cosmopolitan Patriots', *Critical Inquiry* 23, no. 3 (Spring, 1997), pp. 617-639.

Armitage, David, 'The International Turn in Intellectual History' in Darrin M. McMahon and Samuel Moyn (eds.) *Rethinking Modern European Intellectual History* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2014).

Aron, Raymond, *The Opium of the Intellectuals* (New Brunswick: Transaction, 2006)

Arora, K.C, *Indian Nationalist Movement in Britain, 1930-1949* (New Delhi: Inter-India Publications, 1992).

-----, *V.K. Krishna Menon: A Biography* (New Delhi: Sanchar Publishing House, 1998).

Ashby, Eric, *Universities British, Indian, African: A Study in the Ecology of Higher Education* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1966).

-----, *Community of Universities: An Informal Portrait of the Association of Universities of the British Commonwealth 1913-1963* (London: Association of Commonwealth Universities, 1988).

Aydin, Cemil, *The Politics of Anti-Westernism in Asia: Visions of World Order in Pan-Islamic and Pan-Asian Thought* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2007).

Ballantyne, Tony and Antoinette Burton, *Empires and the Reach of the Global, 1870-1945* (Cambridge: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2014).

Banerji, Arun Kumar, 'The Nehru-Menon Legacy Still Survives', *Round Table* 284 (1981), pp. 346-52.
Barooah, Nirode K., *Chatto: The Life and Times of an Anti-Imperialist in Europe* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004).
Basu, Aparna, *G.L. Mehta: A Many Splendoured Man* (New Delhi: Concept Publishing Company, 2001).
Bauer, Harry and Elisabetta Brighi (eds.), *International Relations at LSE: A History of 75 Years* (London, Millennium Publishing Group, 2003).
Bayly, C.A., *Recovering Liberties: Indian Thought in the Age of Liberalism and Empire* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012).
-----, "The Ends of Liberalism and the Political Thought of Nehru's India." *Modern Intellectual History* 12, 3 (2015): 605-626.
Bayly, C.A. et al., 'AHR Conversation: On Transnational History', *American Historical Review* (December, 2006).
Bell, Duncan, *The Idea of Greater Britain: Empire and the Future of World Order, 1860-1900* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2007).
Beloff, Max, 'The Age of Laski', *Fortnightly* vol. CLXVII, (June, 1950).
Berman, Bruce, 'Ethnography as Politics, Politics as Ethnography: Kenyatta, Malinowski, and the Making of Facing Mount Kenya', *Canadian Journal of African Studies* 47, no. 3 (1996), pp. 313-344.
Berman, Bruce and John M. Lonsdale, 'The Labors of "Muigwithania:" Jomo Kenyatta as Author, 1928-45', *Research in African Literatures* 29, no. 1 (Spring 1998), pp. 16-42.
-----, 'Custom, Modernity, and the Search for Kihooto: Kenyatta, Malinowski and the making of Facing Mount Kenya', in H. Tilley and R. J. Gordon (eds.), *Ordering Africa: Anthropology, European Imperialism and the Politics of Knowledge* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2007).
Beveridge, Janet, *An Epic at Clare Market: Birth and Early Days of the London School of Economics* (London: G. Bell & Sons, 1960).
Beveridge, William, *The London School of Economics and its Problems 1919-1937* (London: George Allen & Unwin, 1960).
Bhabha, Homi, *The Location of Culture* (London: Routledge, 1994).
Boehmer, Elleke, *Empire, the National and the Postcolonial, 1890-1920: Resistance in Interaction* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002).
Bose, Sugata and Kris Manjapra (eds.), *Cosmopolitan Thought Zones: South Asia and the Global Circulation of Ideas* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010).
Braithwaite, Lloyd, *Colonial West Indian Students in Britain* (London: University Press of the West Indies, 2001).
Brecher, Michael, *India and World Politics: Krishna Menon's View of the World* (London: Oxford University Press, 1968).
Brown, Judith, 'Gandhi – a Victorian Gentleman: An Essay in Imperial Encounter', *Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History* 27, no. 2 (1999), pp. 68-85.
-----, *Nehru: A Political Life*. (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2003).
-----, *Windows into the Past: Life Histories and the Historian of South Asia* (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 2009).
Brown, Judith and Wm. Roger Lewis (eds.), *The Oxford History of the British Empire: The Twentieth Century* vol. 4, (New York: Oxford University Press, 1999).
Brydan, David, 'Axis Internationalism: Spanish Health Experts and the Nazi "New Europe", 1939-1945', *Contemporary European History* 25, 2 (2016), pp. 192-211.
Bu, Liping, *Making the World Like Us: Education, Cultural Expansion and the American Century* (Westport, Conn.: Praeger, 2003).
Buchanan, Tom, *East Wind: China and the British Left, 1925-1976* (Oxford: Oxford University

Press, 2012).
Buckner, Phillip A. and R. Douglass Francis (eds.), *Canada and the British World: Culture, Migration and Identity* (Vancouver: UBC Press, 2006).
Burbank, Jane and Frederick Cooper, *Empires in World History: Power and the Politics of Difference* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2010).
Burke, Peter, *A Social History of Knowledge II: From the Encyclopédie to Wikipidea* (Cambridge: Polity, 2012).
Burton, Antoinette, *At the Heart of Empire: Indians and the Colonial Encounter in Late-Victorian Britain* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998).
Bush, Barbara, *Imperialism, Race and Resistance: Africa and Britain, 1919-1945* (London: Routledge, 1999).
Butler, Nicholas Murray, *The International Mind: An Argument for the Judicial Settlement of International Disputes* (New York: C. Scribner's Sons, 1913).
Carey, A.T., *Colonial Students: A Study of the Social Adaptation of Colonial Students in London* (London: Secker and Warburg, 1956).
Chacko, Priya, 'The Internationalist Nationalist: Pursuing an Ethical Modernity with Jawaharlal Nehru', in Robbie Shilliam (ed.), *International Relations and Non-Western Thought: Imperialism, Colonialism and Investigations of Global Modernity* (Abingdon: Routledge, 2011).
Chakravarty, Suhash, *V.K. Krishna Menon and the India League, 1925-1947*, 2 vols., (New Delhi: Har-Anand Publications, 1997).
Champion, C.P., *The Strange Demise of British Canada: The Liberals and Canadian Nationalism, 1964-1968* (Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queens University Press, 2010).
Chaudhuri, Asim Kumar *Socialist Movement in India: The Congress Socialist Party, 1934-1947* (Calcutta: Progressive Publishers, 1980).
Coase, R.H., *Essays on Economics and Economists* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1994).
Conrad, Sebastian, *What is Global History?* (Princeton, Princeton University Press, 2016).
Cooper, Frederick, *Africa since 1940: The Past of the Present* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002).
-----, *Colonialism in Question: Theory, Knowledge, History* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2005).
Cooper, Frederick and Randall Packard (eds.), *International Development and the Social Sciences: Essays on the History and Politics of Knowledge* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1997).
Cowen, Michael and Robert Shenton, 'The Origin of Fabian Colonialism in Africa', *Journal of Historical Sociology* 4, no. 2 (July, 1991), pp. 143-174.
Clarkson, Stephan and Christina McCall, *Trudeau and Our Times*, 2 vols., (Toronto: McClelland & Stewart, 1990).
Clarke, Peter, *Liberals and Social Democrats* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1978).
Dahrendorf, Ralf, *LSE: A History of the London School of Economics and Political Science, 1895-1995* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1995).
Darwin, John, 'A World University', in Brian Harrison (ed.), *The History of the University of Oxford: The Twentieth Century*, vol. viii, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994).
-----. *The Empire Project: The Rise and Fall of the British World System, 1830-1970* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009).
-----, *Unfinished Empire: The Global Expansion of Britain* (London: Allen Lane, 2012).
Dasgupta, Surajit Kumar, *West Bengal's Jyoti Basu: A Political Profile* (New Delhi: Gian Publishing House, 1992).
Deane, Herbert A., *The Political Ideas of Harold J. Laski* (New York: Columbia University

Press, 1955).
Deslandes, Paul R., '"The Foreign Element": Newcomers and the Rhetoric of Race, Nation, and Empire in "Oxbridge" Undergraduate Culture, 1850-1920', *Journal of British Studies* 37, no. 1 (Jan., 1998), pp. 54-90.
Dewey, Clive, *Anglo-Indian Attitudes: The Mind of the Indian Civil Service* (London: Hambledon Press, 1993).
-----, 'The Education of a Ruling Caste: The Indian Civil Service in the Era of the Competitive Examination', *English Historical Review* 88, no. 347 (April, 1973), pp. 262-285.
Devenish, Annie, 'Performing the Political Self: A Study of Identity Making and Self Representation in the Autobiographies of India's First Generation of Parliamentary Women', *Women's History Review* 22, no. 2 (2013), pp. 280-294.
Dimier, Véronique, 'Three Universities and the British Elite: A Science of Colonial Administration in the UK', *Public Administration* 84, no. 2 (2006), pp. 337-366.
Dubinsky, K, S. Mills and S. Rutherford (eds.), *Canada and the Third World: Overlapping Histories* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2016).
Duffield, Ian, 'Black People in Britain: History and the Historians', *History Today* 31, no. 9 (September, 1981), pp. 34-6.
Dutt, R.P., *India to-day* (London: Victor Gollancz, 1940).
Dwivedi, H.S. and Ratan Sinha, 'Dr. Ambedkar: The Pioneer of Social Democracy' *The Indian Journal of Political Science* 66, no. 3 (July-Sept., 2005), pp. 661-666.
Eastwood, G.G., *Harold Laski* (London: Mowbrays, 1977).
Eckert, Andreas, 'Bringing the "Black Atlantic" into Global History: The Project of Pan-Africanism' in S. Conrad and D. Sachsenmaier (eds.), *Competing Visions of World Order: Global Moments and movements, 1880s-1930s* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007), pp. 237-266.
Edwards, Brent Hayes, 'The Shadow of Shadows', *Positions* 11, no. 1 (Spring, 2003), pp. 11-49.
Eells, Walter Crosby, 'How Coloured Communist Leaders are Made in Britain', *The Journal of Higher Education*, 26 no. 4 (April 1955), pp. 187-194, 230.
Ekbladh, David, *The Great American Mission: Modernization and the Construction of an American World Order* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2010).
Ekirch, Jr., Arthur A, 'Harold J. Laski: The Liberal *Manqué* or the Lost Libertarian?', *The Journal of Libertarian Studies* 4, no. 2 (Spring, 1980), pp. 139-150.
English, John, *Citizen of the World: The Life of Pierre Elliot Trudeau* vol. 1 (Toronto: A.A. Knopf Canada, 2006).
Faucher, Charlotte, 'Cultural Diplomacy and International Cultural Relations in Twentieth Century Europe', *Contemporary European History* 25, 2 (2016), pp. 373-385.
Fedorowich, Kent and Andrew Thompson, *Empire Migration and Identity in the British World* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2013).
Fernandez, J.F., *Mao's Prey: The History of Chen Renbing, Liberal Intellectual* (London: Garland, 2000).
Filatova, Irina, 'Education of Africans at the Communist University of the Toilers of the East in the Soviet Union, 1923-1937', *Paedagogica Historica* 35, no. 1 (1999), pp. 41-66.
Fischer, Louis, *The Great Challenge* (Port Washington, N.Y.: Kennikat Press, 1971 [c.1947]).
Fischer, Louise, (ed.), *Moshe Sharett: The Second Prime Minister, Selected Documents 1894-1965*, (Israel State Archives: Jerusalem, 2009).
Fisher, Michael H., *A South-Asian History of Britain: Four Centuries of Peoples from the Indian Sub-Continent* (Oxford: Greenwood World Publishing, 2007).
-----., 'Migration to Britain from South Asia, 1600s-1850s', *History Compass* 3 (2005), pp. 1-9.
Framke, Maria, 'Political Humanitarianism in the 1930s: Indian Aid for Republican Spain', *European Review of History* 23, no. 1-2 (2016), pp. 63-81.
Fraser, Peter D., 'Observing the Empire: Gandhi, Malabari, Tagore and Edun, 1888-1928', *Indo-*

British Review: A Journal of History, xvi, no. 2, (June, 1989), pp. 7-15.
Frederiksen, Bodil Folke, 'Jomo Kenyatta, Marie Bonaparte and Bronislaw Malinowski on Clitoridectomy and Female Sexuality', *History Journal Workshop* 65, no. 1 (2008), pp. 23-48.
Freeden, Michael, *Liberalism Divided: A Study of British Political Thought, 1914-1939* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1986).
Fryer, Peter, *Staying Power: The History of Black People in Britain* (London: Pluto Press, 1984).
Fung, Edmund S.K., *In Search of Chinese Democracy: Civil Opposition in Nationalist China, 1929-1949* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000).
-----., *The Intellectual Foundations of Chinese Modernity: Cultural and Political Thought in the Republican Era* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2010).
Gandhi, Gopalkrishna, 'A Remarkable Life Story', *Frontline* 22, no 24, (2 Dec., 2005).
Gellner, Ernest and Roy Ellen and Gräzyna Kubica and Janusz Mucha (eds.), *Malinowski Between Two Worlds: The Polish Roots of an Anthropological Tradition* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988).
George, T.J.S., *Krishna Menon: A Biography* (London: Cape, 1964).
Gikandi, Simon, 'Pan-Africanism and Cosmopolitanism: The Case of Jomo Kenyatta', *English Studies in Africa* 43, no. 1, pp. 3-27.
Gilbert, Martin, *Letters to Auntie Fori: 5000 Years of Jewish History* (London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 2002).
Goodman, J. 'International Citizenship and the International Federation of University Women before 1939', *History of Education* 40, no. 6 (2011), pp. 701-721.
Gorman, Daniel, 'Britain, India, and the United Nations: Colonialism and the Development of International Government, 1945-1960', *Journal of Global History* 9, no. 3 (November, 2014), pp. 471-90.
-----, *The Emergence of International Society in the 1920s* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012).
Greenleaf, W.H., 'Laski and British Socialism', *History of Political Thought* 2 (1981), pp. 573-91.
Gupta, Asha, 'Fabianism and Indian Socialism', in M.M. Sankhdher and S. Mukherjee (eds.), *Essays on Fabian Socialism* (New Delhi: Deep & Deep Publications, 1991), pp. 50-65.
Guha, Ramachandra, *India After Gandhi: The History of the World's Largest Democracy* (New York: Ecco, 2007).
Guha, Ramachandra, (ed.), *Makers of Modern India* (New Delhi: Penguin India, 2010).
Gupta, P.S., 'British Labour and the Indian Left, 1919–1939', in B.R. Nanda (ed.), *Socialism in India* (New Delhi: Vikas Publications, 1972).
-----., *Imperialism and the British Labour Movement 1914-1964* (London: Macmillan, 1975).
-----., *Power, Politics and the People: Studies in British Imperialism and Indian Nationalism* (New Delhi: Permanent Black, 2002).
Hargreaves, John D., 'The Idea of a Colonial University', *African Affairs* Vol. 72, No. 286 (Jan., 1973), pp. 26-36.
-----., 'The Comintern and Anti-Colonialism: New Research Opportunities', *African Affairs* 92 (1993), pp. 255-261.
-----., *Academe and Empire: Some Overseas Connections of Aberdeen University, 1860-1970* (Aberdeen: Aberdeen University Press, 1994).
Harper, Marjory, '"Personal Contact is Worth a Ton of Text-Books": Educational Tours of the Empire, 1926-39', *The Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History*, 32, no. 3, pp. 48-76.
Hayek, Friedrich A., 'The London School of Economics 1895-1945', *Economica* (February 1946), pp. 1-31.
Hayward, Jack and Barry Brian and Archie Brown, *The British Study of Politics in the Twentieth*

Century (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003).
Hobsbawm, Eric, *Interesting Times: A Twentieth Century Life* (London: Allen Lane, 2002).
Hodge, Joseph Morgan, *Triumph of the Expert: Agrarian Doctrines of Development and the Legacies of British Colonialism* (Athens, Ohio: Ohio University Press, 2007).
Hodge, Joseph Morgan, 'British Colonial Expertise, Post-Colonial Careering and the Early History of International Development', *Journal of Modern European History* vol. 8 (2010): pp 24-45.
Holms, Colin, *John Bull's Island: Immigration and British Society 1871-1971* (London: Macmillan, 1988).
Holton, R.J., 'Cosmopolitanism or Cosmopolitanisms? The Universal Races Congress of 1911', *Global Networks* 2, no. 2 (2002), pp. 153-170
Howe, Stephen, *Anti-Colonialism in British Politics: The Left and the End of Empire, 1918-1964* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993).
Howson, Susan, *Lionel Robbins* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2011).
Ingham, Barbara and Paul Mosely, *Sir Arthur Lewis: A Biography* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013).
-----, '"Marvellous Intellectual Feasts": Arthur Lewis at the London School of Economics, 1933-48', *History of Political Economy* 45, no. 2 (Summer, 2013), pp. 187-221.
Iriye, Akira, *Cultural Internationalism and World Order* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1997).
-----, *Global Community: The Role of International Organizations in the Making of the Contemporary World* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002).
-----, *Global and Transnational History: The Past, Present and Future* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013).
Jackson, Ben, *Equality and the British Left: A Study in Progressive Political Thought, 1900-1964* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2007).
Jayawardena, Kumari, *The White Woman's Other Burden: Western Women and South Asia During British Colonial Rule* (London: Routledge, 1995).
Jena, Krisna C. and Krusna C. Jena, 'Harold Laski and his Concept of Liberty', *The Indian Journal of Political Science* 21, no. 1 (Jan.-March, 1960), pp. 62-9.
Jones, Geoffrey, *British Multinational Banking, 1830-1990* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993).
Kapur, Devesh, 'Ideas and Economic Reforms in India: The Role of International Migration and the Indian Diaspora', *India Review* 3, no. 4. (2004), pp. 364-384.
Keck, Margaret E. and Kathryn Sikkink, *Activists Beyond Borders: Advocacy Networks in International Politics* (Ithica, NY.: Cornell University Press, 1998).
Keith, J.L., 'African Students in Great Britain', *African Affairs*, 45, no. 179 (1946), pp. 65-72.
Khilnani, Sunil, *The Idea of India* (London: Penguin, 2004).
Killingray, David, '"To Do Something for the Race": Harold Moody and the League of Coloured People', in Bill Schwarz (ed.), *West Indian Intellectuals in Britain* (New York: Manchester University Press, 2013).
Killingray, David (ed.), *Africans in Britain* (London: Frank Cass, 1994).
Kiran, R.N. and Kuttan Mahadevan (eds.), *V.K. Krishna Menon: Man of the Century* (New Delhi: B.R. Publishing Corporation, 2000).
Kirk-Greene, Anthony, 'Doubly Elite: African Rhodes Scholars, 1960-90', *Immigrants & Minorities* 12, no. 3 (1993), pp. 220-235.
-----, *On Crown Service: A History of HM Colonial and Overseas Civil Services, 1837-1997* (London: I.B. Tauris, 1999).
Kramer, Paul, 'Is the World Our Campus? International Students and U.S. Global Power in the Long Twentieth Century', *Diplomatic History* 33 (2009): pp. 775-805.
Kramnick, Isaac and Barry Sheerman, *Harold Laski: A Life on the Left* (London: H. Hamilton, 1993).

Krishna Iyer, V.R., *Nehru and Krishna Menon* (New Delhi: Konark Publishers, 1993).
Kumarasingham, Harahsn, *A Political Legacy of the British Empire: Power and the Parliamentary System in Post-Colonial India and Sri Lanka* (London: Tauris, 2013).
Kumarasingham, Harshan (ed.), *Constitution Making in Asia: Decolonisation and State-Building in the Aftermath of the British Empire* (London: Routledge, 2016).
Kutty, V.K. Madhavan, *V.K. Krishna Menon*. (New Delhi: Publications Division, Ministry of Information and Broadcasting, Govt. of India, 1988).
Lahiri, Shompa, *Indians in Britain: Anglo-Indian Encounters, Race and Identity, 1880-1930* (London: Frank Cass, 2000).
Lamb, Peter, *Harold Laski: Problems of Democracy, the Sovereign State and International Society* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004).
-----, 'Harold Laski (1893-1950): Political Theorist of a World in Crisis', *Review of International Studies* 25, no. 2 (April 1999), pp. 329-42.
Lamb, Peter and David Morrice, 'Ideological Reconciliation in the Thought of Harold Laski and C.B. Macpherson', *Canadian Journal of Political Science*, 35, no. 4 (December 2002), pp. 795-810.
D. Laqua, 'Transnational Intellectual Cooperation, the League of Nations, and the Problem of Order', *Journal of Global History* 6, no. 2 (July 2011), pp. 223-247.
Lee, Christopher, *Making a World After Empire* (Athens: University of Ohio Press, 2010).
Leiss, William, *C.B. Macpherson: Dilemmas of Liberalism and Socialism* 2nd edn., (Montreal & Kingston: McGill-Queens University Press, 2009).
Liping Bu, 'Education and Cultural Understanding: The American Elite Approach, 1920-1937', in Richard Garlitz and Lisa Jarvinen (eds.), *Teaching America to the World & the World to America: Education and Foreign Relations Since 1870* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012).
MaGee, Gary B and Andrew S. Thompson, *Empire and Globalization: Networks of People and Capital in the British World System c.1850-1914* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010
Makalani, Minkah, *In the Cause of Freedom: Radical Black Internationalism from Harlem to London 1919-1939* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2011).
Manela, Erez, *The Wilsonian Moment: Self-Determination and the International Origins of Anticolonial Nationalism* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2009).
Mangan, J.A., *Education AND Imperialism: Four Case Studies* (Hull: Hull University Press, 1989).
Manjapra, Kris, *M.N. Roy: Marxism and Colonial Cosmopolitanism* (Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge, 2010).
Martin, Kingsley, *Harold Laski, 1893-1950: A Biographical Memoir* (London: Cape, 1969).
Matera, Marc, 'Colonial Subjects: Black Intellectuals and the Development of Colonial Studies in Britain', *The Journal of British Studies* 49, no. 2 (April, 2010), pp. 388-418.
Mazower, Mark, *No Enchanted Palace: The End of Empire and the Ideological Origins of the United Nations* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2009).
-----, *Governing The World: The History of an Idea* (New York: The Penguin Press, 2012).
McClellan, Woodford, 'Africans and Black Americans in the Comintern Schools, 1925-1934', *The International Journal of African Historical Studies* 26, no. 2 (1993), pp. 371-390.
McGarr, P. '"A Serious Menace to Security": British Intelligence, V. K. Krishna Menon and the Indian High Commission in London, 1947-52', *Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History* 38, No. 3 (2010), pp. 441-469.
-----, '"India's Rasputin"? V.K. Krishna Menon and Anglo-American Misperceptions of Indian Foreign Policymaking, 1947-1964', *Diplomacy and Statecraft* 22, no. 2 (2011), pp. 239-60.
McKeown, Adam, 'Global Migration, 1846-1940', *Journal of World History* 15, no. 2 (June,

2004), pp. 155-189.
Mellor, Bernard, *Lugard in Hong Kong: Empires, Education and a Governor at Work, 1907-1912* (Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press, 1992).
Miller, J.D.B., 'The Commonwealth and World Order: The Zimmern Vision and After', *The Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History* 8, no. 1, pp. 159-174.
Mills, Allen, *Citizen Trudeau: An Intellectual Biography, 1944-1965* (Don Mills: Oxford University Press, 2016)
Mills, David, 'British Anthropology at the End of Empire: The Rise and Fall of the Colonial Social Science Research Council, 1944-62', *Revue d'Histoire des Sciences Humaines* 1, no. 6 (2002), pp. 161-88.
Mills, Sean. *The Empire Within: Postcolonial Thought and Political Activism in Sixties Montreal.* (Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queens University Press, 2010).
Mine, Yoichi, 'The Political Element in the Works of W. Arthur Lewis: The 1954 Lewis Model and African Development', *The Developing Economies* XLIV-3 (September, 2006), pp. 329-55.
Mishra, K.K., 'Fabianism and Harold Laski', in M.M. Sankhdher and S. Mukherjee (eds.), *Essays on Fabian Socialism* (New Delhi: Deep & Deep Publications, 1991), pp. 80-91.
Mishra, Pankaj, *From the Ruins of Empire: The Revolt Against the West and the Remaking of Asia* (New York: Allen Lane, 2012).
Misra, Maria, *Vishnu's Crowded Temple: India since the Great Rebellion* (New York: Allen Lane, 2007).
Mitter, Rana, *A Bitter Revolution: China's Struggle with the Modern World* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005).
Molony, T., *Nyerere: The Early Years* (Woodbridge, Suffolk: James Currey, 2014)
Morefield, Jeanne, 'Harold Laski on the Habits of Imperialism', in Duncan Kelly (ed.), *Lineages of Empire: The Historical Roots of British Imperial Thought* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009).
Moscovitch, Brant, 'Harold Laski's Indian Students and the Power of Education, 1920-1950', *Contemporary South Asia* 20, no. 1 (March, 2012), pp. 33-44.
-----, 'Can Scholarships Prevent Wars? The Past Suggests Not', *The Guardian*, Higher Education Network, 5 October 2016.
Moyn, Samuel, *The Last Utopia: Human Rights in History* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 2010).
Moyn, Samuel and Andrew Sartori (eds.), *Global Intellectual History* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2013).
Moynihan, Daniel P., 'The United States in Opposition', *Commentary* 59, no. 3 (August, 1975), pp. 31-44.
Muirhead, Bruce, *Against All Odds: The Public Life and Times of Louis Rasminsky* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1999).
Mukherjee, Sumita, *Nationalism, Education and Migrant Identities: The England-Returned* (London: Routledge, 2010).
Mukherjee, Sumita and Rehana Ahmed (eds.), *South Asian Resistances in Britain 1858-1947* (London: Continuum, 2012).
Nemni, Max and Monique Nemni, *Young Trudeau 1914-1944: Son of Quebec, Father of Canada* (trans.) William Johnson (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 2006).
-----, *Trudeau Transformed: The Shaping of a Statesman* (trans.) George Tombs (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 2011)
Newman, Michael, *Harold Laski: A Political Biography* (London: Merlin Press, 2009).
-----, 'Class, State and Democracy: Laski, Miliband and the Search for a Synthesis', *Political Studies* Vol. 54 (2006), pp. 328-48.
-----, 'Harold Laski Today', *Political Quarterly* 67, no. 3 (July-September 1996), pp. 229-38.

Noboru, Koyama, *Japanese Students at Cambridge University in the Meiji Era, 1868-1912: Pioneers for the Modernization of Japan* (trans.) Ian Ruxton (Morrisville: Lulu, 2004).
Olusanya, O., *The West African Students' Union and the Politics of Decolonisation 1925-58* (Ibadan: Daystar, 1982).
Osborne, Ken, 'Creating the "International Mind": The League of Nations Attempts to Reform History Teaching, 1920-1939' *History of Education Quarterly* 52, no. 2 (May, 2016), pp. 213-240.
Owen, Nicholas, *The British Left and India: Metropolitan Anti-Imperialism, 1885-1947* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007).
Panoff, Michel, *Bronislaw Malinowski* (Paris: Payot, 1972).
Parmar, Inderjeet, *Foundations of the American Century: The Ford, Carnegie, and Rockefeller Foundations in the Rise of American Power* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2012).
Pedersen, Susan, *The Guardians: The League of Nations and the Crisis of Empire* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015).
Pennybacker, Susan D., 'The Universal Races Congress, London Political Culture, and Imperial Dissent, 1900-1939', *Radical History Review* 92 (Spring, 2005), pp. 103-17.
Perraton, H.D., *A History of Foreign Students in Britain* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2014).
Petersson, Fredrik, 'Hub of the Anti-Imperialist Movement: The League against Imperialism and Berlin, 1927-1933', *Interventions: International Journal of Postcolonial Studies* 16, no. 1 (2014), pp. 49-71.
Pietsch, Tamson, 'Wandering Scholars? Academic Mobility and the British World, 1850-1940', *Journal of Historical Geography* 36, no. 4 (2010), pp. 377-387.
-----, 'Many Rhodes: Travelling Scholarships and Imperial Citizenship in the British Academic World, 1880-1940', *Journal of the History of Education* 40, no. 6 (2011), pp. 723-739.
-----, *Empire of Scholars: Universities, Networks and the British Academic World, 1850-1939* (New York: Manchester University Press, 2013).
Political and Economic Planning [*PEP*], *Colonial Students in Britain: A Report by PEP* (London: Political and Economic Planning, 1955).
Porter, Andrew, 'Empires in the Mind', in P.J. Marshall (ed.), *The Cambridge Illustrated History of the British Empire*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), pp.185-223.
Prashad, Vijay, *The Darker Nations: A People's History of the Third World* (New York: The New Press, 2007).
Raju, S.V., *Minoo Masani* (Bombay: Freedom First, 1995).
Ram, Janaki, *V.K. Krishna Menon: A Personal Memoir* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1997).
Ransby, Barbara, *Eslanda: The Large and Unconventional Life of Mrs. Paul Robeson* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2013).
Riedi, Eliza, 'Women, Gender, and the Promotion of Empire: The Victoria League, 1901-1914', *The Historical Journal* 45, no. 3 (Sept., 2002), pp. 569-99.
Rosenberg, Emily (ed.), *A World Connecting, 1870-1945* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2012).
Ross, Dorothy, 'Changing Contours of the Social Science Disciplines', in Theodore M. Porter and Dorothy Ross (eds.), *The Cambridge History of Social Science: The Modern Social Sciences* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), pp. 205-37.
Sabhlok, S., *Breaking Free of Nehru: Let's Unleash India!* (New Delhi: Anthem Press, 2008).
Sacks, Janet (ed.), *The World in London Square: A Portrait of Goodenough College* (London: Third Millennium, 2011).

Sarkar, Susobhan Chandra, *Essays in Honour of Prof. S.C. Sarkar* (New Delhi: People's Publishing House, 1976).
Schneer, Jonathan, *London 1900: The Imperial Metropolis* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1999).
Schwarz, Bill (ed.), *West Indian Intellectuals in Britain* (New York: Manchester University Press, 2003).
Scobie, Edward, *A History of Blacks in Britain* (Chicago: Johnson Publishing Company, 1972).
Scot, Marie, *La London School of Economics and Political Science 1895-2010: Internationalisation universitaire et circulation des saviors* (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 2011).
Sen, Satadru, 'The Politics of Deracination: Empire, Education and Elite Children in Colonial India', *Studies in History* 19, no. 1 (2003), pp. 19-39.
Shapiro, K.A., 'Doctors or Medical Aids – The Debate over Training of Black Medical Personnel for the Rural Black Population in South Africa in the 1920s and 1930s', *Journal of Southern African Studies* 13, no. 2 (January 1987), pp. 234-255.
Sharma, Sita Ram. *K.R. Narayanan: Just the President of India* (Jaipur: Sublime Publications, 1998).
Sheffer, Gabriel, *Moshe Sharett: Biography of a Political Moderate* (Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1996).
Shepperson, George, 'Pan-Africanism and "Pan-Africanism": Some Historical Notes', *Phylon* 23, no. 4 (1962), pp. 346-358.
Sherwood, Marika, *Kwame Nkrumah: The Years Abroad 1935-47* (Legon, Ghana: Freedom Publications, 1996).
-----, 'The Comintern, the CBGB, the Colonies and Black Britons, 1920-1938', *Science & Society*, 60, no. 2 (Summer, 1996), pp. 137-163.
Shils, Edward, 'The Intellectuals in the Political Development of the New States', *World Politics* 12, no. 3 (April, 1960), pp. 329-68.
Shils, E. and J. Epstein (eds.), *Portraits: A Gallery of Intellectuals* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1997).
Shyllon, F., *Black People in Britain, 1555-1833* (London, Oxford University Press, 1977)
Singh, A.K., *Indian Students in Britain: A Survey of Their Adjustment and Attitudes* (London: Asia Publishing House, 1963).
Sluga, Glenda, *Internationalism in the Age of Nationalism* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2013).
Sluga, Glenda and Timothy Rowse, 'Forum: Global Liberalisms', *Modern Intellectual History* 12, 3 (2015): 523-28.
Sluga, Glenda and Patricia Clavin (eds.), *Internationalisms: A Twentieth Century History* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2016).
Spar, Frederic J., 'Human Rights and Political Engagement: Luo Longji in the 1930s', in Roger B. Jeans (ed.) *Roads Not Taken: The Struggle of Opposition Parties in Twentieth Century China* (Boulder, CO.: Westview Press, 1992).
Spence, Johnathan, *The Gate of Heavenly Peace*, (New York: The Viking Press, 1981).
Starfield, Jane, 'A Dance with Empire: Modiri Molema's Glasgow Years, 1914-1921', *Journal of Southern African Studies* 27, no. 3 (September 2001), pp. 479-503.
Stevens, Geoffrey, *The Player: The Life and Times of Dalton Camp* (Toronto: Key Porter Books, 2003).
Stocking, George, *After Tylor: British Social Anthropology 1888-1951* (Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1995).
Stocking, George, 'Maclay, Kubary, Malinowski: Archetypes from the Dreamtime of Anthropology', in G. Stocking (ed.), *Colonial Situations: Essays on the Contextualization of Ethnographic Knowledge* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1991).

Stockwell, A.J., 'Leaders, Dissidents and the Disappointed: Colonial Students in Britain as Empire Ended', *The Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History* 36 no. 3 (2008), pp. 487-507.
Stone, Lawrence, 'Prosopography', *Daedalus* 100, no. 1, Historical Studies Today (Winter, 1971), pp. 46-79.
Svensson, Marina, *Debating Human Rights in China: A Conceptual and Political History* (Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, INC., 2002).
Symonds, Richard, *Oxford and Empire: The Last Lost Cause?* (London: Claredon Press, 1986).
-----., 'Oxford and Empire' in M.G. Brock and M.C. Curthoys (eds.), *The History of the University of Oxford: Nineteenth Century Oxford, Part 2* vol. vii. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2000).
Tan, Siok Sun, *Goh Keng Swee: A Portrait* (Singapore: Editions Didier Millet, 2007).
Tignor, Robert, *W. Arthur Lewis and the Birth of Development Economics* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2005).
Tilley, Helen, *Africa as a Living Laboratory: Empire, Development, and the Problem of Scientific Knowledge, 1870-1950* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2011).
Tilley, Helen and Robert J. Gordon (eds.), *Ordering Africa: Anthropology, European Imperialism and the Politics of Knowledge* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2007).
Torrence, D.E., 'Instructor to Empire: Canada and the Rhodes Scholarship, 1902-39', in P. Buckner and R.D. Francis (eds.), *Canada and the British World: Culture, Migration and Identity* (Vancouver: UBC Press, 2006).
Townshend, Jules, *C.B. Macpherson and the Problem of Liberal Democracy* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2000).
Westad, Odd Arne, *The Global Cold War: Third World Interventions and the Making of Our Time* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2005).
Wilder, Gary, *The French Imperial Nation-State: Negritude & Colonial Humanism Between the Two World Wars* (London: University of Chicago Press, 2005).
Winter, J.M., 'The Webbs and the Non-White World: A Case of Socialist Racialism', *Journal of Contemporary History* 9, no. 181 (January, 1974), pp. 181-192.
Wong, Y.T., 'The Fate of Liberalism in Revolutionary China: Chu Anping and His Circle, 1946-1960', *Modern China*, Vol. 19, No. 4 (Oct., 1993).
Visram, Rozina, *Asians in Britain: 400 Years of History* (London: Pluto Press, 2002).
Ye, Weili, *Seeking Modernity in China's Name: Chinese Students in the United States* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2001).
Young, Michael, *Malinowski: Odyssey of an Anthropologist, 1884-1920* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2004).
Zachariah, Benjamin. *Developing India: An Intellectual and Social History, 1930-1950* (Oxford University Press, 2005).
Zachernuk, Philip Serge, *Colonial Subjects: African Intelligentsia and Atlantic Ideas* (Charlottesville, VA.: University of Virginia Press, 2000).
Ziegler, Philip. *Legacy: Cecil Rhodes, the Rhodes Trust and Rhodes Scholarship* (Yale: Yale University Press, 2008).

Unpublished theses

James, Leslie E., *'What We Put in Black and White': George Padmore and the Practice of Anti-Imperial Politics* (London School of Economics and Political Science Ph.D. thesis, 2012).
Jolly, Emma, *Cultural Imperialism as Home? Mary Trevelyan and Student Movement House, 1932-1946* (Sheffield Hallam University MA thesis, 2014).

Matera, Marc, *Black Internationalism and African and Caribbean Intellectuals in London, 1919-1950* (Rutgers University Ph.D. thesis, 2009).
Mukherjee, Sumita, *The Experience of the England-Returned: The Education of Indians in Britain in the Early Twentieth Century and its Long-Term Impact* (University of Oxford D.Phil thesis, 2007).
Xu, Xi, *British Left Wing Writers and China: Harold Laski, W.H. Auden and Joseph Needham* (University of Hong Kong Ph.D. thesis, 2013).

Websites

Bartholomew, James, 'British economics graduates have left a trail of misery around the world', *The Spectator*, 25 July 2015, accessed 26 July 2015 at http://www.spectator.co.uk/2015/07/how-british-universities-spread-misery-around-the-world/

Guha, Ramachandra, 'The LSE and India', *The Hindu*, 23 November 2003, accessed 7 February 2011 at http://www.thehindu.com/thehindu/mag/2003/11/23/stories/2003112300120300.htm

LSE blog on Arthur Lewis, accessed 18 Feb., 2015 at http://blogs.lse.ac.uk/lsehistory/2015/01/23/arthur-lewis-at-lse-one-of-our-best-teachers/

McBrien, Julie, 'University Protests Around the World: A Fight Against Commercialisation,' *The Guardian*, 25 March 2015, accessed 25 March 2015 at http://www.theguardian.com/higher-education-network/2015/mar/25/university-protests-around-the-world-a-fight-against-commercialisation?CMP=new_1194&CMP=

Nobel Prize Website, 'William Arthur Lewis', accessed 18 February 2015 at http://www.nobelprize.org/nobel_prizes/economic-sciences/laureates/1979/lewis-bio.html

Nye, Joseph, 'Soft Power and Higher Education', report, 1 January 2005, accessed 16 March 2016, at https://net.educause.edu/ir/library/pdf/ffp0502s.pdf

Shils, Edward, 'The Career of Harold Laski', *The New Criterion* 12 (April, 1994), accessed 16 June 2014 at http://www.newcriterion.com/articles.cfm/The-career-of-Harold-Laski-4926 <http://www.hindu.com/thehindu/mag/2003/11/23/stories/2003112300120300.htm>

Singh, Manmohan, 'Speech by Dr. Manmohan Singh, Prime Minister of India, to the LSE Asia Forum 2006', 7 Dec. 2006, accessed 3 October 2011 at http://www2.lse.ac.uk/lseasiaforum/pdf/manmohansingh_openingaddress.pdf